

being expressly prohibited by any law, and yet be doubtful as to its lawfulness, and clearly inexpedient and mischievous.

Now I have no doubt—there can be no doubt—that a Bishop has a right to inquire into such practices and teachings; and in view of the fact that they are inexpedient and mischievous, “advise,” and if need be “admonish,” either Presbyter or Deacon, that he do so no more. Would not such advice be “godly”? Is not the Priest or Deacon bound to “follow” it?

Now what does the Canon really do?

(1.) It makes it *obligatory* on the Bishop “if he has reason to believe, or if complaint be made,” &c., to proceed to inquire, &c.

(2.) It makes it his duty to summon the Standing Committee, and *with them* investigate.

(3.) It makes it the duty of the Bishop to admonish, &c., and prescribes the form in which it shall be done.

Now thus far if anybody has a right to complain of restraint upon their liberty, it certainly is *not* the Presbyter or Deacon. It is the Bishop. He is *commanded* to do what was perhaps a matter of discretion before. He is limited by the consultation and advice of his Standing Committee the first may be no safeguard to the Priest or Deacon; but the latter certainly is of the nature of a safeguard to his liberty.

But I take it that no one will complain that there is anything unconstitutional in thus directing that a Bishop shall do his duty, and providing a safeguard for the clergy under his jurisdiction in his performance of it.

One thing more: the Canon provides §II [2] that “if the minister shall disregard such admonition it shall be the duty of the Standing Committee to cause him to be tried,”—this may be providing for two things that were not before parts of one Canon Law.

(1.) It makes it the duty of the Standing Committee “to cause him to be tried.” It may have been a matter left to their discretion before, whether to cause him to be tried or not.

(2.) It makes the minister liable to presentment and trial for “neglecting,” or not “following” the “admonition,” according to his ordination vow.

But if these are new, they certainly are not unconstitutional.

And this is all there is of it. The Canon does not make anything by way of either Doctrine or Ritual unlawful which was lawful before. It does not attempt any such thing. It only provides for Discipline, authorizes, directs, and in certain cases *commands* its enforcement.

In conclusion I have one word for Dr. Hopkins himself. He has used severe language in speaking of the Canon. My word to him is, that whenever hereafter he finds himself inclined to use such expressions with regard to anything which either a *good* man has done, or a *wise* man has said, he had better suspect that he is laboring under a total misapprehension of the matter; either that, or that he is trying to defeat a measure, which, in any fair view of it, is not liable to any serious objection.

W. D. WILSON.

The Church Journal

AND

GOSPEL MESSENGER.

NEW YORK, MARCH 11, 1875.

SENTIMENTALISM.

We print in another place a communication headed “Sentimentalism,” written, as we are assured, in good faith, and under pressure of conscientious opinion.

And because it deals with a common difficulty, which more or less affects a large number of honest people, we admit it, and make some remarks upon it.

It goes, as one may see, on a conception of the Christian Church, which is not at all that received and advocated in these columns. To remove that conception, would require us to go into an exhibition of first principles, which would be scarcely interesting to our readers, and would lead us into a range of writing in which we take no interest whatever.

Our correspondent's theory, if we understand it rightly, is that all good men are members of the Christian Church, and that as long as they are good men they cannot be expelled, or at least ought not to be, from outward communion with that Church; that doctrine is practically of no importance, and the Church has no right to discipline for false doctrine; that sincerity and honesty of purpose, and the conscientious conviction that one is doing God service, and means to do such service, makes him a true Christian and a genuine member of the Church of God.

That seems to us, to be the line of thought. True be-

lieving is nothing. The only distinction is that of conscientiousness.

And yet, even here, the writer would enter a *caveat*, we think. He would insist that there must be a belief in God, in order to find a ground for moral sanctions, and that the Divinity of our Lord must be accepted, in order to give us assurance that His morality is eternal and binding.

So that after all, at the threshold, *some* true believing is necessary to any true living.

The theory of course opposed to this, which we take to be the theory embraced in the Article “I believe in One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church,” is that there is an outward and visible Church, which has, like all outward and visible bodies, a government, a law, and an order, and a necessary power of discipline. That this Church is to preach and teach a fixed Faith and a settled morality, that it is to guard both; and as the first is the basis of the second, it is to purge itself from evil believing as well as from evil-living; that it is the pillar and ground of the Truth, the visible witness for God on earth; and that it can allow no man whom it believes to be misleading the souls of men into false and doubtful believing, which in the end lead to false and doubtful living, to hold authority within her, or to speak with her authority and in her name.

Manifestly to prove this last theory, is not our place here, and to the mass of Churchmen who have learned it from Catechism and Prayer Book and Pulpit, would be as uninteresting as the spelling-book to a Greek professor.

But we may put down here a few texts, which will suggest the side of truth which our correspondent's theory ignores.

He has a half truth. We do not wish him or any one else to throw even a half truth away. The true way is to complete it—to make a sphere of it—by taking the other half.

For it is a truth that honesty and conscientious sincerity are the main things; that without them, all orthodoxy of creed amounts to nothing.

But conscientious sincerity to be good, must have the Truth. Conscientious sincerity in a Lie, in a blunder, in a mistake, is ruinous. The man who holds a falsehood, is capable of mischief precisely in the degree of his honesty in the falsehood. No man did so much mischief to the Christian Church as young Saul of the tribe of Benjamin, because he was a more conscientious, honest, God-fearing Jew than any Pharisee or Scribe. They hated the Christian Church as much as he, but not being so sincere, they did not hate it with such a discriminating, honest, and religious hatred.

And just here we may as well remark, that there is no evidence to show that St. Paul was any more sincere than Saul. When persecuting the Truth, he was acting honestly by his lights. He surely was not, therefore, a Christian! It was not to make him more sincere, but to illuminate his understanding and his conscience, and make him sincere in the truth, instead of sincere in the lie, that the Lord flashed upon him in his persecuting path. And yet sincerity is so valuable conscientious truth to conviction, so precious that the bitterest persecutor becomes the loftiest saint!

But to pass on. Our correspondent quotes from the Scripture. “No Scripture is of any private interpretation.” That is, no text must be taken away and interpreted apart from other texts, apart from “the proportion of the Faith.” The great mass of error always has come from such interpretation.

The Prophet is speaking to God's own People, those already in the visible Church. The text has no reference to people outside. God tells the people He will judge them as His own, and all being the same in Faith, and outward privilege, the only possible difference in case is a moral one—the only distinction possible, is between the bad Jew and the good Jew. Manifestly there is no speech here of honest and sincere, or of dishonest and insincere, Assyrian or Babylonian idolaters.

We now proceed to cite a few texts, which being parts of God's Word, are not to be ignored, nor to be made to contradict other texts. They are texts which the “Sentimentalism” we discussed slurs over. It finds no place for them, and yet as they stand plainly set down, any theory *must* find place for them, or it must give up all claim to account for *all the facts*.

We see not how under our correspondent's theory there is any place for them; under the other, they range themselves naturally.

The first is a word of our Lord (Matt. xviii. 17): “And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglects to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a *heathen man and a publican*” (excommunicate).

The second is a word of St. Paul (Gal. i. 8): “But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received *let him be accursed*.”

Again, from the same Apostle (2 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 14):

“Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle.”

“And if any man obey not our word by this Epistle, note that man, and *have no company with him*, that he may be ashamed.”

And again (Titus iii. 10): “A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, *reject*.”

Hear again the tender and loving Apostle St. John (Second Epistle 10): “If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed.”

These are but a few specimens of the utterances of God's Word on this matter of examining into truth of doctrine, and treating those who deprave it, and of the taken-for-granted power of the Church in so doing.

Of course the Church may make a mistake in her discipline, but she is far less likely to do so in disciplining for doctrine than for morals. For doctrine is always set out publicly, advocated, and explained.

But the possibility of erring in a duty, does not excuse from the duty. And the man injured by the Church—disciplined for doctrine he does not hold—is no worse in the sight of God. But his method of making his discipline not a harm but a good to him, is to take it modestly and patiently.

In the case of Dr. Colonso, we are clear that the Church in South Africa did only her duty—did in fact what would have compromised her character, and faithfulness to her character and obligations as a Church, as the above commands are in evidence, not to do.

A HALF-GOSPEL.

The complaint of the small hold which Christianity has upon men, is a common complaint, and a just complaint. The number of men who leave the business of religion to their wives and children, and who more or less believe that it is fitting so to leave it, is very large.

There may be many reasons for this state of things. One reason at least occurs to us as deserving notice, and as being perhaps the root and ground of many others.

The type of popular Christianity most preached, is a sentimental and feminine type. The uses claimed for Christianity most commonly are sentimental and feminine uses. The reasons by which it is recommended to the attention and regard of people, are reasons which have special weight with women, and not so much weight with men. The emotional side of it has been dwelt upon to the forgetfulness of a certain earnest, hard, unemotional and somewhat repellent side, which is nevertheless quite as real as the other.

The common conception of Christianity is undoubtedly that it has a power to comfort in trouble, to console in sorrow, to sustain in distress; that it is a thing especially for times of sorrow, pain, and trouble. And all this is true if we understand by it real, and not merely sentimental, comfort consolation, and help.

But if it is to be such a comfort and consolation, it must be a real and serious thing in itself. For fantastic troubles, for unreal and fanciful sorrows and distresses, we cannot believe real religion can much care. It deals with realities if it be a reality itself, and not with hysterical emotions or “the luxury of woe.”

And the case stands thus. We have so allowed unreality to eat into our lives that escape from trouble, deliverance from pain, are sought as the highest good, and that actually it has come to pass that even religion is valued for the comfort it brings, and the ease it produces. It is preached as an anodyne for spiritual pain, it is valued and recommended as a soft and slumberous strain of gentle music to lap a sentimentally suffering soul in a gentle luxury of regret and longing.

It is wonderful how little people appreciate the difference between such a conception and the very actual and real Christianity represented and at work in the New Testament. One stands in astonishment that two such different things could even pass under the same name.

For certainly the Christianity of the New Testament is far from being a sentimental religion. It is a religion that deals, on the other hand, with realities, and very common, hard, and even rough realities too. The scourging, the buffeting, and the Cross, the nails, and the spear-thrust have not much sentimentalism about them. The stoning of Stephen, the beheading of the Baptist, the killing of James, the stoning and imprisoning of Paul, are very harsh and bare facts.

The uses laid down in the New Testament are substantial and real uses also. It is to help men lead honest, upright, genuine lives before God and men, that this religion has been given. They are expected to do honest work, and earn honest wages, to eat no man's bread for nought, to be good fathers and mothers, and faithful husbands and wives, to owe no man anything, to walk honestly in the sight of all men, and to live in the fear of God.

And this life is not represented as easy. “Strait is the gate,” saith the Lord Himself, by which men enter into