

contempt and distrust of the public, must be equally a crime and a blunder. This does not apply to the same extent to the lawyer or physician, we don't as a rule instinctively suspect the skill or learning of the doctor who speaks slightly of other doctors, or the lawyer who alludes sneeringly to his professional brother or brethren, but I defy any layman worth his salt to listen to the manifestly prejudiced and ill natured remarks of a priest about a brother priest without in some degree losing his respect for the clergyman in particular, and possibly for the cloth in general. Clergymen, it is scarcely necessary to say, are judged by a different standard to laymen. With the latter their stock in trade is their skill, their learning, or their capital; but with the former their good name is their stock in trade. We may deplore and despise jealousy in the doctor, but that won't prevent our employing him if we believe him to be an able man, but we cannot entertain such an opinion about a clergyman without his influence over us and our respect for him sensibly or insensibly declining, and his usefulness in our case at least becoming impaired.

And these considerations have all the more weight and importance when we consider that probably jealousy is the great besetting temptation of the ministerial profession. All professions, states, spheres, and occupations have their special temptation, and from a variety of reasons a clergyman is of all men very often tempted to discount the achievements of his professional brothers. How often is the tried and faithful servant of the Church who has borne the burden and heat of the day and done good, hard honest work doomed to see himself overshadowed by the raw recruit; how often the earnest, laborious toiler, the faithful, conscientious student, the high minded hater of all forms and degrees of affectation and humbug, the resolute setter forth by word and example of what he considers the whole counsel of God; the man who experiences in his very bones the consciousness of a rectitude of purpose and a latent intellectual power that only requires a suitable sphere to blossom forth like the rose—how often I say, are priests of undeniable worth and ability forced to listen to the enthusiastic praises and witness the marvellous successes of those whom they know in their heart of hearts to be to put it plainly (in a professional sense), humbugs and charlatans. The public, with all its penetration, is fearfully and wonderfully fond of being humbugged. The gullibility of human nature is practically immeasurable and fathomless, and the man who knows this and can bring himself to trade upon it can scarcely fail of a certain kind of success. Although "hold fast" is the better dog in the long run, "brag" is undeniably a good one and he can generally bark loud enough and long enough to impress the majority of people with a very profound respect for his staying powers. And so it comes about that with average men, excepting of course those of surpassing ability who take the world by storm, and the invincible plodders who have learned to labour and to wait, a

certain degree of what we may mildly call "policy" is in the majority of cases probably essential to success, a quality which from a variety of causes, many men abstain from cultivating, some from indolence, some from an inborn stubbornness of disposition, and others from an inveterate and unconquerable aversion to anything and everything savouring of underhandedness.

To the last named class, therefore, the success of those they cannot help honestly despising, must infallibly arouse a natural and almost pardonable contempt or jealousy that it is torture to conceal. And yet, under circumstances like these (and I could not put a stronger case), a hundred considerations of prudence and expediency bid us preserve a silent tongue and an unruffled brow. To compromise truth and wink at absolute error for the sake of peace, can, of course, never be justifiable, and in situations where essentials are involved it is our bounden duty to brave all consequences and to spare no one whatever unworthy motives may be attributed to us, and however much our usefulness may momentarily suffer.

But to sum up the general consideration of the subject, in any case that falls short of this the manifestation of any form or degree of jealousy on the part of a clergyman is more or less ruinous to himself and the cause, and should be striven against with might and main and resolutely concealed with Spartan fortitude. And would clergymen, as a class, only try and live up to this for say the space of one short twelve months, how immeasurably and swiftly would they rise in public estimation, and thus would their forbearance to one another be twice blessed, as on the other hand their too common jealousy is twice cursed.

SYSTEMATIC GIVING.

THE early Christians acted on the principle laid down by the Divine Founder of the Christian Church, "Freely ye have received, freely give," and having drunk freely of the water of life, their one desire was to spend and be spent in the service of their Master. They gave their money and they gave themselves, and at first, at all events, they had "all things in common." Nor can we doubt that during the brief interval in which this whole-hearted generosity prevailed, the Church was in a purer state than it has ever since attained. The community of goods does not appear, however, to have continued very long, and soon we find the Apostle urging on the believers the systematic setting apart of a certain portion of their income for the service of GOD. Though not actually mentioned, it is probable that the old Jewish "tithe" was adopted as a kind of a free-will offering. That is to say, every Christian was expected to give a tenth of his income as a *minimum* amount. If we reckon up what the Jews actually gave, we shall find that in one way and another a great deal more than a tenth part was set apart for religious and charitable purposes. So also in the early Church it is probable that the tenth was adopt-

ed as the minimum contribution expected from each person, but that some of the more earnest and devoted Christians gave considerably more. Compared with what the heathen around used to give, and do now present to their temples and their priests, this percentage does not appear to be great, especially when we recall the truth conveyed in the lines:

We lose what on ourselves we spend,
We have as treasure without end
Whatever, LORD, to Thee we lend,
Who givest all.

It is, however, to be feared that though we in the nineteenth century can boast much of our privileges and advantages, yet we cannot boast of our generosity as compared with that of the early Christians. We are too apt to take a selfish view of our possessions, as if we had an exclusive right to them; whereas, as a matter of fact, GOD has but made us stewards of the few or many riches, which he has committed to our care for a certain purpose, and for which we shall have to render a strict account to Him to whom they really belong. The temptation to consider that we have an exclusive right to our possessions is, as a rule, very much stronger in those who have earned money than in those who have inherited it. The latter, however badly they may use that which is committed to their care, cannot but feel that it was the mere accident of birth that gave them their wealth. The former, however, are strongly tempted to feel that their earnings are on quite a different footing from an inheritance obtained merely by virtue of birth. As a matter of fact, however, there is no difference whatever in this respect, for the gift is equally from the Creator, whether it takes the form of the aristocracy of birth inheriting wealth, or the aristocracy of intellect giving the individual the capacity to acquire wealth. However we may happen to have received our money, we are bound to admit that it is to GOD we owe whatever we possess.

The Apostle Paul seems to have attached very great importance to *systematic* giving, and it may be well for us to consider carefully whether we are following his instructions. The question of what the proportion to be given shall be, must rest between the individual and his GOD, but that there shall be some system by which it is done, is of the greatest importance.—*The Rock*.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE OFFICIAL YEAR-BOOK OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1887. Published by the S.P.C.K., under sanction of the four Archbishops, the Primus of Scotland, the English Bishops, &c.

This invaluable work now extends to 670 pages, in which are given historical, descriptive, statistical and general items of interest, showing the position and work of the Church in England, Ireland, Wales, Scotland and the colonies. We propose to draw from these stores, in a later notice of a work, one copy of which at least should be in every parish.

THE CHURCH REVIEW. American; Houghton, Mifflin & Co., New York and Boston, April 1887. This number is made specially interesting to Canadians by the article, "The