

"Let us speak not in a spirit of defiance, but in a spirit of love, let us eschew all needless expressions which may give offence; above all let us remember that the grand object which we have in view is the discovery of the wisest methods of work, the strengthening of peace, the firmer cohesion of the members of the Body. By his course our very differences will serve to bring out more clearly the unity of our faith, and our diversities of thought will be at once a safeguard and protection against any narrowing of the limits which define the membership of our branch of the Catholic Church."
BISHOP MACLAGAN.

GAMBETTA.

THE tragedy which removes the most illustrious figure from the stage of French life, one indeed of the greatest men that nation has produced, is an incident highly characteristic of the times, and one which carries its lesson on its face as clearly as an ethical proverb. We who have lived through the period which has given birth to those institutions of which our own and other nations are so boastful—the institutions political, which enlarged the liberties of the great mass of the people; institutions educational, which gave education at a nominal cost or free of direct charge, we remember how eloquent were the advocates of these movements. We recall too our own enthusiasm and labours in their interest, and ask, with a little sadness, Where are the signs of that moral reform which was predicted as "the certain result enlarged political liberty and a general diffusion of education?" A symbolical answer comes up out of the depths in the death of GAMBETTA, the typical former in both the political and educational here, lately murdered by his paramour, who thus engaged the personal wrong to herself and her child, and acted as the dread Nemesis of her intemperate sex. He whose strategical genius and magnificent oratory were at one time almost another wing of the French army; he whose tongue was indeed a sharp sword, the sword of his country; he who swung back the roaring tide of party passion, which in the stormy days of 1877 literally surged at his feet, threatening his life when speaking at the tribune in the National Assembly; he who was tried, two years later on, by an immense majority to the Presidential Chair of that Assembly, and there appealed nobly for justice to be tempered with mercy, and party passion to be drowned in patriotism; he, GAMBETTA, the great orator and statesman of the Republic of France, dies like a hero, shot down as a punishment for the meanness and the cowardice of self-indulgent vice.

While devoting talents of supreme splendour and energies of intensest force to the cause of his country's freedom, its emancipation from the fetters of ancient prejudices and its social elevation, he himself was a miserable slave, and contemptible reason of the base dishonour done by him to mankind in his relations to her by whose hand he has been sent to a dishonorable grave. The lesson needs no bringing out. The wages of sin is death. All that political talent, all that riotic zeal, all that genius can do to elevate humanity fails to ennoble when vice, vice inspired the lust of self-indulgence, heedless of others' honour or interests, is eating into a man's nature rupturing it even to mortification.

"FOURTH PARTY" IN THE CHURCH.

BY H. C. SHUTTLEWORTH.

THE term "party" may be objectionable, and the spirit of party is the very spirit of selfishness, and of all uncharitableness. But it is a fact for the Church that various schools of thought

should exist side by side within her pale. Truth is many-sided, and one man's mind is naturally bent towards one aspect of the same fact or the same verity, which another man approaches from a different point of view. It was so in Apostolic days; it has been so ever since. The various schools have taught each other, and have stirred each other up to good works, and have each of them borne witness to their respective sides of truth; they have secured the proper balance of faith; they have witnessed for that unity in diversity which is the only unity possible for human nature. So far, different schools of thought are necessary and wholesome.

But when the evil spirit of intolerance and bitterness enters into them, and one party begins to claim a monopoly of truth, and to insist that truth ceases to be truth unless it be cramped into its own party moulds and expressed in its own party phrases,—when one party is not content unless it can drive others out, and conceals its fierce and narrow bigotry under the specious plea of loyalty to the Faith—then schools of thought degenerate into parties, and false types of orthodoxy and goodness are formed. The darkest years of the Church's history are those in which this fatal spirit has prevailed. To use ecclesiastical machinery, and to put forth the whole strength of organization, for the purpose of compelling an outward uniformity and calling it Catholic obedience:—this has been the secret of the Inquisition, of Smithfield, of the loss of John Wesley, and, among a hundred other examples, of certain deplorable phenomena in the English Church of to-day.

It would seem, then, that the rise of a fresh school of thought, or the appearance of men who own allegiance to no existing party, but take an unusual line, is a fact which calls upon candid and thoughtful men to wait and watch, and to discourage the fierce outburst of denunciation which is sure to greet a new departure. The first leaders of a new school have generally been worried and fretted into their graves by those who will not endure the unaccustomed, and scent heresy in what may be only indiscretion, or the result of incessant provocation. We have yet to learn the lesson Gamaliel might have taught us centuries ago.

The immediate object of these remarks is the appearance of what has become a "Fourth Party" in the Church of England. "The three recognized schools of thought" have each attained their place after fighting hard for it. Each will last until its own portion of truth is assimilated by the others. Then, its purpose being served and its work done, decay will set in; and though it may drag on its existence as a party, as a school of thought it will die. There are those who consider that the great Evangelical school, to which the Church owes so much, is becoming disintegrated under the pressure of this law. There are signs that the High Church section, which is undoubtedly the dominant school of to-day, has almost exhausted its mandate. The Broad Church party has never been a party in the sense of the two others; it has been rather an influence. It must not be forgotten, however, that this school has two divisions; one represented by such names as Whately and Arnold, and the other by Maurice and Kingsley. Whatever may be said of the former section, the latter is alive and vigorous. But it has formed an alliance with a part of the High Church school, and the result is seen in the large and growing number of clergy—mostly young men—who have all the High Church reverence for the Sacraments, for the idea of the Church, and for beauty of worship, united with free views upon certain doctrinal questions, and a strong dash of what used to be mis-called "muscular Christianity." Perhaps this alliance and its product are not surprising when we remember that both Maurice and Kingsley signed the petition against the Purchase Judgment, and that a leading article was once actually written for the *Times*, attacking Kingsley for his outward marks of reverence in the chapel of Wellington College.

More than any other theologian of this age, Frederick Denison Maurice has influenced the modern English Church. His church in Vere Street was never crowded; his Cambridge lectures were attended only by a select few; his books, though widely read, are too mystical and too obscure for the general public. His style, involved and cloudy, like that of Dr. Pusey, made it hard work to hear or to read him. But Kingsley, one of the most popular of modern writers, became his interpreter; and with Kingsley he gathered around him a small band of devoted disciples, who did understand him, and resolved that the people should understand him too. Maurice is, perhaps, the most conspicuous modern example of a teacher who did not himself reach the public ear, but worked through his immediate followers. He is undoubtedly the father of the coming "Fourth Party," which is neither High nor Broad, but a compound of the two.

The older Broad Church school and the early High Churchmen addressed themselves mainly to cultivated intellects. The middle classes, perhaps, were the stronghold of Evangelicalism. Maurice and Kingsley appealed to the working class, though by no means exclusively to them. The most conspicuous triumphs of the Ritualist school, and some of the most conspicuous failures are in the same direction. They only appear to succeed in certain districts, like the London Docks and Baldwin's Gardens; while what may perhaps be called the "Trades Union" type of intelligent artisans are attracted as little by this as by any other religious body. This is the class in whose hands the balance of political power now rests; and before very long they will possess an even more preponderating influence than at present.

To this class—alienated from the Church and from religion generally; only just touched by Ritualism, and by that alone—the new "Fourth Party" would seem mainly to appeal. Its leading spirits lay great emphasis upon the attitude of the Church towards social and political questions, and point to the example of the Hebrew prophets as their warrant. They declare that the advancement of human well-being in this world is worthy of the Church's thought and care, no less than the life after death. They insist that the fellowship of Christ's Church is not so much a bond of opinion as one of relationship; that the Church is itself a kingdom of heaven set up on earth, a society of righteousness for the glory of God and the good of men, not for the benefit of a select few. The Sacraments are as prominent in their teaching as in that of High Churchmen, and they meet the best men of all schools in their enthusiasm of devotion to the Person of our Lord. They are liberal in their methods of handling Scripture, and of regarding the observance of Sunday; they hold that the baptized laity should have a powerful voice in Church government; they believe that the All-Father's education of His children will not cease with death.

It will readily be seen that these are just the points upon which so many intelligent artisans and others have broken with religion. The report of the Guild of St. Matthew, recently noticed in our leading columns, and itself fairly representative of the Fourth Party, will furnish abundant evidence of the fact; and this may be corroborated by a glance at those cheap newspapers which count their circulation among working men by hundreds of thousands, such as *Reynolds'*, *Lloyd's*, or the *Weekly Dispatch*. The new school, then, clearly meets a need, and a need of the first importance. It has already begun to develop a literature; and I may be allowed shortly to call attention to some recent sermons which belong to it. It has no special organization, but it has produced the Church and Stage Guild, the Committee of Clergy on Trades Unions, and at least one other society; and among its members are active, able and earnest men, who have won their right to be heard.

We must expect a certain amount of indiscreet and foolish action, and a fair allowance of wild talking, from young men who have thus had the boldness to take a line of their own. But sober and large hearted Christians will not make the fatal mistake of discouraging and disheartening these eager brethren by too great severity, or by