

comes round, and the hard-worked journalist, instead of finding a little relief from his toil, has cast upon him the added burden of 'making bricks without straw,' why should not a few English papers follow the example of a certain Canadian paper?—in suspending its issue for a week or two, while most readers are too hot or too far away to take up any serious reading, anything except the very "lightest" of "light literature." Try it, brother, yourself!

GLADSTONE ON SCHISM.

The thought of the world—not Christendom only, or Englishmen only—is sure to be coloured to some extent by the words and ideas of a man so great as William Gladstone. Whatever he may choose to speak or write about, he has excelled in so many subjects that he is listened respectfully to in all. People feel sure that they will gather some valuable material when such a mind unburdens itself. When such men make a *mistake*—as they, being mortals, are sure to do occasionally—the error is not only copied by his admirers, but exaggerated. If the mistake is fundamental to his argument, or important even, an immense rent may be made in one's ideas on matters of great moment. We fear that a mistake of this kind has been made in his last contribution to theological literature—most interesting and valuable, in many respects, as that article undoubtedly is to all thinkers upon such subjects.

HE PLEADS FOR GENTLENESS TO SCHISMATICS.

Far be it from us to deprecate such an attitude—on the contrary, we would make all due allowance for those who have been misled by fancies or prejudices to "take a wrong turn" in regard to religious matters; we feel sure that the Deity Himself will judge such persons with less severity than many people have been disposed to think. It is hardly argument, however, to say that modern ideas have raised up any *great difference* in this respect from the days of the Apostles, much less to intimate that God has viewed schismatical proceedings with a degree of favour. It is easy to recall instances of express meaning to the contrary—and we are surely bound to interpret Scripture so as not to impute or imply inconsistency in the Deity. *Trained theologians* know how to bridge over the apparent inconsistencies which are sometimes alleged.

"CIRCUMSTANCES ALTER CASES."

The threats and promises of God are all conditioned by his quality of *mercy*; so Jonah found out in the case of Nineveh, and there are parallel instances. What looks like human repentance—change of mind—is simply the divine *adaptation* of His decrees to changed circumstances. Such a sentence as that of Nineveh could only be meant for a very disobedient people. By altering their circumstances and condition before God, they gave play to divine love of mercy. In dealing with such episodes, an untrained mind would easily fall into mistake. We fear—unlikely as it may seem—that Gladstone has made a similar mistake in another direction, and from a similar cause.

JEROBOAM, THE SON OF NEBAT,

has made more than "Israel to sin." We have known good and eminent Bishops—men of learning and eloquence—make substantially the same mistake in regard to his proceedings as Gladstone appears to do in this essay. What God authorized was the division of the descendants of Abraham into two *nations*—what he did *not* authorize was the setting up of Jeroboam's new

altars at Dan and Bethel. This last action—not the former at all—was the "schism." It is quite impossible to find any excuse or condonation for Jeroboam's schism. Scripture reads all the other way. Yet, upon the supposition that God in some way connived at or approved of the schism, a large part of Gladstone's argument is built. Jeroboam's action "became a sin," and the true worshippers in Israel still "went up to Jerusalem" to worship. See Kings and Chronicles at large.

"GOD DID NOT DESERT ISRAEL."

—neither does nor did He desert the *heathen* nations. Even with the worst of them "He left not Himself without a witness." That is not His way—and we may well follow it. That, however, is a very different thing from "winking at" their sins and follies. The originator of a split in the Church has much to answer for. His successors, born into schism, have only to answer for the use of what light the founder *has left them* in his cloud of darkness. On no other hypothesis can we account for or justify such strong language as that of the New Testament on the subject of divisions in the body of Christ. It is folly to fancy that there is any essential difference between the sin then and the sin now.

ONLY WE HAVE GROWN CALLOUS.

Some of our British schisms have lasted so long and been so leniently regarded that they have come to be looked upon as *national eccentricities*, licensed by use. The spirit of toleration is thoroughly English, and finds a natural home among us, so that divisions are made almost too comfortable. For instance, Scotch Presbyterianism is so thoroughly well recognized, and so respectable nowadays, that the idea of their *indefensible departure* from the apostolic norm is very nearly lost. So with English Congregationalism and with Methodism. In Ireland, the Church of Rome has—"rightly or wrongly," as some would say—gained a *numerical* superiority over the Ancient Church, which gives it a certain foothold and standing in the community. So with a certain type of dissent in Wales. In Canada we have a prolongation of these various sectional peculiarities of the motherland. But

ALL THIS DOES NOT ALTER THE FACT—

causeless schism—or to give it the less offensive title, "division"—is a *sin*. Take the great mass of the Holy Catholic Church for 1,850 years, take them from East and West, from North and South; and then set beside this grand army of "faithful ones" the "motley crew" of heterogeneous sects! Thus, we regain the idea of schism's sinfulness—the "rending and tearing" of the skirts of Christ's vesture, the "cutting and carving" and weakening of the body of His spiritual incarnation. In order to estimate rightly the sin of such a proceeding, it is necessary for us to *close our eyes* resolutely to all considerations of *worldly* respectability and worth. These are the things which *blind* people—even such as Gladstone—to the true and quite unalterable issues set forth in Holy Scripture. To do otherwise is to perpetuate what ought to be speedily got rid of and abolished—a shame to Christendom, a dishonour to Christ. Let no sophistry prevent that consummation.

THIS "FLY IN THE OINTMENT"

disfigures and spoils what would otherwise be a most deeply interesting and valuable contribution to modern Christian thought on this subject. Even in spite of this disfigurement, the effort of

this aged statesman to use his enforced retirement from the turmoil of politics for the good of still more momentous concerns, may not be without wholesome fruit. Criticism can seldom find much room for activity in emanations from his well-furnished intellect, but—"even Homer sometimes nods." Less talented and less many-sided persons *then* have their innings, and their good natured laugh. The "Achilles of debate" will be the last to grudge others a laugh at his expense. Only he will make them *pay dear* for it before he gives up! He dies hard. The Church has had to suffer much at times from his occasional mistakes; but, upon the whole, she has had in him a son to be proud of. Her continued possession of his utter allegiance and perfect loyalty has been a "tower of strength" to her in many a crisis of recent times. His "wild" adherents and associates always were made to understand that he would never permit any tampering with what he believed to be the real interest of the Church. That was *sacred*. He could always be relied upon to strike a strong blow for her—even if it fell on his political friends.

THE SOCIETY OF ST. OSMUND.

This Society kept its fifth anniversary on Monday, 16th July. The Holy Eucharist was offered on its behalf in some eighty or ninety churches, and the High Service was held, by permission of the Rev. J. L. Fish, at St. Margaret Pattens, Rood-lane, at mid-day. The celebrant was the Bishop of Cairo (Illinois), who was assisted by an assistant-priest, deacon, and sub-deacon. The music was efficiently rendered by a plainsong choir of boys and men, and a solo boy sang some modern music which was hardly in keeping with the ritual music of the Church. When the service began the church was quite full, though not inconveniently crowded, the great preponderance of the congregation being men.

Kneeling as we did under the shadow of a mural tablet erected to the memory of one "Stephen Osmund," we felt that the heart of St. Osmund in paradise must have been gladdened when the Holy Sacrifice was offered up for the first time in the City of London since the reign of Mary Tudor (as the preacher afterwards explained), pontifically. The service lasted an hour and a quarter, which was rather too long for some city men. It might have been curtailed by the omission of the sermon.

The ceremonies of a pontifical celebration are somewhat elaborate, and the vesting of the Bishop before service was watched with some interest. His Lordship, of course, wore all the vestments—amice, alb, girdle, stole, tunicle, dalmatic, maniple, chasuble, and mitre. These were all of the thinnest silk, and unlined, or the heat would have been insupportable, even on a dull July day. There were a few priests in choir, including the rector and the preacher (the Rev. C. Rumball, Vicar of Littlehampton), and a large number of acolytes, but the choir was placed in the west gallery, by the side of the organ. The preacher was vested in full old-English surplice, scarf, and hood, but the Society will have to instruct its Oxford graduates that the form of the M.A. hood known as a "split salmon" is not in accordance with ancient precedent.

All the ceremonies of the service were carefully performed, and the singing of the Epistle to the old Sarum tone was especially good. We noticed that the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel used were those appointed in the Prayer Book for the Eighth Sunday after Trinity. Mr. Rumball's sermon was brief and to the point. He said that it was more than 800 years since the Holy Eucharist had been celebrated pontifically in the City of London, and went on to speak of the condition of Church feeling during that period. He spoke with respect of the Evangelical school, which had laid a sound foundation for the Catholic revival, and said that when people asked them what rule or what authority they had for their ceremonial, they were able to say that it was the rule of their forefathers and the authority of the Book of Common