

the public confession in the church, confession should be made first to God and then privately to the priests.

(48.) HILARIUS, 461-467, was a Sardinian. His first act was to draw up a canon regulating the date for the observance of Easter, which had again occasioned disputes in the church. A council was held at Rome on the 17th November, 465, to consider two appeals made by bishops in Spain to the Pope. This council adopted a canon forbidding bishops to name their successors. The Emperor Anthimus being accused of favouring heretics, the Pope admonished him openly in St. Peter's Church on this subject.

(49.) SIMPLICIUS, 467-483; shortly after his accession received a letter of congratulation from Leo, Emperor of the East, urging him to acknowledge the canons of the council of Calcedon, which raised the city of Constantinople to the second rank in the episcopal dignity. The Pope, however, did not act on this suggestion. A dispute soon arose between Simplicius and the Patriarch of Constantinople respecting the election of a bishop at Antioch, which ended in the Patriarch giving way. This pontificate was signalized by incessant conflicts between the Roman See and the churches of the East.

(50.) FELIX III., 483-492, was elected by the clergy and magistrates in the church of St. Peter, where they were addressed by the prefect of the city relative to the protection of the property owned by the Church. The Patriarch of Constantinople being charged with protecting heretics, was excommunicated by Felix. This schism between the churches of Rome and Constantinople existed for thirty years.

(51.) GELASIUS I., 492-496, in a letter to the Emperor of the East, Anastasius, claimed for himself the same authority in ecclesiastical matters as the Emperor possessed in matters civil. In the year 494 he held a council to decide which should be recognised as the Canonical Books of the Old Testament. Some irregularities having arisen in the disposal of the property of the churches, the Pope wrote a Decretal, or general order, requiring all ecclesiastical property to be considered as divided into four parts: one-fourth for the bishop, another fourth for the clergy, another for the poor, and the remaining fourth for the maintenance of the church. He also ordered that all Christians should receive the communion under both kinds, regarding as sacrilegious those who would separate the two symbols administered in that sacrament.

(52.) ANASTASIUS II., 496-498, devoted his efforts to the task of bringing about a reconciliation with the eastern church. He even received into communion a prominent partizan of the Patriarch of Constantinople. This act was so displeasing to some of the orthodox party in Rome, that they separated themselves from communion with the Pope. At this time an event of great importance occurred in Gaul; Clovis, King of France, being converted to Christianity. The Pope wrote him a letter of congratulation.

(53.) SYMMACHUS, 498-514. On the same day that Symmachus was elected, some discontented clergy met in one of the churches and chose a priest named Lawrence. A sedition arose in the city in consequence, and several lives were lost in the disturbance. Finally the two candidates were summoned to Ravenna, where they appeared before the Emperor, who decided in favour of Symmachus. A council was then held at Rome, which drew up regulations to prevent a recurrence of such irregular elections. The priest Lawrence subsequently accused the Pope, before the Emperor, of immoral conduct. The Emperor called a council to investigate this charge; but the Pope refused to appear before it, alleging that he was in danger of his life owing to the sedition raised by his rival. The council, in his absence, absolved him of the crimes imputed to him. Another council, in the following year, enacted that all bishops, priests and deacons, should always have with them a person of known probity, who should be witness of all their actions.

(54.) HORMISDAS, 514-523. A council was held at Constantinople in the year 516 with the object of bringing about a union between the churches, to which the Pope sent legates; but no terms could be agreed upon. Three years later, however, a second council was held in that city, at which also Papal envoys were present; and the representatives of the Eastern Churches then acceded to a declaration of faith drawn up by the legates from Rome, thus terminating the long schism between East and West. The Pope next devoted his attention to the churches in Gaul and Spain, appointing the Bishops of Vienne, Tarragona, and Seville, to act as his vicars in those countries. He also interested himself in the study of psalmody, causing the clergy to be well instructed in this subject.

(55.) JOHN I., 523-526, was a native of Tuscany. Disturbances having arisen at Constantinople, owing to the action taken by the Emperor for repressing the heresies which were now flourishing in that city, the Pope was requested to visit the East. He accordingly went to Constantinople, where he was received with great demonstrations of respect; and succeeded in inducing the Emperor to adopt a more conciliatory policy. On his way home, the Pope was arrested at Ravenna by order of Theodoric (Emperor of the West), who had become jealous of his influence in the empire; and being cast into prison he died soon after.

(To be continued.)

A MODERN 'SYMPOSIUM.'

THE SOUL AND FUTURE LIFE.

(Continued.)

The exceeding readiness and joyfulness with which the truth was welcomed, and the measure in which Christendom—and that means all that is most powerful and progressive in human society—has been moulded by it, are the most notable facts of history. Be it truth, be it fiction, be it dream, one thing is clear: it was a baptism of new life to the world which was touched by it, and it has been near the heart of all the great movements of human society from that day until now. I do not even exclude 'the Revolution,' whose current is under us still. Space is precious, or it would not be difficult to show how deeply the Revolution was indebted to the ideas which this gospel brought into the world. I entirely agree with Lord Blachford that Revelation is the ground on which Christian faith securely rests. But the history of the quickening and the growth of Christian society is a factor of enormous moment in the estimation of the arguments for the truth of immortality. We are assured that the idea had the duldest and

even basest origin. Man has a shadow, it suggested the idea of a second self to him! he has memories of departed friends, he gave them a body and made them ghosts! Very wonderful surely, that mere figments should be the strongest and most productive things in the whole sphere of human activity, and should have stirred the spirit and led the march of the strongest, noblest, and most cultivated peoples; until now, in this nineteenth century, we think that we have discovered, as Miss Martineau tersely puts it, that 'the theological belief of almost everybody in the civilised world is baseless.' Let who will believe it, I cannot.

It may be urged that the idea has strong fascination, that man naturally longs for immortality, and gladly catches at any figment which seems to respond to his yearning and to justify his hope. But this belief is among the clearest, broadest, and strongest features of his experience and history. It must flow out of something very deeply embedded in his constitution. If the force that is behind all the phenomena of life is responsible for all that is, it must be responsible for this also. Somehow man, the masterpiece of the Creation, has got himself wedded to the belief that all things here have relations to issues which lie in a world that is behind the shadow of death. This belief has been at the root of his highest endeavour and of his keenest pain; it is the secret of his chronic unrest. Now Nature through all her orders appears to have made all creatures contented with the conditions of their life. The brute seems fully satisfied with the resources of his world. He shows no sign of being tormented by dreams; his life withers under no blight of regret. All things rest, and are glad and beautiful in their spheres. Violate the order of their nature, rob them of their fit surroundings, and they grow restless, sad, and poor. A plant shut out from light and moisture will twist itself into the most fantastic shapes, and strain itself to ghastly tenuity; nay, it will work its delicate tissues through stone walls or hard rock, to find what its nature has made needful to its life. Having found it, it rests and is glad in its beauty once more. Living things, perverted by human intelligent effort, revert swiftly the moment that the pressure is removed. This marked tendency to reversion seems to be set in Nature as a sign that all things are at rest in their natural conditions, content with their life and its sphere. Only in ways of which they are wholly unconscious, and which rob them of no contentment with their present, do they prepare the way for the higher developments of life.

What then means this restless longing in man for that which lies beyond the range of his visible world? Has Nature wantonly and cruelly made man, her masterpiece, alone of all the creatures restless and sad? Of all beings in the Creation must he alone be made wretched by an unattainable longing, by futile dreams of a visionary world? This were an utter breach of the method of Nature in all her operations. It is impossible to believe that the harmony that runs through all her spheres fails and falls into discord in man. The very order of Nature presses us to the conviction that this insatiable longing which somehow she generates and sustains in man, and which is unquestionably the largest feature of his life, is not visionary and futile, but profoundly significant; pointing with firm finger to the reality of that sphere of being to which she has taught him to lift his thoughts and aspirations, and in which he will find, unless the prophetic order of the Creation has lied to him, the harmonious completeness of his life.

And there seems to be no fair escape from the conclusion by giving up the order, and writing Babel on the world and its life. Whatever it is, it is not confusion. Out of its disorder, order palpably grows; out of its confusion arises a grand and stately progress. Progress is a sacred word with Mr. Harrison. In the progress of humanity he finds his longed-for immortality. But, if I may repeat in other terms a remark which I offered in the first number of this Review, while progress is the human law, the world, the sphere of the progress, is tending slowly but inevitably to dissolution. Is there discord again in this highest region? Mr. Harrison writes of an immortal humanity. How immortal, if the glorious progress is striving to accomplish itself in a world of wreck? Or is the progress that of a race born with sore but joyful travail from the highest level of the material creation into a higher region of being, whence it can watch with calmness the dissolution of all the perishable worlds?

The belief in immortality is so dear to man because he grasps through it the complement of his else unshaped and imperfect life. It seems to be equally the complement of this otherwise hopelessly jangled and disordered world. It is asked triumphantly: Why of all the hosts of creatures does man alone lay claim to this great inheritance? Because in man alone we see the experiences, the strain, the anguish, that demand it, as the sole key to what he does and endures. There is to me something horrible in the thought of such a life as ours, in which for all of us, in some form or other, the Cross must be the most sacred symbol, lived out in that bare, heartless, hopeless world of the material, to which Professor Clifford so lightly limits it. And I cannot but think that there are strong signs in many quarters of an almost fierce revulsion from the ghastly dreariness of such a vision of life.

There seems to me to run through Mr. Harrison's utterances on these great subjects—I say it with honest diffidence of one whose large range of power I so fully recognise, but one must speak frankly if this Symposium is to be worth anything—an instinctive yearning towards Christian ideas, while that faith is denied which alone can vivify them and make them a living power in our world. There is everywhere a shadowy image of a Christian substance; but it reminds one of that formless form, wherein 'what seemed a head, the likeness of a kingly crown had on.' And it is characteristic of much of the finest thinking and writing of our times. The saviour Deronda, the prophet Mordecai, lack just that living heart of faith which would put blood into their pallid lineaments, and make them breathe and move among men. Again I say that we have largely ourselves to thank for this saddening feature of the higher life of our times—we who have narrowed God's great kingdom to the dimensions of our little theological sphere. I am no theologian, though intensely interested in the themes with which the theologians occupy themselves. Urania, with darkened brow, may perhaps rebuke my prating. But I seem to see quite clearly that the sad strain and anguish of our life, social, intellectual, and spiritual, is but the pain by which great stages of growth accomplish themselves. We have quite out-grown our venerable, and in its time large and noble, theological shell. We must wait, not fearful, far less hopeless, while by the help of