

who may not have the Anglican Prayer Book at hand, I quote the first paragraph of the said preface in full.

"It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons. Which offices were evermore had in such reverent estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority. And, therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of England, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried and examined and admitted thereunto according to the Form hereafter following or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination."

Now, even if this paragraph from the rubric is to be esteemed "beyond the altogether human, temporary, or accidental," which the Church of England, as Dr. Ker says, must hand down unpaired—thus inhibiting all compromise in the matter and manner of official ordination, and thus forming a barrier to union now or hereafter,—there is, at least, in my opinion, nothing in it to prevent an interchange of pulpits among the pastors of all Protestant Churches. If the paragraph, however, be forced in its meaning to signify authoritatively that no one may occupy a pulpit of the Church of England as homilist, unless he be ordained a bishop, priest or deacon in terms of the doctrine and polity of the historic episcopate, then does it signify more than I or my Anglican associates have been able to make out, while searching for warrants for an interchanging of pulpits as a first friendly step towards union with the three bodies which have already reported progress in that direction. I contend that the words "any of the said Functions" does not necessarily mean "any of the functions of the said Orders of Ministers." If that contention be set aside, then may the courtesy of inviting the Anglicans to share in the deliberations on union be looked upon as a courtesy that can lead to nothing of any great moment,—nay, then is the first part of my thesis proven conclusively, namely, that there is a meantime impossibility in the way of Church union beyond the limits of what has already reached a common ground of agreement. All Anglicans of the Dr. Ker type must learn to distinguish between union and absorption. Church union cannot be accomplished, no more than could confederation, otherwise than by a process of friendly compromise. Church pride has had no place in the deliberations so far. No one of the negotiating bodies expects to gain any advantage over the other. And it is hardly necessary to repeat that the possible and practical in the union proposal is not likely to be stultified or prolongingly delayed on account of any impossible or impracticable there may be in the wider proposal. Indeed if the gentle friendly challenge for an interchanging of pulpits and a preliminary subduing of denominational aloofness and of all so-called church pride be ignored, it is safe to say that all serious meaning and real significance has gone out of the wider enterprise and the sooner it collapses the better for the partial enterprise. And yet even should such a collapse ensue, the second part of my thesis still remains, namely: Is all future wider Church Union with the Anglicans an impossibility? I am convinced it is not, though a separate article is needed to elaborate that side of the question, even should the heather be thereby set on fire.

Note.—I wish to assure my Anglican

friends that no word of any kind of Presbyterian prejudice need be searched for in the above. There is no such word to be met with in any part of my argument, since from associations, I feel as much at home in an Anglican Church as in a Methodist or Congregational, with no thought of disloyalty towards Presbyterianism, and would gladly see them all embraced within one communion, if it were possible.

THE PREACHER'S SATURDAY NIGHT.

Saturday night is a very quiet and gracious time to me. I will have it so. No matter what my circuit stewards say, no matter how the tea meetings rage and the people imagine a vain thing. I stick by my Saturday nights. The shadow of the Sabbath has begun to fall. Perhaps it would be better to say the dawn of the day has begun to make ready—for what is night save the messenger of the morning? If our people drive their preacher riotously to the very verge of the midnight like any weary shop-keeper, will he arise when he should have upon him the dew of his youth? So have I set my neck stubbornly to refuse the yoke. A mood will not come because the clock points to a certain hour, and if you are to be apt for the vision of God you must go apart for a season. Isaac Taylor has a charming volume of studies which he calls Saturday Evening, "which," says he, "devout persons, whose leisure permits them to do so, are accustomed to devote to preparatory meditation." You can generally find the book for a shilling—it ran through many editions and has fallen on evil times. You can get in that volume the germ of his Physical Theory of Another Life, but the book is worthy for its own sake, and should be peculiarly valuable to the preacher, as from the pen of a layman. But my point is that I stick by Saturday evening. I have had to fight many a battle about it and expect to fight many another; but it pays—it pays my people best of all. Every other night may go; they belong to Gog and Magog, to the needy and the voracious and the daring and the deaf, to Greatheart and Mr. Fearing, to Faithful and Ignorance and to all who can make any reasonable show, any claim of right or plea of pity, but Saturday night belongs to Sunday and Sunday belongs to God.—(Reviewer, in the Methodist Times.)

LIFE BEYOND DEATH.

"Man is made for the Infinite," says Pascal. "We desire immortality, not as a reward of virtue, but as its continuance," says Jean Paul Richter. So close is this kinship with the Divine that to lose faith in God and immortality is to lose hope in the world. Professor Le Conte has wisely said, "Without immortality this beautiful cosmos, which has been developing into increasing beauty for so many millions of years, when it has run its course and all is over, would be precisely as it had never been, an idle dream, an idle talk, signifying nothing." Sully says, "To abandon hope of a future life is a vast loss not to be made good so far as I can see, by any new idea of service to humanity." Strauss confessed that when he had lost his faith in God and immortality he lost his interest in human life, and in the world he inhabited. He saw nothing to live for. And Professor Clifford, after losing his religious faith, said, "We have seen the sun shine out of an empty heaven to light up a soulless world; we have felt with utter loneliness that the Great Companion is dead." A being thus related to God, made in His image and fitted for communion with Him, endowed with the capacity of knowing, loving, and enjoying Him forever, prepared and disciplined for a career of never-ending glory and blessedness hereafter, can have its full fruition only in a life beyond the grave.—Hugh Johnson, in "Beyond Death."

SCIENCE FOR THE CHINESE.

It comes out that a Chinese publisher formerly an officer of high rank in the Chinese Navy, Jen Fuh by name, the father of the Chinese Secretary of Legation in Paris, has been taking the educated Chinese through practically the same course of reading that the best and most enlightened English and American reading public has been brought up on during the latter half of the nineteenth century, says the Boston Transcript. For instance, besides issuing at Shanghai The Commercial Press and the Diplomatic Review, from the publishing house of which he is one of the Directors, he has been sending out translations of the works of these great English philosophers and scientists who have most powerfully affected the views and beliefs of the modern world. The first of these issues was Huxley's "Evolution and Ethics," an old story with us now. But its success with us in our first "popular science" days was instantly repeated in China a dozen years ago. Four hundred thousand copies were sold before the demand was satisfied, showing with what passionate eagerness the Chinese have been studying the new thought of modern Europe. The doctrine of "the survival of the fittest" produced a profound impression on the Chinese reading classes. It taught them that if they would survive as a nation and as a civilization they must bestir themselves. This was more than ten years ago, and the heaven has, of course been working at least that length of time. The Chinese ex-naufragi chieftain, Jen Fuh, turned publisher and educator of his countrymen, has his parallel in the great Viceroy of the capital province, Yuan Shih Kai, for some time now recognized as the most powerful official in China, turned author. Two books of his have lately been given to the Chinese world of 200,000,000 to 300,000,000. What a population would this be for any "best-selling book"! With the usual inversion, however, of the motives of action in the two worlds of East and West, these books have not been published to sell. They are circulated in semi-private fashion in the Government educational establishments. One is a textbook of patriotism, and the other a plea for the missionary and appeal to the Christian and non-Christian to live on good terms and remember always that they are both Chinese. And what says this leading statesman at present in authority in China in his "Plea for Patriotism"? The most striking of the practical counsels are those in which he touches upon the perilous situation for China rising out of her supine attitude as a quarry for adventurous foreign nations. On the subject of education, for instance, he observes: "By the possession of knowledge our people will be able to take an intelligent interest in public business. The history of Western nations has shown that national progress and strength have been proportioned to the attention given to education. This has been proved by Japan, and will be so with China. Education, however, must be not merely literary, but military. The cultivation of the patriotic spirit and the practice of regular military drill have been a prominent feature in the educational systems of modern countries. This must be further supplemented by more advanced military training for all the people, (conscription). The conditions of modern politics require every great State to be a military power."

Dr. William Henry, an English physician, states, as the result of experiments, that, in all forms of animal life, insects included, exists the taste for alcohol. He says that fishes are the only "real teetotalers" in creation.

Feeding on the wind will not satisfy hunger, nor will a foolish man find strength in his folly.