

all sins met. His prayer, short and humble as it was, ascended like sweetest incense to the Father of angels and of men; for it was no doubt, the expression of feeling the most deeply seated, and of purposes of amendment, the most sincere. "And he went down to his house justified rather than the other," or *in preference to the other.*" There is an interpretation of these words which must be carefully guarded against; and it is remarkable that it should be adopted by the two extremists, the Romanists and the Neologians. It supposes that neither was the Pharisee altogether condemned, nor was the Publican entirely approved; but only that the Publican was more favourably regarded than the Pharisee. On this exposition, Abp. Trench remarks:—"Christ does not mean that one by comparison with the other was justified, for there are no degrees in justification; but that one was absolutely justified, was contemplated of God as a righteous man, and the other was not; so that here the words found their fulfilment, 'He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away.'"

EXTREMES MEET.

If there are any individuals living on this world of ours who have made so little observation of human nature, as still to be ignorant that *extremes are very apt to meet*, as well in religion as in any thing else, another instance is just now being added to the long list that might have been quoted in support of the statement we advanced some time ago; and it must not be allowed to pass without a word or two of remark. It is, indeed, an instance of so glaring a character, that, notwithstanding the repeated instances which we have heretofore met with, of a somewhat similar nature, we were hardly prepared for anything quite so startling. We refer to the sympathy which is just now accorded by religious people—Christians—English and Canadian Christians—to the Mohammedan Turks in the atrocities they have committed, and are still committing, upon an unoffending Christian population—abominations and atrocities, we venture to say, that have found no parallel in countries professing to be civilized, for many a century past, and which were by no means equalled on the memorable night of the capture of Constantinople, on the 29th of May, in the year of grace, 1453. On that occasion, as our great historian remarks: "The wealth of Constantinople had been granted by the Sultan to his victorious troops; and the rapine of an hour is more productive than the industry of years;" deeds of barbarism were committed; outrage and assassination, attended by excessive cruelty, were resorted to; but these criminalities, while of less magnitude than those which have now been witnessed, were regarded as the privilege of the conquerors, while the great majority of recent sufferers were entirely innocent of indulging in what, to some nations of the earth,

would be regarded as the luxury of insurrection. When first the English consuls remonstrated with the Turkish authorities, the rumors were said to be exaggerated; and when Mr. Disraeli was questioned on the subject in the House of Commons, the excuse of exaggeration was again repeated. But the most recent and reliable accounts show that the original reports were far below the truth in the number and extent, as well as in the savage abominations which the Moslem population committed upon the Christians. Nor, according to the same most recent and reliable accounts, is it true that the Christians began the atrocities, or that any Christians joined the Mohammedan standard, except a very small proportion of those who were in absolute want, and resorted to it for relief. The account taken to England by a traveller who says a Bulgarian showed him a number of heads of Turks, whom he boasted he had slain, may be dismissed, with the contempt it deserves, by those who know that the Bulgarians are notoriously plodding, sluggish, and absolutely incapable of being roused to avenge their wrongs, or to assert their rights, as Christians and as men. If it occurred at all, it must have been entirely exceptional.

And yet with these facts, and a multitude more of a similar character, the Ultramontane Romanists blame the Christians, and give their sympathy to Turkey. Of course they hate the Greek Church and every member of it, and rather than that more primitive form of Christianity should rise from the depression and degradation to which it has been subjected, and rather than see the Patriarch of the East ascend his ancient seat in the Temple of St. Sophia, and eclipse his brother of the West, the Bishop of Rome and his most ardent supporters would prefer to hold out the olive branch of peace to the successor of Mohammed, and rejoice in the continuance of a savage Moslem barbarism, on some of the finest and the loveliest tracts of the earth's surface. At Rome, the Pope and the Sultan appear to be on the best terms; and the *Journal des Debats*, commenting on the fact, remarks:—"The Court of Rome would rather treat with Mohammed than with Photius—with the Sultan than the Czar."

Being tolerably well aware of the fact that the morality of Rome, by her own confession, rises no higher than the principle that *the end sanctifies the means*, we are not so very much surprised to find the natural antipathy of the Romanist and the Mohammedan reduced to a minimum in the presence of the common foe—the Greek Christian—who simply as being a Christian, is foe to the Turk; and is foe to the Romanist, because he will not bow down to the Roman Pontiff; and also because in the renovation of the Turkish Empire the Faith of the East would again resuscitate, and still further diminish the authority of his own.

But that, again, the strongly puritanic, the absolute and unappeasable anti-Roman section, the professedly

evangelistic school among us, which claims exclusively to disseminate the Gospel,—that it should join with the Ultramontane Romanist in his sympathy with Turkish hatred of Greek Christianity, is so plain and forcible an illustration of the principle that "extremes are very apt to meet," as we did not think we should so soon meet with. And yet the fact is so patent, and so recent, that surely no one will have the hardihood to deny it. The periodical literature of the hour teems with the proofs of it; and the cause is not very difficult to find. The Eastern Church, though in several respects more thoroughly Protestant than our own, yet bears its unflinching, its ineffaceable testimony to historical Christianity—to the necessary historical connection, that is, between the Church founded by Christ's own person when on earth, and the legitimate Christian Church of the present day. Or it may be because the Turk is an unmitigated Calvinist. But whatever may be the cause, the fact cannot be disputed.

We are glad, however, to find that the whole of the school to which we have referred, is not open to the strictures we have made. A very prominent member of that school, the Earl of Shaftsbury, in a speech he lately made on the subject, says that it is a serious question in his mind whether it is not a disgrace and a shame that we should continue any longer in alliance with such a power as Turkey. And this feeling is by no means confined to the Earl of Shaftsbury; we are rather inclined to think that the voice of the United British Empire will soon be heard, in unmistakable language, on the subject. We willingly quote a few sentences of the Earl's speech, as given in the *Guardian*. He says:—

"I believe every word that was sent by 'our own correspondent,' of the *Daily News*, and I think you will see that the cautious language of the Blue-Book confirms every syllable of that correspondent. But, then, it is very sad to hear that all these excesses are spoken of by persons in authority as a war between savage races. It is all very well—though the Turk might say, 'Save me from my friends,' at the thought—to save his character at the expense of his civilization. I will leave that consideration to others; but I will come forward and say, Will you have this said as to the Bulgarian population? All that I have learned from books, all that I have seen in letters, all that has been told me by travellers, describes the Bulgarian population as an honest, quiet, industrious, agricultural race, and if there is any doubt about it, there is the testimony of the Blue-Book itself."

He further says:—"We are threatened with the extermination of a noble race; and I confess I think the time has come when all the powers of Europe should rise as one man, and in the name of common humanity, see that this shall not be permitted in their midst, and that Turkey has proved wholly unfit to have any authority over any portion of the human race." We entirely agree