

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

NOVEMBER, 1889.

ART. I.—THE CHURCH AND THE “WORKING CLASSES.”

WE are living in times fraught with much that may well occasion grave anxiety. There are undercurrents of thought and feeling which may be characterized as nothing less than revolutionary. Every now and then—witness the recent strike—there rises to the surface enough to warn us of what is festering or simmering beneath it. A great change is coming over the face of society in every department of it with which we are conversant. There are pressing social questions which imperatively demand attention, which cannot much longer be burked or ignored. Political power is rapidly passing into the hands of the so-called “working classes,” who, as a rule, are the least qualified to wield and exercise it; and though the “demagogue,” pure and simple, is not so far a success in Parliament, the expression “the future democracy” is being freely bandied about by public speakers and leading politicians. Everything points to the influence which ere long the working classes will command. We must look this inevitable fact in the face, momentous not only from a political but from a higher point of view, for who can doubt that “righteousness exalteth a nation,” and that her real prosperity and influence depend on her religious condition? Now the question may be asked, “Are what we call ‘the working classes,’ as a body, religious? Are they sensibly influenced and actuated by religion?” I use this word *working classes* in its generally accepted sense, difficult as it may be to understand how it ever came to be exclusively applied to a particular class of workers in the busy hive of men. All work is not of the same kind. Some work with brain, some with hands. Our statesmen, philanthropists, professional men, scientists, students, who think and labour for the good of their fellow-creatures,

each in his own department of life, are surely of the "working classes." They are not drones; they are as much entitled to be called "working men" as is the mechanic, artisan, or tiller of the soil. And it is possible that the fact of our thus labelling, in common parlance, a certain section of humanity, has contributed not a little to that tendency to classify, which loses sight of the great law of God's kingdom of mutual interdependence. The tendency of our day is to disintegrate rather than to amalgamate, and hence a certain class of men come to consider themselves as a peculiar and privileged class, whose state and condition of life is somewhat exceptional. And this will be so, with an ever-widening chasm, increasingly difficult to bridge over, so long as we constantly speak of "upper ten thousand" and "lower strata," of the *οἱ πολλοί* of our common humanity. If any one truth is taught in the natural kingdom it is that "all are but parts of one stupendous whole." If any one truth was specially taught by Christ, it is that of the brotherhood of men. The Apostles lost no opportunity of enforcing this lesson "that God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth." It was Irving who so loved to insist on "the Fatherhood of God." To insist on this is not to advocate Socialism. It is not even to ignore all obvious and necessary distinctions; it is rather, with the comprehensiveness of such an expression and relationship, to recognise that, differing in many respects, we are members of one body. We have, however, in various ways so labelled different classes that interests come to be regarded not as mutual, but rather as separate. It is not difficult to see how class legislation with all its unfairness and inequality may spring out of this; *e.g.*, the closing of the public-house on Sundays, and no prohibition or restraint imposed on a West-end club. The political agitator makes capital of all this. He finds tinder ready for the spark, fuel at hand to excite into flame. He is not content with exciting ill-feeling in the mind of the mechanic and artisan; he shifts the scene of his operations to the more stolid and simple-minded agricultural labourer. He stirs up strife and promotes a spirit at variance with the mind of God and the Spirit of Christ. This process of disintegration, this sowing of the seed of discord, this scattering abroad of tares, is bringing forth its fruit, and not a few are seriously concerned at the mutterings of what may forebode an overwhelming storm.

Few would be bold enough to predict what in this direction is "coming upon the earth." This being so, the question arises—What is the attitude of one section of society to the other; rich to poor; more cultured to less cultured; more advantaged to those of fewer advantages; the man of title to untitled; employer to employé, well-dressed to poorly clad, luxuriously

housed and fed to the man who has little or nought beyond daily bread; one of leisure to him who has no leisure; the believer to unbeliever; the professing Christian to one who makes little or no profession of Christianity? What proportion of our titled, wealthy, well-to-do learned men and women, some with no little leisure, are really and intentionally endeavouring to bridge over the gulf which too often separates the East and West of human life; how many, naming the name of our common Lord, are bearing their part in a conscientious and deliberate endeavour, directly or indirectly, mediately or immediately, to make human lives, often less favoured or fortunate, better and brighter? For a selfish, self-pleasing life is to forget our brotherhood. God allows and sanctions in His kingdom real or apparent differences to teach us this which underlies these distinctions, that "no man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself." Some flowers have exquisite foliage, but no perfume; some have delicate perfume and but poor foliage. Some birds are rich in plumage but not gifted with song; some again are of Nature's sweetest songsters, but of homely plumage. Everything in this world has its place, use, purpose, and this very variety constitutes its unity or oneness. The men who till our fields, dig out our coal, who are engaged in callings perilous to life and deleterious to health; they who labour in dockyards or open fields, who toil in foundry and factory, by dint of whose sweat of brow and industry England is great, individuals become opulent, and society at large enjoys the fruit of ingenuity and skill—have not the great toiling class, on whom we so much depend, a large claim on our sympathy, and reasonable ground for looking for it? I do not ask what legislation is doing for them, but what is the Church doing for them? I have had large experience of the working classes, abundant opportunity of forming an opinion, and I am persuaded that it would be to do them a grave injustice to characterize them as irreligious as a body, or as averse to, though they may seem estranged from religion. In rural districts they will walk or drive for miles, if need be, to hear the Word of God and the simple message of the Gospel. In country parishes the infidels and freethinkers are few and far between. The Parish Church—for I have not to take into consideration Nonconformity—is regarded with deep affection, consecrated by many natural ties, and the parish priest, if he be an earnest and devoted man, is looked up to and respected. In the majority of cases in our rural districts, if the dissenting chapel be filled and Parish Church emptied, it is less from theological conviction than *faute de mieux*. The country parson has also this advantage over the vicar of large town parishes, that it is not impossible for him to know personally all his people. That the artisan in our

industrial centres is not averse, naturally and conscientiously averse, to religion is shown in the fact that very, very rarely is a child withdrawn from school lest it should be taught which be the principles of the doctrine of Christ; but it must be confessed that the parents are bad church or chapel goers. A very large percentage of the "working classes" go to no place of worship. The Church of England has not succeeded in persuading them. Nonconformity does not seem more attractive, for it is the middle class which is the mainstay of and affects Dissent. You have only to go into one of our large towns, whether London, Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Halifax, Huddersfield, Bradford, Dewsbury, and similar industrial centres to see how Sunday is spent. You have only to analyze an ordinary congregation at any given Service to discover the missing link. Many and various causes are in operation to account for this.

There is one of a very general nature, of which the working classes themselves are probably unconscious, but which is continually exercising an influence prejudicial to spirituality. I refer to the moral and religious disadvantage of their ordinary employments. Few can realize the monotony of the work of a factory hand, mill-girl, and ordinary artisan. Over and over again, in conversation with such as these, have the more intelligent expressed to me how keenly this is felt. One of the many employés in the watch trade at Coventry told me that all his life from boyhood had been spent in drilling holes in dial-plates! Another in Lancashire that he had grown gray watching the planing-machine doing its automatic work! Look at a factory girl, a mill-hand, hour by hour at her loom! Such lives know but little or no variety; they become almost as much machines as the machines by which they hourly stand. A large part of their nature is undeveloped, uncultured, unused; and to my mind one of the pressing and very difficult problems to solve is how to provide healthy recreation and innocent amusement for such worn, jaded, and monotonous lives. But this is not all that may be said under this head. The working man, in the larger centres of industrial labour, becomes almost exclusively familiar with the works of his own hands and with the achievements of skilled labour. His acquaintance with Nature is but scanty. He lives in the midst of whirling wheels, the perpetual motion of machinery, shut out from sight of green fields and sunlit streams. Streets and squares, steam-engines and warehouses, belching smoke, tall chimneys, heated furnaces, dirt, grit, meet him at every turn. The surroundings and accessories, the implements and tools of industry, occupy thought, press on his every sense. Almost all that he takes cognizance of is what is *known, handled, seen*. It is purely *secular*; it is suggestive of nothing beyond. He practically

worships Force. We have had to invent a word which shall express his condition of mind. We call it "*Secularism*." They who preach it affirm that secular business is the sole concern of man, that religious matters are too vague, too distant, too uncertain to deserve serious attention. The creed, if such we may call it, of Positivism with the more intellectual, of Secularism with the artisan, has not originated this condition of mind, but the attitude of the mind has assumed by degrees this definite form. An eminent metaphysician of the last century, Dugald Stewart, anticipated this evil, and lifted up his voice of warning. "Nothing," he says, "banishes moral impressions from the thoughts so much as the artificial objects with which we are everywhere surrounded in popular centres, because the Mind is too deeply engrossed by the productions of human skill and industry to have leisure to follow its natural direction." He might have added that as we find more and more how Mind controls Matter, how the great powers and forces of nature are being more and more made subservient to our use, we come to worship Force, we observe the phenomena, and not the God behind the phenomena. We are not surprised to find Secularism reduced to a system. Its adherents have organized themselves into a kind of non-religious sect. They have their lecture halls, and engage lecturers of no mean ability. They have their *Secularist Review*, and other well-known periodicals. They propagate their views with assiduity and persevering plausibility. In some places, where many hands are employed, the men contribute out of their wages to pay one of their number to read to them when engaged in their sedentary work. I believe I am correct in saying that Mr. Bradlaugh's income is considerably supplemented out of the wages of the artisans, who look on him as the apostle of freethought. And this condition of mind is encouraged and stimulated by the greater freedom, or, shall I say, unrestrained license of a certain portion of the press. In the days gone by infidel writers addressed themselves to educated persons in the higher walks of life, and in language studiously elegant and refined. Their object was to render vice and scepticism fashionable in court and palace, in club and drawing-room. During the last half century infidel writers have as much popularized their infidelity as Science is popularized in familiar Manuals.

In the days past "freethought" was affected as the thin veneer of a dissolute life. With increased education, not only is crime becoming more clever, but infidelity is being made more intelligible to the less educated. We have for long formed too low an estimate of the popular understanding. The late Lord Beaconsfield was amongst the first to recognise the place and influence of the provincial press. Not one artisan

out of a hundred reads the leading articles of our leading papers. He is influenced by the opinions of one nearer home. The working man can read. Whatever else he may part company with after leaving our schools, forget as he may his geography and history, the three R's stand by him. He may not understand technical terms or sententious phrases, but it is a mistake to think any *pabulum* or off-hand reply will satisfy him. To this the excellent "Christian Evidence Society," worthy of all support, is become alive. Its tracts and other publications give the working man credit for power of thought as well as appreciation of what is thoughtful. He discerns the difference between foolish preaching and the foolishness of preaching; infidelity addresses itself to his intellect, and insists on a reply. He is, moreover, bewildered at the prevalence of conflicting schools of thought. The old cry, "What is truth?" is asked by some earnestly, by others cynically. With no very definite opinion of his own, unanchored to any deep and strong convictions, he is open, as soil to winds of heaven, to every blast of doctrine. Nothing to him is more intelligible and plausible than undenominationalism. No one creed, he is told, possesses or sets forth all the truth. There is a measure, a *souppçon* of truth in all schools of thought. Board schools make headway, and heavy rates are forgotten to maintain them, because it is a conscience clause clothed in bricks and mortar. Tax his beer or necessaries of life to a twentieth of the same amount, and what a cry would be raised throughout the length and breadth of the land! Away with creeds! they are fetters on thought. Think as you like, and take your chance. Amidst these professing Christians, wrangling over altar lights and coloured stoles, surplice and black gown, mixed chalice and eastward position, with all the bitterness of party spirit, and recklessness of party organs, who shall I implicitly trust? For to himself he says it is not against vice and immorality that *Rock* and *Church Times* so much inveigh, as against those who conscientiously differ on matters not essential to salvation.

I might point out how prejudicial to morality, and of course to religious influence, is the home life of many of our poor. We hardly realize how much our daily surroundings affect our mental and moral habits. Overcrowding is one of the most wide-spread and painful causes of immorality and irreligion. Public attention is being drawn to this. "Rookeries," cellars in which you would not keep a favourite dog, the fact of families herding below the pavement, or occupying a single room for all the purposes of existence, these things are becoming such a scandal in our midst that the legislature is seriously taking it all in hand. Who knows not well the havoc that drink and gambling make of men's lives? But not to dwell on vices

which are by no means characteristic of, or peculiar to, the working classes, but which are doing their deadly work amongst all grades of society, there are other facts to be borne in mind. To some, *habits* of religion are foreign to their ways, and the nature of their calling is not favourable to serious or prolonged reflection. Granted that in some few cases the working man has been religiously brought up, has had godly parents, has been a Sunday-school scholar, has even been Confirmed and admitted to Holy Communion, how many slip through the net! We may some day have to acknowledge and confess the poor results of our Sunday-schools, compared with all the labour expended upon them. Who will have the courage of his convictions, and be brave and bold enough to say on this subject what, from experience and observation, he really thinks? But there is a *getting out of the habit* of attending a place of worship, and by degrees a shyness and reluctance to reappear. In many cases, if you question a man as to the reason why you never see him at church, it is not that he is averse to religion, but he has got, from one cause or another, "out of the habit." He makes the excuse of his old clothes, which he knows is only an excuse. Sometimes he pleads his excessive work as his excuse, but be the excuse what it may, he is not to be seen; and by degrees with him salvation must take its chance. Often have I asked my curates—and here I would record the deep debt of gratitude I owe to my many faithful and devoted curates—how did such an one, who never came to church or mission-room, die? What did he say to you during your visits to him in his last sickness? What evidence did he give of repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ? As a rule he said nothing, for as a rule men die as they have lived. Salvation becomes a "perhaps." There is an idea, to be attributed to indefinite and colourless teaching, that, granted Christianity be true, the love of God is so great, His mercy in Christ so all-embracing, the acceptance of Christ is not a work of urgency, and a peaceful end rather than a holy life is the great desideratum. It is a fact that men who have lived irreligiously die apparently without misgivings or even a qualm of fear. They go down to their graves like the brutes that perish. The desire again to reconcile a careless life with the hope of final salvation has suggested a variety of expedients more or less plausible, *e.g.*, death-bed baptism, death-bed communion. Stories are afloat and quoted of the mercy of God so overtaking man at the last that others cling to the hope that such may be their happy experience. When Lord Seymour, in the days of Edward VI., was executed, his decapitation required two strokes of the axe. An eminent divine being appealed to, expressed his inability to determine whether the

dying and, as he was, wicked man, did not work out his salvation in the short convulsive interval between the first and second stroke! "When a man," said Bishop Latimer, "hath two strokes of an axe, who can tell but between two strokes he doth repent?" The same hope was expressed of one killed by his horse stumbling. "Who shall say," was the remark, "that salvation may not be found between the stirrup and the ground!" Would this persuasion be so wide-spread and so influential if this were more clearly taught, that the thief on the cross was saved once that none might despair, once that none might presume?

It is sometimes alleged by working men, as a reason why they are estranged from religion, that the clergy do not sympathize with them in their combination to raise their wages, and to uphold the rights of labour. This is scarcely within our province. These are difficult, delicate, intricate subjects. In some cases you might as well meddle with a hornet's nest, and too often our sympathy, naturally on the side of *authority*, is prevented from being exercised by the arbitrary prohibition which, in some instances, trade unions impose. There may be much to be said in favour of combination to protect the working man's rights; but all sympathy is gone so soon as the working man regards labour as undignified, is too indolent to do an honest day's work, or imposes tyrannous restrictions on those who, in sound health, and with a large family dependent on him, are not allowed to earn his daily bread. Few clergy have made these social questions their study. We are not all of the calibre and stamp of the late beloved and widely respected Bishop Fraser. Even he of late years was thought to meddle too much with social questions, and to make the pulpit too habitually the opportunity of expressing his mind on questions of this nature. As a rule, a clergyman very rarely gains influence by taking prominent parts in semi-social, semi-political questions. It is very easy to acquire a clap-trap popularity. If he do not take the working man's side his interference would most likely be resented, and if he take it he places himself in a doubtful and questionable position. The working man is shrewd enough to know that all this is not his parson's *métier*, and takes it at its worth. The safer and wiser course is to confine himself to his more proper and immediate ministrations, and I believe with the late Bishop of Ripon, when he said to me, "It is, after all, spiritual work which tells."

There are one or two other and much more serious facts which we have to face, and which reasonably account for the estrangement of our working classes from religion. The Pew system is a confessed hindrance. That is not a "free and open church" in which you find Prayer Book and Bible left. Free and open

means, in plain English, "free and open." First come first served. The poor do not like to be *labelled*. They open God's Word, and read that "God is no respecter of persons," that in His house rich and poor meet alike; the Lord is maker of them all. They come to His house and find pews appropriated; the rich sit here, the poor sit there. I am well aware of the technical difficulties in this matter. I know that churchwardens are legally bound to accommodate *bonâ-fide* parishioners. I fear I must add that the laity of the Church of England are not trained and taught from their childhood, as in Nonconforming bodies, to support voluntarily their clergy and the ministrations of religion. Endowments make voluntaryism apparently superfluous, and appropriation of pews, whether met by a recognised pew-rent or by "subscription," which really comes to the same thing, is to many a sufficient reason for a constitutional dislike to offertories, and for complaints at their frequency. But why should not seats be assigned to the working classes according to their means? My revered vicar, under whom for two years I served—Archdeacon Sinclair, then Vicar of Kensington—strongly maintained that the poor do not value what they have not to pay for. He encouraged the plan of allowing the poor to have their seats in church, varying from 2s. 6d. to 1s. a year; every seat was taken. I am under the impression, though open to correction, that there is one church in this diocese, built by one who bequeathed a sufficient sum for the purpose, on the condition that it should be a poor man's church, and that the poor should be encouraged to *rent* their sittings. But what becomes of our faith in God and our faith in the poorer classes, if we cannot believe that an earnest, loving, faithful ministry would never lack material support?

Again, there is this fact to face: The language of our Liturgy is archaic. Endeared by many associations, sacred to the cultured layman, how many words are absolutely unintelligible to the working man! How many illustrations we might give of this! Max Müller makes somewhere a calculation that a fairly educated man's vocabulary is limited to, say, eight hundred words; a poor man's to five hundred. For all practical purposes much might be Greek or Latin. It is not for him the "vulgar" or mother tongue.

Again, in how many churches is the Service much too long, much too ornate, the music too elaborate, the sermon above the poor man's head. I quite think that the demand of our age, speaking generally, is a reverent ritual and faithful preaching of "the truth as it is in Jesus"; that our churches, in all their surroundings and accessories to worship, should present an ideal and a marked contrast to the homes outside church doors; but all this need not be at the cost of

simplicity or of what is needful for the bulk of our people to ensure heartiness and spiritual refreshment. It ought not to be that the mission-room shall be a *pis-aller* or a kind of refuge for the destitute. It is grand exercise and discipline for a man to acquire the power of making himself intelligible to all classes without affecting on the one hand cleverness, or "condescending" to minds of less intellectual fibre. Do we not need to remember that old rule, "Let all things be done to edifying"?

Added to all these reasons, to which more might be added, is this, which, though it may not "hold water," is too commonly urged by the working classes as reasons for their apparent estrangement from religion, and that is the example set by the upper classes, who are for the most part without excuse. Look at the increasing desecration of God's holy day by those whose life is already one round of pleasure, and who cannot honestly plead overwork in the week-days as an excuse for their disregard of ordinances! Such examples as church parades, the "Zoo," dinner-parties, lawn-tennis on Sundays, filter down from upper to lower strata, and it irritates the working man to think that restrictions should be imposed on him which are not equally imposed on all! Look at the selfish extravagance of the upper classes, the lavish expenditure on a single entertainment or on some personal hobby when hundreds are in want of the necessities of life! A single entertainment recently at the Mansion House cost £2,000, and the day following a woman was discovered on a doorstep within reach of the Mansion House starved to death! Look at all the more than questionable methods to raise money for religious and charitable objects, such as bazaars, fancy fairs, charity dinners, fancy balls, methods unwarranted by Scripture, absolutely unworthy of the name and dignity of charity, patronized by bishops who ought to protest against such spurious methods of giving by purchasing, by feeding, by dancing! How shall we persuade the working man, sitting loosely to religion, that this is the Christianity Christ taught, and would have us practise? How shall we make them realize what Christianity is when it is so travestied, so misrepresented, so adulterated with a worldly spirit? It does not do for us to say hard and uncharitable things of the working classes. We must take into consideration the surroundings of their daily life, the monotony of their calling, the depressing influences of their home life, the *res angusta domi*, the corrosive care, the hindrances that come from without, the manifold disadvantages under which they live and labour from childhood upwards, before a verdict harsh or condemnatory be passed upon them.

The facts are confessed; the danger which may arise out of a mass of men practically unreached and unleavened by religion

is real and grave; the remedy ought not to be far to find. Tonic springs are often near fever-breeding plains. There is abundant room for the statesman, for the philanthropist, for a readjusting of the attitude, somewhat unfriendly, of one section of society towards another. Much is being done; great and laudable efforts are being put forth. All honour to those who would improve the dwellings of the poor, enforce sanitary laws, reclaim from intemperance, encourage thrift, lighten heavy hours with kindly presence and the consecration of any special gift. Penny readings, free concerts, working men's clubs, church institutes, mother's meetings, bands of hope and of mercy, sewing classes, anything of the nature of counter-attraction, not to speak of day and Sunday schools—who would disparage these? Who does not know that these agencies of any well-worked parish are, up to a certain point, remedial, corrective, and helpful. But do these things touch or reach the root of the evil? May we not err in the direction of not sufficiently endeavouring to evangelize the illiterate, rude, and rough?

Our blessed Lord, both by teaching and example, would point out the true method. The gospel of Christ, preached and lived, is the only true and reliable panacea for the world's evils. He did not send salvation; He brought it. He came into close contact with humanity; He gave Himself that we might live through Him. He persuaded men the most scornful, women the most forlorn, that He was real by a sympathy direct and self-sacrificing. The world will never outlive Christianity. It is not a new faith or creed we want; we want life and meaning put into the creed we profess. So far from the nineteenth century outgrowing Christianity, the need of its leavening influence becomes increasingly great. We do not want miracles to be wrought for His Church; we want wonders to be wrought by His Church in the power of the Holy Ghost. The evils which real Christians most deplore, those on which the enemies of the Cross fasten most readily for scorn and criticism, spring from the apparent neglect of the great purpose of Christianity in relation to the world. It is the charge brought by Morison in his "Service of Man," speaking on behalf of Agnostics, that our Christianity as now represented is intensely selfish. The urgency of the appeal to men to make "their calling and their election sure," the promises held out as lures for this world and the next, can scarcely fail, if we limit our idea of "salvation" to this to minister to our selfishness. We have to learn, we have to realize our responsibility in reference to the world's conversion. We cannot fully understand the blessings of Christianity, except as these tend through us to bless the world. "I am saved," cried the shipwrecked boy on recovering consciousness. "There is another lad on that sinking ship, go

and save him." We cannot—profess what we may—know the Fatherhood of God in Christ except as it lead us to personal consecration and a closer brotherhood with all that Christ has redeemed. If Christianity does not make greater headway; if it seem paralyzed here, powerless there, the fault or hindrance is not in the Creed. The great hindrance is un-Christlike Christians, men and women who will not lift a finger nor stir a foot for Him, whose faith is a collection of loose opinions, not of deep-rooted conviction such as influences their lives, and impresses as it influences others. To uplift and purify the religion of our time; to put into what we have the heroism and might of a conquering force, is our need. We do not want miracles; we should only ask for more were they vouchsafed. We want men and women advantaged above their fellows, some with abounding means, some with commanding position, some with high gifts, who will bridge over the yawning chasm, carrying on Christ's work in Christ's way, living over again Christ's life in the power which fitted Him for His blessed work. The responsibility of teaching truth, of enjoying Christian privilege, is really greater than the responsibility that attaches itself to any other possession or gift. It is a responsibility which attaches itself increasingly to the *laity* of our day, in proportion as they know more. The knowledge of Divine truth is no longer the privilege or possession of the few. There is room for an unordained as well as for an ordained ministry. It is not by sighs and sentiment that we shall win the world for Christ. It is not by spurious charity done from easy-chairs and at arm's length. It is not by spasmodic effort and galvanic shocks of impulsive benevolence. It is by sustained, persistent, unwearying effort that can endure apparent failure, and is not too impatient of success. It will not be by rich men, but it will be by holy men. It will be by those who come out from their exclusiveness, dignity, reserve, selfishness, indolence, and false views of life, and who look on a sin-stricken world through the pitiful eyes of Him who had compassion on the multitude and yearned over them. There is wealth enough in the world to meet all its poverty. There is intellect enough in the world to cross swords with doubt. There is sympathy in the world frozen up, as it may seem, in the Arctic regions of hearts that have never been melted by the constraining love of Christ. Oh for more of that spirit, and of His outpoured influence! Oh for more of the love of Christ shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost! And who shall say how the long-standing malady would be stanch'd, and all would become more truly one in Christ?

FRANCIS PIGOU.

