

that some, at any rate, of such recreations, must involve work on the part of others.

A renewed effort should be made to discountenance unnecessary employment on Sundays, and it might be well to reflect to what extent the alleged failure of the Church in country parishes is due to the practice of Sunday labour. Farmers, not unnaturally in these days, have reduced their staff to a minimum, the result being that there can rarely be a rotation in the men employed on Sundays. It would be a modest demand that every agricultural labourer should have at least one Sunday in each month entirely free from ordinary toil, and the Church should take the lead in making such a demand.

When the necessity of being present at Divine service is more fully acknowledged, then it may be the time to cease deploring the assimilation of Folkestone to Boulogne in all matters, even in apparent neglect of Sunday observance.

H. F. WILSON.



Correspondence.

BISHOP BERKELEY.

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—Some time ago you invited your readers to send you observations on the articles in your magazine, and accordingly I venture to suggest that Mr. Hooton, in his interesting article on “Bishop Berkeley and the Bermudas,” has done the good Bishop less than justice with regard to his methods of thought.

On p. 905 he says: “Imagine the kind of character which can put forth ‘reiterated efforts and pangs to apprehend the general idea of a triangle’ and (though a student of mathematics) find it ‘altogether incomprehensible’”; and on p. 906 he again refers to his “painful efforts to realize the abstract general idea of a triangle”: in both cases leaving the reader to infer that this effort was part of the Bishop’s own philosophical imagining.

But as a matter of fact the Bishop is only ridiculing the notions of his opponents—it was they who were the propounders of the notion of abstract ideas; they who, as Mr. Leslie Stephen says, “implied that we could frame an idea of a triangle *neither equilateral isosceles nor scalene*”; and the fact that the Bishop found such an “abstract idea” altogether incomprehensible is an indication rather of robust common sense than of a mind so minutely dialectic as to exclude missionary fervour. (By the way, Acts xvii. 17 indicates that the two are not necessarily mutually exclusive.)

G. A. KING.