

MEMORIES OF CANON CHRISTOPHER.

BY THE REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.

(Continued from THE CHURCHMAN of September, p. 514.)

[It may perhaps be permitted me to say that as Canon Christopher wrote to me many of his memories, the material now presented is usually very largely and sometimes identically in his language.—W. H. G. T.]

VII. OXFORD: CENTRAL YEARS. 1871-1885.

AS time went on and Mr. Christopher became better known, his church was a centre and rallying point for Evangelical life and work in Oxford.

NEW RECTORY.

Although he had been enabled to obtain for the parish a restored and enlarged church and new day-schools, the need of a new Rectory still remained, and to the provision of this in 1877 he directed his abundant energies. The house in North Oxford was far away from the parish, while the old Rectory in Pembroke Street had been declared by an architect to be incapable of further repair. The result was the erection of a new, large and commodious building, which not only relieved Mr. Christopher himself from the considerable outgoing for a private house, but, as he used to say, it would give his successor a house which would be commodious in case he were a man with a large family. His many friends again rallied to his help, and among them were both senior and junior members of the University. An appeal was circulated among clergy who had been in Oxford during Mr. Christopher's time, and elicited some remarkable testimonies to his life and work. While all these are deeply interesting, it is impossible to do more than refer to two or three: one by the Bishop of Manchester, Dr. Knox, then Fellow and Tutor of Merton College; one by the Bishop of Liverpool, Dr. Chavasse, then Vicar of St. Paul's, Holloway, and a third by Dr. Aglionby, Vicar of Newbold Pacey, then Curate of Christ Church, Hampstead. Junior members were not behindhand, for they subscribed the sum of £100, and accompanied the gift with an address which showed very warm appreciation of Mr. Christopher's work on their behalf. Among the one hundred and forty names appended to this address were some who have become well-known in the

Church since that day, including Canon Hay Aiken; Mr. (now Sir) W. F. A. Archibald; Mr. G. A. King, Master in Chancery; Rev. F. Baylis, Secretary of the Church Missionary Society; Prebendary Brightman of Magdalen College, Oxford; Rev. A. R. Buckland, afterwards Secretary of the Religious Tract Society; the Bishop of Liverpool; the late Canon Yorke Fausset; Rev. H. G. Grey, formerly Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, and Mr. J. Wells, now Warden of Wadham College.

LUTHER AND PROTESTANTISM.

As an illustration of Mr. Christopher's spirit in controversy, reference may be made to a letter of his which appeared in the *Oxford Times* for August 2nd, 1877. A serious charge of antinomianism had been made against the teaching of Martin Luther, and this elicited a statement by Mr. Christopher of Luther's doctrine and a plea for fuller and fairer consideration:

"Avoiding all the bitterness which too often has hindered the usefulness of Christian controversy, let me show what Luther's doctrine really was with regard to faith and good works and compare it with that of the Church of England.

"I trust that those who have misunderstood and, therefore, have misrepresented Luther, will be glad to read the following extracts from his great work on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. When he has so clearly expressed his meaning with regard to the relation between faith and works, it would not be fair and just, by means of other quotations separated from their context, to try and make out that his meaning is something else."

[Then follow several quotations to prove that good works were regarded by Luther as the essential fruit of faith.]

CORRESPONDENCE WITH CANON LIDDON.

Mr. Christopher's championship of things Protestant necessarily brought him into conflict with those in Oxford whom he believed to be "undoing the Reformation," and he, therefore, used every available means to counteract influences which he considered perilous to Scripture and Church teaching. Among these efforts were lectures delivered by prominent clergy and laity at which he usually took the chair. One of these was given by the Rev. T. Howard Gill, afterwards English Chaplain at Paris. Dr. Pusey had strongly recommended to the clergy of the Church of England the Abbé Gaume's *Manual for Confessors*, which he had adapted for use in the English Church. Mr. Gill's remarks with those of Mr. Christopher from the chair led to an interesting correspondence between

the latter and Canon Liddon who championed Dr. Pusey. Although the entire correspondence has not been preserved, the following letters give an adequate idea of what passed.

Mr. Christopher to Canon Liddon, November 27th, 1878.

It is a great grief to me that the Abbé Gaume's Romish book, the teaching of which I believe to be utterly subversive of the Gospel of Christ, should have been published by Dr. Pusey as adapted by him to the use of the English Church.

I respect Dr. Pusey for his age, his learning, and specially for his great and valuable work on the Book of Daniel, and, generally, for his opposition to scepticism, but if the dearest friend I have on earth were to publish a book subversive of the Gospel, and teaching "another Gospel which is not another," it would be my plain duty, in faithfulness to Christ, and in love to the souls of my fellowmen, to do what I could to help to expose this pernicious perversion of the Gospel. Mr. Gill's lecture, of which you shall have a copy next week, will prove to the Church that my description of the Romish book adapted to the use of the English Church by Dr. Pusey is a true one. . . .

It is a pain to me to give you pain, dear Dr. Liddon, who have shown a kind feeling in subscribing, as you remind me, to the schools of the very poor parish which half surrounds Christ Church; and in other ways. But with the strong conviction which I have of the dishonour to the Gospel of Christ which the Romish teaching of the Abbé Gaume's Manual does, I have no choice but, at any cost, to take part in exposing this evil book. A dear friend of mine, a learned theologian of this University, who has a great respect and regard for Dr. Pusey, and a high esteem of his great work on the Book of the Prophet Daniel, and his other efforts against scepticism, was entirely opposed to such a lecture as Mr. Gill's being delivered, *until he had read the lecture*; when he had done this, his view was entirely changed and he felt that duty to God demanded that it should be delivered at once, and printed for the information of the Church. I shall be greatly grieved, dear Dr. Liddon, if my having acted on a sense of duty to God lessens your friendship towards me.

Canon Liddon to Mr. Christopher, November 27th, 1878.

Nothing, I fear, would be gained, if I were to enter on the subject of the Lecture, at which you thought it well to preside; or, on the very important question, as to how far Dr. Pusey does "subvert" either "the gospel" as taught by St. Paul and St. John—or—what you conceive to be "the Gospel."

What I venture to urge is this. If controversy be a duty, it ought, if possible, to keep clear of personalities. Your lecturer was not obliged to select Dr. Pusey's book as the text of his lecture. To do so in Oxford was to offer a public insult to the most distinguished Professor of Divinity in the place.

If Dr. Pusey had been an eminent Low Churchman, and had written a book to show that Baptismal Regeneration was a "lie of Satan;" and, if, thereupon, Mr. Noel or some other clergyman had presided at a meeting at which a lecturer had exposed the *dishonesty* of Dr. Pusey's book, by showing, that as a minister of the Church, he was bound to say over every baptized child, without any qualification, "This child is regenerate"—you would, I think, have thought Mr. Noel's proceeding unjustifiable. The lecturer might have quoted Mr. Spurgeon as agreeing with him; and might have said a great many sharp and exasperating, and, withal, true things at Mr.

Pusey's expense. But, in the opinion of all good men, who care for higher things than the indulgence of party passions, the proceeding would have been deplorable. It would have been felt that the question whether Baptismal Regeneration is a "lie of Satan" or an integral portion of the Gospel of Jesus Christ could have been better discussed, if the personal element were left out of sight.

But it is the *personal* element in controversy which attracts the many men who do not care very much about the solemn question of truth, or falsehood. It was the fact that *Dr. Pusey*, well known in Oxford, and living in the same street, had written the book which gave zest to the subject and commanded the attention of your audience on Monday, at the Town Hall.

I have known *Dr. Pusey* intimately for thirty-two years, and I do not affect to be indifferent to such a discreditable proceeding as that of Monday evening. I regret with all my heart that so good a man as yourself should be associated with it, upon whatever grounds; and I think it sincere to say to you what I have said, and shall say, to others.

P.S. . . . *Dr. Pusey* has no idea that I have written to you. I do not suppose that he has heard of the Lecture.

Mr. Christopher to Canon Liddon, December 2nd, 1878.

. . . In the exercise of the like cordial frankness as you have so kindly claimed in your note to me, you must suffer me to point out that it is exactly that long and intimate affection for *Dr. Pusey*, to which you refer, that disqualifies you for sitting as judge upon my conduct. Had your relations to *Dr. Pusey* not been what they are, private feeling would not have usurped the place of a calm and just judgment, and you would never have suffered your pen to charge me with taking part (necessarily the principal part) in a "discreditable proceeding," and (as an accomplice) with "offering a public insult" to your friend.

You evidently forgot in the moment of writing that *Dr. Pusey* has within the last three months publicly invited criticism by two overt acts absolutely unparalleled in the history of our Church since the Reformation. He has adapted and published for use in our Protestant Communion a Roman Catholic *Manual for Confessors*. And when one hundred Protestant Bishops, in conference assembled, have solemnly and unanimously condemned the practice of habitual confession, *Dr. Pusey* has publicly challenged the correctness of their decision, or else the justice of their censure.

How, at such a crisis, a Protestant lecturer on the evils and unlawfulness of a stated practice of confession could (as you suggest) select any other book as the text-book of his lecture, I am utterly unable to conceive. How, under such circumstances, *Dr. Pusey's* friends can either suppose or wish that his recent volume should escape public criticism is equally unintelligible to me. And if so, is it really true that what would be natural and proper in any and every other town of England, is, however, improper and "a public insult" in Oxford? You seem to deprecate public criticism of *Dr. Pusey's* recent volume here in Oxford, on the ground partly of his distinguished position amongst us, and partly of his being resident here. . . .

You offer me an hypothesis, which is not only violently improbable, but absolutely impossible. I can, however, accept what you really mean with the fullest fearlessness, and unhesitatingly reply that if any eminent Low Churchman, really taught by the Spirit of God, having just put forth a book on which the eyes of the whole Church were fastened, were charged with having written contrary to Scripture, or to the formularies of the Church of

England, the desire of his heart and the language of his lips would be, especially if he resided in a University city, "Here, where I live, and have laboured and am known, let those who controvert my teaching, and charge me with unfaithfulness to the truth, come and make good their positions." With infinite sorrow, I can well conceive, would he deprecate as treason against truth, the mistaken affection of a friend, who would try to keep from the place a conscientious opponent by the suggestion that to be "personal" in controversy is necessarily identical with being "insulting."

It has escaped your notice that when you wrote about "the indulgence of party passions," you are borrowing wholly from conjecture, and in no degree from fact. And no less so when you volunteer the remark that the large attendance at the recent lecture was due to zest which expected personalities lent to the subject. The attendance at prior lectures of the Church Association in Oxford has been just as large. And I have known the lecturer as a valued private friend for many years, and can say honestly that he is not actuated by religious partisanship, does not deal in "sharp" or "exasperating" sayings at another's expense, and has no pleasure in those who do.

Canon Liddon to Mr. Christopher, December 3rd, 1878.

When I termed your proceedings in the Oxford Town Hall "discreditable," I was using the language of a highly educated man, who has no sort of sympathy either with High Church or Low Church principles, but who thinks that respect is due to age, and learning, and sanctuary, such as Dr. Pusey's.

Dr. Pusey *himself* would be the last person in the world to shrink from criticism. He has challenged those who may think it their duty to do so, to prosecute him at law. The Church Association, apparently, thinks it *safer* to hold him up to odium before a popular and necessarily semi-educated audience.

You will, of course, take your own line. If you think that the spirit of such lectures as that at which you presided is consistent with 1 Corinthians xiii., and is not rather calculated to produce in very many souls at least *four* out of those *seventeen* works of the flesh which are condemned in Galatians v. 19-21, all that I can say is that we read our New Testaments with very different eyes indeed.

One who was present at the lecture said that "Dr. Pusey was *well* groaned at." [Not correct.—A.M.W.C.]

With sincere regret, but without further hesitation, I must ask you no longer to consider me a supporter of your schools, or of any other works in your parish.

Mr. Christopher to Canon Liddon, December 6th, 1878.

Your last letter has disappointed me in more respects than one. I had hoped that my statement would at once draw from you a frank admission that you had been mistaken, and a frank withdrawal of the words which stigmatized my conduct as "discreditable." It is true, you tell me, that that term was not originally applied to me by yourself; but you make it too clear that you have adopted it *ex animo*.

Would it be difficult for me to meet with more than one "highly educated man, having no sort of sympathy either with High Church or Low Church principles," who would both think and say that your withdrawal of your annual subscription from the parochial schools of St. Aldate's is on your part to take a poor revenge for an imaginary wrong done by me to your friend?

Would you accept his verdict? Would you deem it generous or just in me to adopt it?

I have referred to more grounds of disappointment than one, and this, your mode, I will not say of retaliation, but of protest, causes me more sorrow than that to which I have already alluded. I had supposed always that your kind subscription was a gift to our Master and to His poor, and have never imagined that it was personal to myself, or to be accepted by me as a stamp of your approval of my theological views, or of my conduct as a clergyman in Oxford. This entirely new view of your liberality forces me to consider how far I can, consistently with self-respect, or with that freedom to act according to the dictates of conscience which I am persuaded you value as highly as do I, retain your donation to the fund for supplying my parish with a parsonage. That house, while I continue Rector of St. Aldate's, will be personally enjoyed by myself. And if it is now irksome to you to have helped in maintaining the schools for the poor of St. Aldate's, it must be tenfold more painful to you to have had part in providing a home for its incumbent, of whom, to my sorrow, you now think and write so ill. It is, therefore, surely my duty at once to place the enclosed cheque for five guineas, the amount of your donation, in your hands. . . .

And now, in conclusion, dear Dr. Liddon, may I treat you with the freedom, of a Christian brother, and honestly express my regret that you should have levelled so gratuitous a sarcasm at the Council of the Church Association. To use your own words—Is it consistent with 1 Corinthians xiii.?

For the last twenty years it has been widely known that Dr. Pusey is absolutely safe from legal prosecution. He is not within the jurisdiction of any Bishop—and, as holding a post under letters patent, he is not amenable to the law ecclesiastical. Now in my judgment it would be just as generous, just as fair and righteous, and just as charitable for me to assert that Dr. Pusey, *knowing this*, challenges prosecution in insincere bravado, as for you to charge the Council of the Church Association with holding him up to popular odium and resorting to that as a "safer" course than appealing to the law to coerce him. As a fact, the Church Association had nothing whatever to do with the choice of the subject of Mr. Gill's lecture.

Canon Liddon to Mr. Christopher, December 7th, 1878.

Your letter obliges me to ask your permission to make two explanations.

In referring to the Church Association, I stated what I honestly supposed to be the fact. The handbills led me to connect the Church Association with the Lecture. And I never before heard that Dr. Pusey's position protects him against an action in the Church courts. Dr. Pusey, I am very confident, has no suspicion that this is the case. Had he believed his position to be legally unassailable, it would, in my opinion, have been cowardly of him to challenge other people to prosecute him, if they thought fit. If the Church Association has been advised by competent lawyers that the case is as you say, I unreservedly admit that my language was undeserved, and I beg to retract it. But the fact ought to be generally known.

If it were possible to continue my subscription to your schools without doing more than making an offering to Christ and His poor, I would thankfully do so. As it is, I shall transfer the subscription to a neighbouring parish. But such a subscription is inevitably a mark of sympathy, almost a vote of confidence. So long as I could think of you only as a self-denying worker among the poor, I gave it gladly; even though "the Gospel," as taught by the Low Church party, seems to me a very inadequate reproduction

of the Gospel as taught in the New Testament. But when you take the chair at such a meeting as that which was held the other day, you use your position as the parish minister of St. Aldate's for a purpose which my conscience tells me is very wrong. You oblige me to ask myself, how far I am right in continuing in any way to strengthen your hands.

But I hope you will allow me to return you your cheque. My feeling is in no sense retrospective; and I was bold enough to hope that my first letter might somehow have prevented your attending the meeting, and thus have saved me from all further difficulty. If I could do so, without seeming to hold out to you what you might think an unworthy motive, I would say that I would gladly continue or rather increase my subscription, if I could be assured that you would not use your position for such purposes as promoting attacks on aged and holy men, who certainly have had as full opportunities of ascertaining what the Gospel really is as any of their assailants. But I fear you would not allow me to say this; and I cannot, without insincerity, withdraw the epithet "discreditable" as applied to the proceedings in question. It represents, in my opinion, the least that they deserve in the way of censure; and I must once more say how pained I am that a man like yourself—whom I have always hitherto associated with the devotional and Christian rather than with the fierce and merely controversialist section of the Low Church party—should have been in any way mixed up with them.

Mr. Christopher to Canon Liddon, December 9th, 1878.

More than twenty years ago, before the formation of the Church Association, a small committee of theologians and lawyers met in London to consider the duty of prosecuting Dr. Pusey in the Ecclesiastical Courts. It seemed to them that from his, as the directing mind, the stream of doctrinal error, which has since risen to such a height, was invading the Church. Every one of his theological writings was carefully perused and considered, and a case was eventually laid before very eminent Ecclesiastical Counsel. The then movers were distinctly advised that, though much written by Dr. Pusey was so repugnant to the formularies of the Church of England as to ensure judicial condemnation, yet his peculiar position rendered him unassailable by any process of law.

His Canonry is only an incident of his Professorship which he holds under letters patent. The foregoing I have received from one of the lawyers concerned, but it is pretty widely known, and long has been so. The legal advisers of the Church Association and its Committee are conversant with these facts.

I am sorry indeed to seem obstinate, or to run the risk of wounding your feelings, but it will be a relief to me if you will kindly suffer my cheque enclosed to remain in your hands.

I am, I trust, above creating a sentimental grievance, or seeking to rub a blow into a sore. But humble and limited as are my position and influence compared with yours, if I forfeit my self-respect, I spontaneously throw away a force for usefulness which is Christ's gift to me. Would He have me accept, for my personal convenience and use, a gift, even from a brother who, after careful reflection, persists in designating my recent conduct "discreditable"?

I am well persuaded, dear Dr. Liddon, that at our earliest meeting in eternity, your first act towards me will be to express regret for having employed the term. . . .

I will only add that you seem to me not to realize the consequence of your denunciation of me: now, in reality, it amounts to this—that no Oxford clergyman may, while Dr. Pusey lives, call in question from his pulpit any

one of the Professor's doctrinal statements in connexion with his name. By reason of the respect due to his age and position—which I *ex animo* concede to him—he is to have, in your judgment, such absolute dominion over the faith and practice of his brethren in the ministry, that their congregations are to find them dumb whenever Dr. Pusey has spoken.

Canon Liddon to Mr. Christopher, December 10th, 1878.

I thank you for your interesting information on the subject of Dr. Pusey's legal position. It is entirely new to me, as it will be, I think, to Dr. Pusey himself.

I must, of course, accept, although reluctantly, your decision as to the cheque.

Indeed, you mistake my claim on behalf of Dr. Pusey. He has been criticized all his life, probably more persistently and more passionately than any other member of the Church of England. He has long learnt to do justice, and only justice, to human criticisms. He would be the last person in England to complain of anything that might be said about himself. But while I am, also, as far as possible from deprecating criticism of what he writes, I submit that it should be addressed to knowledge and reason, and not to passion. If, for instance, *you* were to write a book against what Dr. Pusey teaches on the subject of Confession and Absolution, it would be read by those who (having the Bible and Prayer-Book in their hands) entirely disagree with you, but with the respect which is due to your character. And the University Pulpit is much more at the command of those who dissent from Dr. Pusey than of those who agree with him; and, if his opponents can say anything that is theologically entitled to serious consideration, they are very sure to carry with them a very large number of minds. If I regret, I should not think of complaining of these methods of opposing Dr. Pusey; but the case is very different when a strange lecturer, announced as appearing under the auspices of an extreme party organization, addresses himself to a large number of well-meaning but half-educated people on a difficult subject,—as to which it is easy to rouse their passions, but with the real bearings of which they are, necessarily, almost entirely unacquainted—in the Town Hall. . . . Alas! the Church Association reminds me of nothing so much as of the Spanish Inquisition; and I have the same feeling of utter *moral* repugnance towards both these bodies. They work in the interest of different beliefs, and by different methods. But their animating spirit is the same.

Among the many things that I look forward to with thankful hope in another life, one is the surprise of all my Low Church brethren at finding out what the Gospel of our Divine Redeemer really is in its unmutilated grandeur, and, next, their utter wonder that they should ever (in perfect good faith) have denounced such a servant of Christ as Dr. Pusey, while on earth.

Mr. Christopher to Canon Liddon, December 14th, 1878.

You are well aware that I am President of the Oxford Branch of the Church Association, for this was on the bill on which you read my name, and the fact that I lately presided at a lecture connected with that Association, though the subject was not in any way suggested by it, was the occasion of our correspondence, yet in your last letter to me you write, though I feel sure that in doing so you did not intend any personal unkindness towards myself, "Alas! the Church Association reminds me of nothing so much as of the Spanish Inquisition; and I have the same feeling of utter *moral* repugnance towards both these bodies. They work in the interest of different beliefs and by different methods, but their animating spirit is the same."

You began your correspondence with me by referring to St. Paul's chapter on charity (1 Cor. xiii.), and you close it with an illustration of your own conception of Christian charity, in the saying that "the animating spirit" of a body of faithful Brethren in Christ, deeply attached to the Church of England, and to the Scriptural principles of the Protestant Reformation, is "the same as that of the Spanish Inquisition"! I *know* many of these brethren, and you, naturally, do not. I know that their animating spirit is that faithful love which is the fruit of Gospel truth, combined with a faithfulness to Christ which makes them abhor those deadly additions to the Gospel which gradually produced that idolatrous caricature of Christianity which we see in the Church of Rome, and which has been one of the great causes of infidelity on the Continent from which much has come to our own country. . . .

I observe that in the whole of your correspondence with me you never attempt to justify the Romish book which Dr. Pusey has given to our Church, but you seem to make the whole question, which concerns the health and usefulness of our Church for generations to come, a merely personal matter respecting your friend.

I shall praise God if at some future time you understand better the spirit of those who act on the belief that truth is the only foundation of real unity: and if you are brought to see that it is possible in obedience to God's command to contend earnestly for the faith against Romanizing errors and practices in our Church, without any trace of the cruel "animating spirit" of the Spanish Inquisition.

Canon Liddon to Mr. Christopher, December 17th, 1878.

1. When I read the public handbills from which I gathered that you were to preside at a meeting in which a strange lecturer was to abuse Dr. Pusey publicly, my first impulse was, to say nothing about it to yourself, to say what I thought of it in the Common Room of Christ Church or elsewhere, and, at some future time, to withdraw my subscription to your schools, without assigning any reason for doing so.

On consideration, I thought it a better course to tell you (as in your place I should wish to have been told myself) what a brother-clergyman thought of your proceedings. There was the hope that my remonstrance might have had some weight with you: though perhaps I ought not to have entertained it. As it is, my first impulse might have saved us both from a correspondence, which does not, I fear, help us to draw nearer to each other. To write to you at all, unless I was perfectly outspoken, would have been useless. And the result of my doing so speaks for itself.

2. You observe that I have not discussed the worth of Dr. Pusey's book. There is no occasion for me to do so. If it were *proved* that Dr. Pusey's book "subverted the Gospel," etc., etc., I should still hold the Meeting in the Town Hall to be discreditable, on the ground that it was combating religious error by an appeal, not to reason or knowledge, but to uninformed and inflammable passion. There would be other ways of dealing with Dr. Pusey, open to those who felt bound to combat him. There are books in which the revealed doctrine of baptismal regeneration¹ is denied by men, who—to the astonishment of dissenters like Mr. Spurgeon—still find it morally possible to use the Baptismal Service of the Church of England. This error seems to me to be quite as dishonouring to the work of Christ as the restorer of our fallen race, and quite as inconsistent with the plain

¹ Note on margin by Canon Christopher: "I will send him 'Mozley on the Baptismal Controvers'—AMWC."

meaning of Church of England language, as anything that Dr. Pusey has ever written can seem to you. Yet if a High Church clergyman were to preside at a lecture, given by some one else, in which the author of such a book was denounced, till his name was greeted with "volleys of groans" ¹ (see *Rock*, Nov. 29th, 1878), I, for one, should think the proceeding discreditable, and I hope I should have the moral courage to tell my friends so. . . .

3. You write of "deadly additions to the Gospel," etc., etc. I would rather treat such language as the product of strong feeling than as accurate representations of thought. For I, too, might write about "deadly mutilations of the Gospel," and might proceed to give reasons for my strong conviction that Low Church arguments against the grace of the Sacraments have paved the way for rationalistic rejection of the Atonement, and that Low Church denials of the authority of the primitive Church have undermined in many minds *known* to myself, all serious belief in the canon of the New Testament. But this would be a large subject. . . .

4. . . . I was careful to say that the religious theory which the Church Association upholds, and the methods which it is able to employ are not those of the Spanish Inquisition. The animating temper, whether of the Inquisition, or the Association, can only be judged from their proceedings. My conclusion is not disturbed by the fact which you mention, and which I *unreservedly* believe, that many of the persons concerned in managing the Church Association are, in their private capacity, very estimable indeed. Yet, surely also, among the Spanish Inquisitors, there were gentle and conscientious men, who yet sincerely believed that in persecuting the Spanish protestants to death, they were doing God service. They had at command gentle phrases which disguised from themselves the real character of their proceedings; and the good men of the Church Association talk, quite sincerely, I am sure, of "zeal for the purity of the Gospel," "ascertaining the law," and the like, while, in reality, they are filling the Church of England almost from end to end with hatred and uncharitableness which it is piteous to think of. . . .

How much I wish that in view of our immense dangers from the Church of Rome on one side, and from sheer unbelief on the other, we of the Church of England could learn to tolerate each other and to trust to God the Holy Spirit to teach us what is right, or to unteach us what is wrong, in our faith! It will, I fear, seem irony to you, if I say that Dr. Pusey *is* for a great number of minds, their one great stay against the claims of Rome—as for others, he is against the arguments of infidelity. If you could utterly discredit him, as a Minister of the Church of England—if you *could* "expell the unclean thing from our midst" ² it would be a costly victory for the conquerors.

Dear Mr. Christopher, in view of another world, there are better things to be done here on earth than presiding at Lectures against Dr. Pusey in the Oxford Town Hall.

The way in which Mr. Christopher held his own against so redoubtable a champion as Canon Liddon is interesting, as is also the plain fact that no attempt is made to justify the book which Dr. Pusey issued. Even taking the broadest possible grounds it would be impossible to speak of it as loyal to Anglicanism.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

(To be continued.)

¹ Note on margin by Canon Christopher: "Not true—AMWC."

² A phrase of Mr. Gill's.