

ministry, and the edifying of the Body of Christ shall be completed at Christ's second advent. Such a gift was given to Bishop Timothy by the imposition of St. Paul's hands, and he earnestly exhorts him 'to stir it up.'

Such a gift the Church of England declares to be given to every Bishop from that time to this, and the consecrator, after the words of consecration, continues: 'Remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is given thee by this imposition of our hands.' The Church in Rome had never seen an Apostle among them when St. Paul wrote his Epistle; they had not as yet received this gift, and, therefore, he earnestly desires to go and give it to them (i. 6); it was in this that the Church of Crete was 'wanting' till Bishop Titus should supply its deficiency, and we all know what that gift was—the gift of the Holy Ghost not only for ruling the Church, but for ordaining priests to their work and confirming the baptized in their privileges and duties.

Estimate as highly as we may all the good done by Nonconformist ministers through the blessing of that God who not only works according to His covenanted promises, but who can go beyond them, and work abundantly outside them, nevertheless, it is questionable whether their overt rejection of 'the gift' in Orders and Confirmation does not countervail and counteract everything that could be put to their credit. Who can reckon up the disintegration and weakness of God's House and Kingdom, the disunion, pride and uncharitableness, as well as absence of all discipline, wrought in the Body of Christ by the denial of the gift of the Holy Ghost in Apostolic Orders; or who can measure the ignorance of Christ, and the gracelessness which might have been remedied during the last 300 years, if all the baptized had been properly instructed to receive the Pentecostal Outpouring in that blessed rite of Confirmation which is the peculiar ordinance of the Holy Ghost Himself?—*Church Times*.

MODERN MARRIAGE.

[From a Lecture delivered by Canon Knox Little at All Saints', Margaret Street.]

For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.

In these days what must be called the Pagan reaction touched all things; but it touched them all, because it went to the root of all—it went for marriage. We knew the ways in which the Pagan reaction had come upon us. There was a great development in the education of women. He hoped it would be clearly understood that no words of his would be taken to mean that he had any fault to find with the higher education of women when that education was sanctioned, guided, governed, adorned, by the teaching of the religion of Christ. But certainly there was a direction which that development was taking which filled the heart of the Christian, at least, with anxiety. Our daughters were sometimes taught, not that God had created two sexes, but that there were two classes, and that those two classes were rivals; that woman was to find herself at home in the cricket field, on the foot-ball ground, on the platform, perhaps in Parliament, at the ballot-box, as much as man. If so, all the magnificent influence of woman, which came from her sex, from her supplying that which man had not; all that wondrous influence of hers that built up homes, trained men, that made a nation, and supported the Church was gone. For this Pagan reaction taught us, not that there were two sexes, to help each other, to be companions side by side, each supplying gifts which the

other lacked, but two classes to fight it out in rivalry and in bitter scorn. But the Pagan reaction went further. In those days it was blatant. It rejoiced in divorce, though, God knows, we had had more than enough of the horrors of the divorce court. It rejoiced in the legalization of incest. England, it was true, had not yet committed itself to the marriage of a man with his sister-in-law, but only the other day the imperial sanction was given to the most wanton of divorce laws yet passed in the colonies. And when we would understand what it all meant, we were told that there was to be justice done to woman, that she was to be kept no more in a state of subordination and subjection to man. One writer reminded us that it was impossible for a wife to do her duty unless the husband paid her for her work, if she was to be independent. Then we were instructed to remember that marriage was not a relation but a contract to be dissolved at the will of either party. We had also been told by the "higher culture" that there was something almost degrading in being a mother! And, lastly, we were informed that, if there was such a thing as a happy marriage at all, it must arise from the softening of the brain on either side. All this was inconceivable nonsense to a sensible person, but these were the counters with which men and women were bartering away the great institution of marriage. We bowed our heads in shame that such things should appear in the newspaper Press. In the name of Christ, he gave the lie to the infamy! In the name of the mother who had made in us all that we were of good, and checked whatever in us was evil, with her large hearted sympathy and tender love, and her intellectual capacity and deeply penetrated sense of the nature of man, he gave the lie to the infamy! In the name of the girl we had loved with devotion in early manhood, in the name of the amiable, faithful, and obedient wife, who gave her troth to the man she loved, in the name of the daughter who brightened the home by her purity and tenderness and sweetness, he gave the lie to the infamy! It was disgusting to think that a woman with an English name could pen anything so atrocious, and that Englishmen and Englishwomen could tolerate such words appearing in a public print. But what was the alleged justification? Unhappy marriages. He was quite aware that there were unhappy marriages enough and to spare—mostly unhappy because they had not been rooted in loyal love, but in love of money and social position. There might be unhappy marriages, there might be unhappy homes; but we were creatures of time born for eternity, and out of darkness He bringeth light. The man who found that he had made a mistake might find with the help of God's grace that he could rise to higher things from his dead self; and those who sprang from unhappy homes might learn the great lessons of truth and duty would they but come under the sunlight of the Christian Church. These apostles of the "higher culture" would cure you by killing you; but the Christian Church pointed to submission, to prayer, to the tender graces of the Holy Spirit. Yet the Church did not say that in this valley of tears all would be brightness and sunlight and glory, but she taught that if a married life was a trial, it was one to be borne, and to be sanctified. People thought that the affections were mere impulses which could not be controlled. He denied it. The affections were to be governed by the will, and we were not to allow ourselves to drift helplessly down the stream of inclination. Yes, in spite of the "high-fallutin" nonsense that appeared in reviews, there were such things as happy marriages, not simply among the foolish and the sentimentalists, but among the real, the strong thinkers, and the hard workers, and they were so because they were guided by Christian principle, because there was the due recognition of the proper place of man and

woman, because the affections were governed, by high principle, and that high principle came from a strong will and an understanding illumined by the grace of God. Was England going to listen to this miserable teaching of the Pagan reaction? Then, if so, England was gone, for patriotism, like society, depended upon the home, and there would be no home-life in England under this new system. Were we going to proclaim in the interest of society a universal licentiousness and call it morality, or to maintain the dignity of law, of self-restraint, of self-mastery, the high ideal of a pure and noble affection, and the thought that deep down at the root of society was the loyal love of the man for the woman and the woman for the man? Long might the Christian view of marriage remain uncontaminated and intact! It rested with Christian women to determine that it should. Men were what women made them, and he appealed to the Christian womanhood of England to insist upon a high ideal of a really noble love.—*The Family Churchman*.

"CATHOLIC," THE CHURCH'S TRUE NAME.

The word 'Catholic' means universal. It is applied to Christ's Church to show that it was not to be confined to one country or people; that it was to teach all truth, all things necessary for salvation; that it was to bring all classes of men to God; that it was to cure all spiritual diseases. The word is also used to distinguish those Christians who maintained what had been universally taught from the beginning, from those who have detracted from or added to that faith.

In the English Prayer Book the word 'Catholic' is found in the Preface, the Three Creeds, the Prayer for all conditions of men. The word 'Protestant,' on the other hand, does not occur once in that Prayer Book. Protestant was originally applied to the Lutheran party who protested against the Spire edicts in 1526. 'If a man says that he is a Protestant he only tells us that he is not a Romanist. At the same time he may be what is worse, a Socinian, or even an infidel; for these are all united under the common principle of protesting against Popery' (Hook's Church Dict).

'Catholic' denoted union and agreement with the main body and its teaching, the acceptance of those doctrines that can bear the test of the *quod semper, quod ubique, et quod ab omnibus*. Protestant is opposition to and separation from all this.* Canon 30 shows that the Church of England never separated from the main body or Catholic Church.

The English and American Churches have adhered most tenaciously to this title. It sets forth their claim to oneness with the primitive Church. It is the warrant and assurance that their ministry is of Apostolic origin; that the faith they profess is the one faith that has been handed down from the beginning; that the sacraments they administer were ordained by Christ.

Therefore, to apply the term 'Catholic' to Romanists implies that they are right and the Church of England wrong; that only in the Church of Rome are valid Orders, Creeds, Sacraments; that the English Church is a sect, and English Churchmen merely a portion of a great multitude of Separatists, the 'Protestant Omnium Gatherum.'—*Church Critic*.

[*We would rather say that 'Protestant' as applicable to the Church of England rests upon her character—that of being truly CATHOLIC: as such she is Protestant relatively to the Church of Rome, in so far as the latter is in error doctrinally and otherwise; and Protestant, relatively to the bodies of Christians generally included in the term, as also protesting against their errors, and their separation from the Church Catholic.—Ed.]