

remarkably thin, and the "Catholic Faith," if we apply the expression to what they all hold in common, goes down with uncommon velocity to the vanishing point. The *Scotsman* thinks that Mr. Jupp does not manage his orphanage on sufficiently "Catholic" principles, because he does not teach his orphans the distinctive tenets of all the sects in the country. If the *Scotsman* would allow him to teach them simply what all the sects are agreed on, one advantage might follow—there would be few attacks of brain fever among the orphans as the result of committing the Creed to memory. But the *Scotsman's* method of concurrent instruction in all sorts of contradictory dogmas would not possess even this recommendation. The poor orphans would still have their full increase of risk in respect of brain fever, and superadded thereto all the evils of mental and spiritual confusion. It looks strange, but it is true, that it is just because Mr. Jupp is so Catholic, in the true sense of believing and teaching the Catholic Faith, that he appears so uncatholic in the eyes of the *Scotsmen*.

It should be borne in mind that the word "Catholic" is not properly applied to persons at all, but to the doctrines or truths which make up the Catholic Faith, the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* of St. Vincent of Lerins. It is only by a natural process of metonymy that the word is applied to persons. A Catholic is one who holds the Catholic Faith, and even the Church is Catholic, not because it embraces all sorts of men who place themselves under the label "Christian," but because it holds in its integrity the one Faith once delivered to the Saints. It is needful to insist upon this in these days when the attempt is so persistently made to wrest the word "Catholic" from its proper application to doctrine, and to apply it to mere miscellaneous collections of all sorts and conditions of men, believing and unbelieving alike.

Holding, as I do, that the word Catholic can never properly apply to anything else than the one Faith once delivered to the Saints, and if applied by metonymy to a person can only denote a holder of that faith, I am unable to appreciate the subtle distinction which Dr. Duncan appears to have drawn between Christian and Catholic. Used in their strictness the terms are synonymous, and neither Pope or Presbytery should be allowed, without protest, to wrest them from their true significance.

I daresay Dr. Duncan, who was a thoughtful man and knew something of theology, was not very far astray in his application of the word "Catholic" to himself. He probably meant that he accepted the Christian Faith as it had been defined in what are known as the Catholic Creeds of the Church. If so, it is a thousand pities that he did not stop there. Why did he spoil his Christianity and Catholicity by tacking on to them the *catgut mortuum* of Calvinism? Was not the Faith that sufficed for Peter and Paul, and Athanasius and Chrysostom, sufficient to meet the case of Dr. John Duncan? Was his soul one bit safer because he overloaded the simplicity of the Catholic

Faith with the vainly circling logical fallacies that ensnared the Frenchified intellect of John Calvin? As for Pædo-baptism, thank God he did not need to go beyond Catholic faith and practice to have full scope and sanction for that. The Catholic Church has never said nay to the Saviour's injunction, "Suffer little children to come unto Me." But was Dr. Duncan in his Presbyterianism conscious of no encroachment on the integrity of the Catholic Faith? Probably he was not, and yet as long as in that Faith we profess our belief in "one Catholic and Apostolic Church," and are unable to find Presbyterianism in that order which was Catholic and Apostolic, so long are we bound to maintain that Presbyterianism is not simply an addition to that which is Catholic, but is incompatible therewith. In adding Presbyterianism, therefore, to his profession of Catholicity, I fear that Dr. Duncan was not only indulging in a word of supererogation by adding to that which was perfectly sufficient before, but he was actually spoiling the good to which, by his own profession, he had previously attained.—*Scottish Guardian*.

WHAT'S IN A NAME.

MUCH every way. So think the people of Australia, most of whom very rightly object to the name which belongs to their whole island being monopolised by one portion only of it. So think authors and inventors, who find a name a very important factor in their great object of catching the public eye. The book called *How to be Happy though Married* has had, it is said, an enormous sale, owing chiefly to its name. And, to come more nearly to our principal object in this Comment, those who form themselves into Societies for purposes connected with religion, know very well that there is very much in a name; and are accordingly very careful, and in some instances very cunning, in their choice of what they consider a suitable name for their Society. It was a 'happy thought' of the Society for Plundering the Church, to call itself the 'Society for Liberating the Church from State Control.' It is characteristic of the otiose assent of the English to things as they find them, when they do not care much about them, to admit tacitly the various claims which are made wrongfully to certain names and titles.

One of the most conspicuous instances of this is to be found in the constant misuse of the term 'Catholic.' Although members of the Church of England constantly declare, as in the Creeds and the Prayer for all conditions of Men, that the Church of England is a true branch of the Catholic Church; yet many of them allow themselves habitually to restrict the use of this term, as though the Romish schismatics were the only Catholics in this land. And this carelessness in speaking and writing is found even among those who ought to be our leaders. Thus Canon Creighton, now an Ecclesiastical Professor at Cambridge, allowed such passages as this in the useful little *Epochs of English History* which he edited:—"Though the Parliament wished to do something for the

Puritans, it had no mercy on men who still clung to the old Church. Not only was the Catholic faith held to be harmful to the minds of men, but Catholics themselves were looked upon as bad subjects.' And constantly throughout the volume where this occurs the term 'Catholic' is applied exclusively to the Papists. It will be observed, also, that the English Church before the Reformation is spoken of as 'the old Church.' Now it is very probable that the Romanists in the sixteenth century, like their successors in the nineteenth, claimed to themselves the exclusive title of Catholic; and that the vast majority of those who gloried in calling themselves Protestants, forgot, or seemed to forget, that they were quite as much entitled (and even more) as were the Papists to the designation of Catholic. But this does not justify a writer in these days, who adopts these terms without carefully pointing out their real meaning, in contradistinction to what may be called their conventional meaning; and the neglect becomes very mischievous when the persons instructed are the young and less educated members of the Church.

If there were not already too many Societies within that great Society, the Church, it might be well to form a new one—'The Society for Calling Things by their Right Names.' The members would be bound to call Romanists 'Romanists,' and would never allow them to speak of themselves as the only 'Catholics.' They would take care to use Prayer-book terms; not being afraid to designate men 'in priests' orders' as 'Priests,' and endeavouring to bring back the right use of the word Curate (which includes rectors and vicars), calling the assistant clergy 'Assistant Curate' or 'Assistant Priest,' &c. And such a Society would always be prepared to combat the assumption of improper titles by anti-Church Societies, and to expose their pretensions. How much truth might be taught if we were always careful to 'call a spade a spade' in matters ecclesiastical, avoiding the euphemisms which are creeping in and misleading simple minds! Unless a decided stand be made against the propensity to use misleading names, and substitute long words for short, we may live to hear the Eighth Commandment altered into 'Thou shalt not disendow,' and the police aroused by the cry, 'Stop disendower'—*A. M. W., in Church Bells*.

INTER-COLLEGIATE MISSION UNION.

A movement for a closer union of the theological seminaries and the church societies in the different universities in the United States and Canada, has been agitated for some time. The first meeting took place in the Theological Seminary, New York, on 18th January and following days. There were forty-five delegates present from the following eighteen colleges and other institutions, viz: The General Theological Seminary, N. Y.; the West Philadelphia Divinity School, the Berkeley Divinity School, Nashotah Seminary, St. Stephen's College, Annandale; the Cambridge Divinity School, Mass.; the Theological Seminary of Virginia; St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.; Bishop's College, Diocese of Quebec; Groton School, Groton, Mass.; University of the South, Sewanee; St. Paul's Missionary Society of Princeton College, N. J.; Episcopal High School of Virginia, near Alexandria, Va.; St. John's School, Manlius, N. Y.; Seabury Guild of Cornell University; Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.; Trinity College, Toronto, Canada; St. Paul's Society of Harvard University, Mass. Trinity College was represented by the Rev. Charles