

While these words are followed almost immediately by what seems to us not only to do credit to the position of Williams in the English Church, and to his wisdom and loyalty, but also what we, as Christians and Churchmen, shall do well to ponder and remember.

"Such leanings find in me no place,  
So broad I feel the gulf 'twixt her and us,  
Form'd by her dark and sad idolatries,  
That I would rather die a thousand death  
Than pass it."

And with that loving fidelity to truth, which every Christian teacher must possess, and which will make him value other men's souls, it is added.—

"sure I cannot others lead  
To thoughts which foreign are to all I love,  
And find in me no sympathetic chord."

—Family Churchman.

## THE LAWS OF MARRIAGE.

BY CANON SCOTT HOLLAND.

If we are ever tempted to suppose that the secular and the religious aspects of human life can be held apart in separate compartments, or that the Gospel of Jesus Christ makes it appeal only to the individual conscience, and has no positive bearing on social interest, our hopes of intellectual consistency are bound to come to an abrupt arrest at the point where we encounter marriage. Here, if anywhere, religion claims to be concerned; always, in every place, form, and fashion, the religious instinct has fastened on marriage as its own. Here in marriage, if anywhere, the inner world of feeling, of passion, of imagination, all that strange and delicate world which we would at all costs keep in our possession, in its own sacred secrecy, unpublished, undiscovered, unadvertised, unhampered, must be intimately touched. We reach in marriage the very sanctuary where a soul puts out its claim to be itself, and to be hidden from alien eyes, and invokes by public supervision to be at liberty to trust its private instincts, and to develop its natural capacities. Marriage, then, engages all those innermost elements in us which go to constitute our personal, our religious individuality. And yet there is nothing which is more obviously and more essentially a public and social affair. Beyond all question the State must take account of it in all its bearings. The life of the whole community rests on it, revolves round it, springs from it. Far from being a merely private business it has issues at every turn which compel public legislation to take note of its every step, to follow its every movement, to inspect, to regulate, to direct, to guard, to license, to limit, to define, to handle it. But the complicated legal mechanism by which a society controls and supervises the marriage of its citizens is bound to embody a definite ideal. It cannot be merely the friend, or regulate its action as that of an indifferent spectator who has no other interest than that of keeping the peace. Marriage is one absolutely inevitable point at which the theory of separating the outer and inner order of things, the social and the individual life, the purpose of the State and the purpose of religion, must for ever break down. It cannot be done. Here the two halves must either collide or agree, they must have interests in common, interests that overlap, interests, too, that belong to what is deepest in each. A man or a woman in marrying, however private, personal, intimate the motives that are at work within them; however profoundly to them it may seem to be their own affair, and no one else's are as a fact undertaking of necessity public responsibility which the

entire body of their fellow-citizens are concerned in imposing, and are exercising the highest privileges of their corporate citizenship. You and I have come here to-day just because we are anxiously inquiring whether our public and our private lives can be brought into harmonious agreement; whether our social and our individual consciences correspond; whether our conduct as citizens reflects in any degree the mind of the Lord Jesus Christ. In such an inquiry there can be no point at which the challenge rings out with sharper urgency, with a more piercing anxiety, than this of marriage. And this urgency, this anxiety are acutely heightened for us at the moment at which we stand, because the newer social ideals and motives which are beginning to tell upon our civil life, and to mould our legislation, have not yet shown what their action will be in this vital sphere. They have hardly yet displaced at all, in this department, those counter-ideas which everywhere else they are so rapidly ousting, and yet at last they are bound to invade this domain as well as all others; and when they do they will be liable to those peculiar perils which have always historically accompanied Socialism in its treatment of marriage.

Why, is marriage "suspect" of Socialism? What is the unfortunate blunder? Is it not the old and familiar one of opposing the general to the particular? We fancy that in order, for instance, to love all men more we must love separate men less. We suppose that a strong personal affection for one must be in collision with the universal affection for all. But in reality, if it is, it has falsified itself. The right way to love all men better is so to love one friend with all your heart, and with all your soul, that in him you may learn to love every man who is in his likeness, and of his nature. And intense personal attachment is the training ground in which we find out how wonderfully lovable a thing man is. If it be true to itself, it will act as an inspiration to prompt and kindle in us a tender kindness for every man, woman, and child we meet. The human race at large becomes tangible, actual, comprehensible, lovable in the face of him to whom our heart goes out in such abundance, and if we fail to find out general sympathies widened by the intensity of a particular affection we have somehow disturbed and hindered its own proper instinctive movements. So with marriage. It is the ground of our corporate existence in society. It evokes within its own sphere the very temper of altruism, or mutual service, of incorporated interests, which has only got to be extended to become the true tone of the social citizen. And the way to extend it is not to abolish the smaller sphere of its exercise, but, on the contrary, to fortify, to protect, to enrich, to intensify it. The closer and the warmer the home affection, the larger and the stronger should become those social instincts which make life inconceivable except in a community, and which constituted a matter of sheer habit and of unmitigated joy to think always of others as well as of oneself, to associate others with every word and work, to devote to the common welfare the richest energies with which man is endowed.

You will be compelled to handle the marriage laws. The pressure of social forces is bound to require this of you. From all sides this pressure will arrive, sometimes from the side of what is noblest and finest in the modern movement—as, for instance, from the larger recognition of women's freedom and of a woman's rights; sometimes, on the contrary, it will proceed from the terrible mortal disintegration which is incident to a time of vast social change and of religious chaos. Anyhow, that pressure will come; and let me remind you this law of marriage which you will be compelled to touch and treat has been taken wholly

away from its ancient ecclesiastical administration and committed to the secular power to direct, and to the civil courts to apply. Quite rightly. I am not disputing this, or doubting its fitness. Only remember what it involves. Behind its old administration under ecclesiastical supervision derived from canon law, there was always assumed a controlling and inspiring and sanctioning force, a fixed and unshaken authority, the Christian ideal of marriage. The law rested on that beyond argument, beyond doubt. Now under its civil conditions, under its secular administration, are you going to retain that ideal as your basis and your trust, or are you not? That is the question of questions. We have imagined for so long that by handing public affairs over to secular bodies to deal with we shall avoid religious problems. We have done this so long that we have come to fancy that even the law of marriage, if it could be so handed over, could be determined by plain common-sense and considerations of general expediency. But, as we started by saying, this vague supposition that secular life can be handed over, and divorce, even if it can make a shift to manage most things, must be brought up short at this particular point. Marriage necessitates a positive ideal, and this ideal must have its base in the spiritual life. For, indeed, it lays such a tremendous strain on the powers of self-sacrifice for others; it involves such momentous responsibilities, and such far-reaching issues that nothing less than a spiritual ideal can have weight and authority enough to carry it through. Without this, if once it dropped to the level of mere expediency and utilities, if it be discussed and handled and legislated for and administered on materialistic grounds that are so inevitable to the average man of the world, it is bound to go under; it is bound to yield and break. The personal crises involved in its course are so intense, so manifold, and so severe that nothing but an appeal to the spirit of self-sacrifice can carry men or women through them; and self-sacrifice can only be made at the altar of an authoritative and supreme ideal. An ideal! We cannot be without it here. We cannot, we dare not, for all around us and within us, the hideous and awful powers of passion are waiting there in the darkness for the opportunities offered by our indecision. Whenever we slacken in theory, or totter in will, or falter in judgment, they press in, they rush forward, they seize the advantage, they gather to the onset; hardly even at our best can we hold the fort of purity; hardly can we withstand these swarming hosts that even now are ever on the verge of victory; let but one gate be opened, but one wall be breached, and the day is lost.—Family Churchmanship.

\* Extracts from a Lecture of the Christian Social Union, delivered at St. Edmund's Lombard-street.

## TACTUAL SUCCESSION.

It is popularly supposed that Episcopalians alone maintain an exclusive position with reference to orders. But this is not true. The Presbyterians and Lutherans, for instance, are also committed to the theory of exclusive orders. Ordination by proper authorities is necessary to a valid ministry among them as among ourselves. According to Scripture and to Church history, as well as according to our formularies, this authority is to be found in the Apostolate succeeded by the Episcopate; according to the Presbyterian formularies it is to be found in the Apostolate succeeded by the Presbyterate. But the fountain head is regarded by both as to be found alone in the original mission; therefore, in Christ Himself. Both regard that ministry alone as valid which has descended from this fountain-head. Both