

men. The Brotherhood's plan of spreading Christ's Kingdom among young men is to procure their enlistment one by one in that Kingdom. Its way is by the personal influence of one man upon another to bring him to hear and consider the calling of Christ as set forth by the Church in the preaching of Christ's Message and teaching of God's Word.

In carrying out this plan and following this way, the Brotherhood has been obliged to face two conditions: The condition of our young men and the condition of the Church which calls them.

The first consideration, the condition of our young men, has led the Brotherhood to develop many kinds of work to help them to get out of bad habits and surroundings; to antidote the spirits of covetousness, lust and worldliness which rule almost supreme among them; and to bring them to the Church. To these ends the Brotherhood has sent its men out to visit and make friends with young men at their homes, at hotels, and elsewhere, seeking to establish friendships which shall give the chance for personal influence for good. Reading rooms, gymnasiums, Bible classes and meetings of various sorts have been established by which to get hold of and help men to better footing; the study of social questions has been encouraged, experiments in the way of social settlements have been tried in a quiet way, and we are looking to the establishment of "Brotherhood Houses" for men who will live in community and give their spare time to the uplifting of their fellow men. The Boys' Department is taking hold of our Church boys, to hold them steady in faith and helpfulness; and it, together with concerted work among college students, will fill out the period between the innocence of childhood and the beginning of a man's work in the world. All these expedients have been deemed secondary to the Brotherhood man's first duty, which is to live a life which shall witness to Christ and His Kingdom to every man who touches it. The development of a sturdy type of Christian manhood has been the most encouraging mark of the decade; the Church is judged by the quality of her men, and the invitation of strong men to come and hear the Gospel must be heeded.

The second condition which has confronted the Brotherhood has been that of the Church. A consideration of this condition has led to the very characteristic and general work of the Brotherhood in welcoming strangers to the Church service, which has brought about a change of air in our churches. It is not too much to say as a general statement that ten years ago the Church had the reputation of being cold and formal and inhospitable, and that now its reputation is exactly the reverse. It may further be noted that the success of the clergy in enlisting laymen in the Brotherhood has greatly revived their courage and ardor, and many are no longer content with leading blameless lives and ministering in the congregation in a purely conventional way; their missionary spirit has been aroused by the possibilities opening before them, and they have taken new heart to spread Christ's Kingdom aggressively. Through lay co-operation they are better officers because they lead better men. The Brotherhood idea of responsibility and service has also extended far beyond its own boundaries, and is pervading the whole body of laymen to a marked degree; all kinds of Church work is being better done than before, and a better class of men are offering as candidates for the ministry.

Parochialism is the antithesis of true Christian brotherhood, and there has been warfare from the start between the sectarian spirit of parochialism and the Church spirit of the Brotherhood. The Brotherhood has, by uniting parochial Chapters in local assemblies and in the general order, broken down dividing walls, opened out the horizon and prepared the way for true Catholic Churchmanship.

The main achievement of the first decade of the Brotherhood has been the restoration in its members of the idea of citizenship in the Kingdom of God, and along with this has come an awakening to the dignity, the duty and the privilege of this citizenship. In the light of this idea small matters look small alongside of the great issues of the Kingdom, and many cherished habits and customs are now seen to be unworthy provincialisms. The Brotherhood has come, during the past ten years, to stand, without self-consciousness, for the abolition of caste and privilege in the Church; for church doors open every day in the year, for free pews, multiplied services, frequent celebrations, and the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to every creature. It has come to stand also for the Prayer Book, the whole Prayer Book, and nothing but the Prayer Book in the regular prescribed public worship of the Church. It has come to recognize the Prayer Book as the Magna Charta of the laymen of the Church. At the same time it stands for such loyal and fearless evangelistic methods as will gather men from the highways and hedges to the King's supper. It stands for loyalty to the clergy—true loyalty, not of inactive admiration or servile following after, but of sturdy co-operation. To-day, while the Brotherhood may be called radical, for it aims to get at the root of things, on the other hand it is essentially conservative. It allows no cranks to grind it, and its spirit is absolutely hostile to cant, parish politics, and to offensive partisanship for different schools of thought within the Church.

The record of the first decade is nothing to boast of, but there is much to be got out of it for encouragement. God has blessed us beyond our deserts and has kept us from great mistakes, scandals and disputings. We have learned many lessons, have restored a high idea, and have enlisted a great company of men. Now it remains for us to make the second decade fruitful by better, wiser work, and to live up towards the idea of good citizenship in the Kingdom of Christ.—*From St. Andrew's Cross.*

#### THE WORD "CATHOLIC."

What is the meaning of the word *Catholic*? We do not refer to its etymological, historical or theological meaning, but to its plain meaning in which a plain Englishman ought in these days to be understood when using it. Is the word always used correctly? If it is misused can we correct the misuse? Can we find the true meaning of the word?

When the correct meaning of a word is in question, a true Englishman naturally turns to Dr. Johnson. We do so in this instance. We go, of course, to an unabridged, unadulterated edition of his dictionary. There we see how he defines the word. He defines it under four heads, of which we give the first three in full:

1. The Church of Jesus Christ is called *catholic*, because it extends throughout the world, and is not limited by time.
2. Some truths are said to be *catholic*, because they are received by all the faithful.
3. *Catholic* is often set in opposition to heretic or sectary, and to schismatic.

The fourth head refers to the 'catholic' or 'general' Epistles of the New Testament.

So far Dr. Johnson; and after reading over his definition several times we have come to the not very surprising conclusion that we can not improve upon it. The style of a dictionary is, however, marked by extreme brevity, not to say curtness, and though we cannot improve upon Dr. Johnson, we may, perhaps, be able to amplify him to some purpose. We may point to some misuses of the word which his silence condemns as un-English.

We shall adhere strictly to his threefold definition. We observe, in the first place, then,

that the Church is called *Catholic* because it extends throughout the world. 'Catholic,' as we know from a slight acquaintance with the Greek tongue, is opposed to 'particular.' And so we understand that as there is but one *Catholic* Church throughout the world, so there are many *particular* Churches scattered over the world. St. Paul wrote a letter to the Church that was at Corinth, and another to the 'Churches of Galatia;' St. John to the 'seven Churches that were in Asia.' Similarly, at the present day we talk familiarly of the 'Church of England,' 'the Church of Russia,' 'Church of South Africa,' or the 'Church of Rome.' In equally familiar Latin form one of these particular churches is known as '*Ecclesia Anglicana*,' another as '*Ecclesia Romana*.'

In each case the phrase means the whole body of the faithful who live together under their pastors, the Bishops, in a particular place or country. So, then, since these are *particular* Churches, and 'particular' is the opposite of 'Catholic,' it would be absurd to call any one of these a 'Catholic Church.' Yet one of them—the Church of Rome—delights to call itself such; and its official style is sometimes *Sancta Romana Ecclesia* (as in the title of the Cardinals), but more frequently *Ecclesia Romana Catholica*. Is this an absurdity, or is there any rational explanation of it? We shall see.

In the second place we observe that some truths are called *Catholic* because they are generally or universally received by all the faithful, that is, by the whole 'Catholic' Church. Thus we speak of the 'Catholic Faith,' meaning the whole body of such truths, and from this we exclude all mere opinions, however pious, probable and wholesome, which are held only by certain persons or in certain localities, that is to say by some *particular churches*. Thus the particular Church of Rome most devoutly believes in the infallibility of its own Bishop, but as this belief is not shared by the Church of Russia or the Church of England, to mention no others, it is not a 'Catholic' truth; even if it be true at all, which, of course, is open to doubt. And here we may observe that a doctrine may be true, and even necessarily true, without being a 'Catholic' truth; it is not a Catholic truth unless it is not only true but also received as true by the whole Church.

The third signification of the word flows directly from the first two. As there is one Catholic Church extending throughout the world, and one Catholic Faith held throughout the Church, the word 'Catholic' comes to be used as a description of those who belong to the one Church and hold the one faith. They are thus distinguished from 'schismatics,' or those who have cut themselves off from the unity of the Church, and from 'heretics' and 'sectaries,' or those who have rejected a part of the one Faith, and either choose for themselves or follow those who have chosen, a set of doctrines peculiar to themselves. In this sense, and in this sense only, an individual person can be called 'Catholic,' namely, as indicating that he is a faithful member of the one Catholic Church. In a similar sense, too, a particular Church may be called 'Catholic,' not, of course, that it extends throughout the world, which no particular Church can do, but because it is a faithful integral part of the one Catholic Church, holding and teaching the one Catholic Faith. In this sense it is clear that 'Catholic' means exactly the same as 'orthodox.'

For example, as we have seen, the particular Church of Rome loves to style itself '*Ecclesia Romana Catholica*;' and we may now see that there is nothing absurd in this, if only the title be properly understood. It does not mean, of course, that the Church of Rome extends throughout the world—an obvious absurdity; it simply calls attention to the undisputed fact that the Church of Rome, that is to say, the body of Christians living at Rome under the pastoral rule of their Bishop, is a part of the