

and more felt, even in the Berlin schools, is opposed to us—viz., Atheism. Abstract moral instruction without a Christian basis will have little success in elementary schools. Whoever admits that the struggle with Atheism must be faced is bound to admit that religion must be taught in such schools. The Premier held that Church and State can hardly ever be quite separated, and in reply to an argument brought forward, declared that Scotland was able to dispense with religious teaching in its public schools, only because it was the most religious country in the world. In Germany it would be difficult to maintain religion among the lower classes without definite teaching in the elementary schools.

SCOTLAND.—The Duke of Argyll has taken an opportunity of replying to the letter of Bishop Wordsworth, which appeared in the *Scotsman*, and to which reference was made recently. His Grace's reply appeared in the same paper on the 22nd. His letter is "able and comprehensive," but it is, as Bishop Wordsworth says in answering it on the 25th ult., "no attempt to answer" the points which the Bishop made in challenging the view of the Duke on the opinion of the late Bishop Lightfoot concerning Episcopacy. The Bishop says, "I quite admit—indeed I have maintained—that the concessions which the Bishop has made in the early part of his essay, and which the Duke has referred to in detail, go some way to damage his conclusion; but surely, if we are to treat him fairly, in quoting his opinion, we must look not to those concessions, but to the conclusion itself, as he himself virtually bids us to do, when he complains of those who 'emphasised his partial and qualifying statements to the neglect of the general drift of the essay.' The concessions, in my opinion, are more than questionable." His Lordship then proceeds to touch upon the concessions to which he refers—necessarily very briefly—and to express his view concerning their general weakness, and justifies his position by interesting testimonies. For instance, he quotes Dean Church as writing, "Will you let me thank you for your 'remarks' on Lightfoot's unfortunate essay? In every way, in manner and substance, they seem to be admirable. Lightfoot is a very dear friend of mine, and I have abundant reason to know how great his powers are in every way. But I never could understand what he was thinking of when he wrote that essay."

The book to which the Dean referred is a work by the Bishop entitled, *Some Remarks on Bishop Lightfoot's Dissertation on the Christian Ministry*, which was published in 1878. Bishop Moberly, of Salisbury, also wrote, "I am greatly obliged to you, both publicly and privately, for your 'Remarks on Bishop Lightfoot's Essay.' I have read every word of it with great satisfaction, and feel very grateful to you for having written it. How curious it is to contrast his equitable (though inconsistent) statement, with the dashing undoubtfulness of our friend at Westminster (Stanley)? Extracts from letters from Bishop Cotterill of Edinburgh, Bishop Littlejohn, of Long Island, U.S.A., and Cardinal Manning, are also quoted as witnesses for Bishop Wordsworth. As a final testimony, the Bishop refers to Canon M'Cull, who says in the preface to the third edition of his work on *Christianity in Relation to Science and Morals*, 'In the end of last October [1889] I had the privilege of spending some days with the Bishop at Auckland Castle, and he then told me that the study of the early records of Christianity had left no doubt whatever on his mind as to the Apostolic—which in fact, meant the Divine—origin of Episcopacy.' In conclusion, the Bishop remarks that he and the Duke differ, so far as Bishop Lightfoot is concerned, because the Duke has been looking at his concessions, while he has looked to his conclusion. But, says the Bishop, 'I shall be sincerely glad if the object for which the Duke's speech was delivered can be accomplished, and our Presbyterian brethren can see their way to reunion among themselves. It will be a step in the right direction. It will not, however (according to our judgment), be a reunion in unity or in the truth. Whatever other merits Presbyterianism may have—and it has many—it has no principle of unity, to judge from the present, and still less from past, of Christendom. We know what is meant when we hear of the "historic Episcopate," but no one has ever spoken of "historic Presbyterianism." Scottish Churchmen and Presbyterians have been much interested in the discussion.'

### Notes and Queries.

SIR.—What is the proper course for an Anglican priest to take, in the present condition of the Catholic Church, if two members of the Roman communion present themselves to him with a request to be united in the bonds of holy matrimony? Should he marry them, or, declining to do so, refer them to their own parish priest? S.

Ans.—Accepting their request as being made in good faith, he should marry them without hesitation, as he would two Presbyterians. Romanists are the last that should appeal to Catholic principles, and either they are in schism or we are, when altar is set up against altar.

### Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

N. B.—If any one has a good thought, or a Christian sentiment, or has facts, or deductions from facts, useful to the Church, and to Churchmen, we would solicit their statement in brief and concise letters in this department.

### Sketches of Canadian Church History.

SIR.—Will some of your many able correspondents be so kind as to favour us with a Sketch of Canadian Church History? The Church has gradually found her way along the St. Lawrence and chain of lakes, so as to embrace both Lower Canada and Upper, and stretches westward till her services are organised on the Pacific shore and in the huts of the Esquimaux. In place of the few missions upon the eastern seaboard and the banks of the St. Lawrence, the Church has grown into two ecclesiastical provinces with eight and nine dioceses, and if we include the Bahamas, five other independent dioceses. In this development of Church energy there must have been many thrilling incidents, which may be related to interest old and young. It is only about two centuries since the pioneers of civilisation were pushing round the lakes and "seeking the skins of beasts and the souls of men." But there are also a good many points upon which it is most desirable that a little more light should be thrown. Many questions will be asked when the proposal is fairly taken in hand for the unification of the Canadian provinces, and for the possible drawing the independent dioceses into the union. Here, for example, a slight complication appears to come in with the idea that the Archbishop of Canterbury is already Primate of one of the provinces. For my own part I should very much like to know the exact amount of the primacy, when and why it was accorded, and what its position might be in any new ecclesiastical organisation. If we suppose that the archbishop were to go into opposition, might his primacy bar all attempts at consolidation? In the discussions last summer upon the consolidation of the Church in British North America, I do not think this question was mooted: it may be a formal primacy, or it may become an irksome reality, and there can be no possible harm in one having an accurate knowledge of what it means. In the public press last autumn, it was stated that Dean Reeve was appointed to the diocese of Mackenzie River by His Grace of Canterbury; if the archbishop did so as primate of the province, it suggests some curious thoughts with regard to present and future autonomy. Canada is, of course, too young as yet, for its history, either in church or in state, being written, because it is still crude and unformed, but useful sketches may, even now, be given to interest the present generation and provide material, ready at hand, for the historians of a future date. A concise and accurate account of the Church's march through the forests of the Canadas, and across the prairie provinces, the lone land of the North-west lakes, and the Rockies, would be full of life and interest. Many small matters might be easily explained now, and a name of a person, place, or date, would stand fixed for all time to come. I am, etc.,

JAMES GAMMACK, LL.D.

East Toronto, Feb. 20th, 1892.

### Sunday School Lesson.

1st Sunday in Lent

March 6th, 1892.

THE TEMPTATION.

We have a great foe, called in the Catechism "our ghostly enemy," and in the Bible "Satan." He tempts, i.e., tries us, whether or not we are able to be firm in our obedience to God. Satan tries our souls, to see what we can or cannot bear. As Jesus had to bear whatever we bear, Satan tried Him. We read about His special trial or Temptation. (S. Luke iv. 1-14.) From this we learn that

I. SATAN IS VERY CUNNING.

He came to Eve in a way suiting his character. We do not know in what shape he appeared to Jesus. Satan tried Jesus in three different ways.

1st. Knowing that he was hungry, he tried to persuade Him to satisfy His hunger in a way which God had not commanded (S. Luke iv. 3). Jesus would not doubt His Father's love and care (v. 4).

2nd. As He trusted so much, Satan tried His trust (v. 9-11). Jesus answered (v. 12), which meant that He loved His Father too much to presume.

3rd. Satan, seeing that Jesus loved His Father's will so much, tried to persuade Him that, as it was His Father's will that He should reign over the world, any means of attaining that end must be right (v. 5-7). Jesus was most firm against any attempt to rob God of His honour. He answered, (v. 8). See how Satan in each case made doing wrong look like doing right. This is the way Satan often does. See S. John xii. 4-6, where covetousness is made to look like care for the poor.

The Bible warns us against Satan's craft (2 Cor. xi. 3, 14). Any suggestion contrary to God's commands is a suggestion of Satan.

The way Jesus met Satan, teaches us that,

II. THE BIBLE IS OUR BEST DEFENCE AGAINST OUR FOE.

Read Eph. vi. 11-17. Bible called "sword of The Spirit" (v. 17). Every time Jesus was attacked, He defended Himself with a text. Find them. (Deut. viii. 3; vi. 16 and 13). This shows the use of learning texts. Satan can quote, and sometimes mis-quotes. (See S. Luke iv. 10, 11).

III. JESUS CAN FEEL FOR US WHEN TEMPTED.

The Temptation of Jesus assures us of three things.

(1.) He understands what temptation is.

(2.) Jesus is stronger than Satan. (S. Luke xi. 21, 22.)

(3.) Jesus is willing to help us. By telling us of His temptation, He says, "See what I am willing to bear for you." If willing to be tempted—much more willing to help you in temptation.

### Family Reading.

"Changed Lots; or, Nobody Cares."

CHAPTER XIV.

A SAD SUMMER.

After Jem's funeral poor Missie felt as if she did not much care what became of her; she followed the others passively and silently, feeling that each step took her further from the kind brother who had watched over her with such dog-like devotion that only when she had really lost him had she known how much she owed him.

To her his death had seemed sudden, for within an hour he had been talking to her much as usual, and she had never given up the hope that when the winter was over he might get better again, as he had done the summer before.

Nance, too, was very grief-stricken; Jem had always been a devoted son, doing for her as long as his strength lasted what no other boy in the camp would do, and when he was laid up she had still felt him a help, for she had grown to respect his judgment and lean on his advice.

Then she had always looked forward until quite lately to his being the stay of her old age. Jem would never let her want, she knew.

Very few weeks passed before Joe Lovell was again pressing her to marry him, pointing out with brutal frankness that she and Lil would find it hard now to get along without him, and that he did not choose to be fooled any longer; if Nance would not listen to him he should part company.

For the last year Joe had done a great deal for Nance, and had made him-self almost necessary. He had been careful, too, in his conduct, and steadier than usual, taking much hard work from her, and making her feel his presence a protection. Now, when she again refused to marry him, he suddenly left her, thinking, no doubt, that his absence was more likely than anything else to make her give in.

His horse was a strong one he had lately bought and it could travel fast; hers was so aged that each week it was a wonder how it managed to struggle along, and it had been lame for years.

When Nance found herself quite alone with Lil she saw for the first time all the difficulties before her, and she felt very desolate, in spite of her high courage.

Everything she had saved during the winter had been spent on Jem's funeral and the black dresses; it would have hurt her dreadfully to do without.

It was true Lil could sing, and the summer would make things easier; but it was only in the towns that Lil's singing was of much avail; and Lil was not looking strong; thinking of the next