

king's tomb removed to make way for the burial of a greater. There, a heap of broken stones are fragments of the monuments and chantries destroyed as idolatrous in fanatical times. A confused collection in a corner of carved and gilded scraps of plaster and wood represents the pomp of heraldic ornament at the funeral of a duke or a general. Nothing is lost that has once found its way into the Church; and the storehouse has ample room for everything worth preserving, as well as for much that has ceased to interest the people of this generation.

The ascent is made by various flights of stairs. One of these opens on the east aisle of the cloister, close to the entrance of the Chapter-house. When the ancient Church of the Confessor was superseded by the more magnificent building of Henry III., the cloisters though they abutted on the new ground-plan of the western aisle of the south transept, were not removed, and the Poet's Corner is thus defrauded of its full proportions. The cloister is much lower than the aisle would have been in its place; and over it is the minium room, with its iron bound coffers. The triforium is another flight above, and the winding stair is steep, slippery and dark. When at length we stand on the red brick pavement and look around, we are surprised to observe the great size of the chamber which intervenes between the top of the vaulting below and the timbers of the roof above. Nothing gives a better idea of the vastness of the building than to see the greatness of its minor parts. The pavement, which only dates from the time of Wren, becomes more irregular as we turn into the triforium of the nave. It conceals the "pockets" of the vaulting, receptacles probably filled with fragrances of the statues and altars displaced at the Reformation. At the further end, in the south tower, over the Abbot's Chapel or baptistry, the floor was of wood. On its being removed, the remains of Torregiano's images in terra-cotta, for the decoration of the altar in Henry VII.'s Chapel, were found. They indicate rather than prove the magnificence of the whole structure; but are broken into such minute pieces that the united efforts of several antiquaries have so far failed to make up a single complete figure. Among them is the "torso" of a splendidly modelled statue of the dead Saviour, and beautiful are the feet of the angels of the canopy. This altar, which was engraved by Sanford as the monument of Edward VI., was destroyed in 1643 by one Sir Robert Harlow, who deserves to go down to posterity with Erostratus and Lloyd. Some portions, identified at Oxford among the Arundel marbles of Mr. Middleton, have been recently restored to their place, but it is to be feared that the terra-cotta fragments in the triforium are beyond repair. The chamber over the vaulting of the Abbot's Chapel, in which they were found, was that occupied, it is said, by Bradshaw, President of the High Court of Justice which condemned Charles I. The Deanery, with which by a separate staircase this part of the triforium communicates, was granted to Bradshaw, who died in it in 1659. Constant tradition avers that he actually died in this very room, a room which certainly was at some period used as a lodging, for it contains a fire place of Late Perpendicular work. Hence, along the triforium his restless spirit walks on the nights of the 30th January and the 22d November; and in truth a more ghostly-looking corner than this would be difficult to imagine. Little cherubs peep out here and there from behind the marble panes removed from the montment below of Admiral Tyrrell. Close by are two wooden obelisks removed in 1775 from the entrance to the choir, where, according to Dart's view, they stood on the summit of tall classical gateposts. A label on one of them attributes the carving to Gibbons, but this ascription is more than doubtful.

In those parts of the triforium which are over the apsidal chapels some curious collections have been formed. A buttress of Henry VII.'s Chapel long concealed a window here, and in it have been found some panels of original glazing of the thirteenth century, being among the most ancient and complete examples of the kind left. They are very different from most of the modern glass.

(To be continued.)

## THE "INVISIBLE" CHURCH.

The ordinary Protestant idea of the Christian Church is that it is, first of all, and in its most essential aspect, a community of souls not bound together by any outward organism, and therefore invisible to the eye of sense—a democracy of spirits capable of being recognized only by the all-seeing One. The organization of any portion of these into a community, having a place in time and space, is a secondary idea, and results in a "denomination," which may exist or cease to exist without any effect upon the integrity of the "invisible" Church.

The nineteenth article of that formulary known as the "Thirty-Nine Articles," speaks of the "visible" Church of Christ; but it does not thereby lead us to infer that the invisible Church is other than that portion of the visible Church which has passed out of our sight through the grave and gate of death. If it be objected that the article seems to infer the idea of particular bodies, less than a Catholic organism, the objection is admitted; but it is contended that the small organizations or "congregations" are not "denominations" in the modern sense of the word. The language of the article, in

its second clause, where it speaks of "the Church of Jerusalem, the Church of Alexandria, and Antioch," "also the Church of Rome," shows that the only divisions contemplated by the article are such as exercise their functions under national or patriarchal limits, within the pale of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

But suppose we concede the "invisible" theory as describing the state of things at the outstart of Christianity. Let us contemplate it as a purely spiritual order, without power or outward expression, realizing, though in a different sense from that which our Lord designed to convey by the words, that "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation."

Nevertheless it was inevitable that this invisible entity should eventually manifest itself in a visible form: a proposition which no one will be disposed to gainsay. Moreover, this development into historic objectivity must have been conducted under the influence of the same mighty Agent by Whom the spiritual life of individual members of Christ was begun, by the Holy Ghost. A Lutheran theologian (Van Oosterzee) says: "Prepared for by the theocracy of the Old Covenant, and more especially by the coming and work of Christ, it (the Church) dates from the first Christian Pentecost, and is in the full sense of the word a creation of the Holy Ghost."

But what was the law or method which the Spirit guided his creative energies by, when He thus gave external form to the invisible Church? Was that law of a nature to produce in the earliest age such a condition of things, with respect to outward organizations, as is presented by modern Protestant Christianity? Were there as many denominations? Was the idea of unity regarded as sufficiently illustrated by professed agreement respecting a few things and sectarian controversy and division respecting many other things? Did Antioch contain two or three kinds of Presbyterians, five or six kinds of Baptists, four or five kinds of Methodists, one kind of Swedenborgians, and four kinds of Reformed Episcopalians?

We would that it might be deeply impressed upon the mind and conscience of Christian people in this age of division and consequent unbelief, that the law of the Spirit's Pentecostal power was unto organic unity. The Church of the Holy Ghost was visibly one. "When the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place." "The same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." And the Lord added to The Church daily such as should be saved."

That was not denominationalism, certainly! On the contrary, the invisibility which we just now conceded, for the sake of argument, seems to have passed out of existence, and the spiritual organism is identical with the Church of the Holy Ghost, visible, capable of numerical measurement, having a creed and communion ("the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship"), sacraments (baptism and the "breaking of bread"), a form of worship ("the prayers"), and a place to meet in ("continuing daily with one accord in the temple").

Visible unity, then, was the character stamped upon the Church of the Holy Ghost. The "invisible" theory is untrue. Denominationalism is a blunder and a sin, contrary to the mind of the Spirit, to the rational mind of man, to the teaching of the Scriptures, and to the better instincts of the Christian conscience when it is permitted to speak its real convictions.

The visible unity of Christ's disciples is the most spiritual conception of the Church. Denominationalism is carnality. It is a surrender to the lower motives, the divisive and disintegrating forces, which assert themselves when "the fruits of the Spirit" begin to disappear from the Church. St. Paul could not speak to the Christians of Corinth "as unto spiritual," and why? "For ye are yet carnal." That was St. Paul's indictment, and he follows it up by specific testimony. "For whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?" "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions (Greek, *schisms*) among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."

The "invisible" theory is a novelty. It was the logical outcome of the mistake of those who undertook to organize Protestants according to a method thoroughly contradictory of that which the Holy Ghost employed on the day of Pentecost. The Scriptures uniformly speak of the Church. To be Scriptural and yet denominational, it was necessary to put a new meaning into the words. "The Church" must be made to indicate the invisible unity of all those who in different Churches are one in Christ. Never before were those who were one in Christ partitioned off into different Churches. It was a sad error. There is but one remedy—the return of all Christians to the visible unity of the Church of the Holy Ghost as established at Pentecost and continued to the present time by perfect and unbroken continuity of historic existence. God speed the day!

"Neither pray I for these (Apostles) alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one; as Thou Father, art in me, and I in Him, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me."—*Living Church.*

## Correspondence.

The columns of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN will be freely open to all who may wish to use them, no matter what the writer's views or opinions may be; but objectionable personal language, or doctrines contrary to the well understood teaching of the Church, will not be admitted.

### NUMERARI: MUNERARI.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS.—When in the Temple Church, London, a few weeks ago, my attention was called to the *Te Deum* which is painted around its walls. On enquiring of the vergers, I was informed that, though the lettering was modern, it was copied, or painted over the ancient text, the 21st verse reading, "fac . . . tuis in gloria *numerari*." Reading subsequently in the Pictorial Library, Liverpool, "The Book of Hymns of the Ancient Church of Ireland," edited by Dr. Todd, the following words occur in an ancient *Te Deum*: "Eternam fac cum sanctis tuis gloriam *munerari*, &c., while in a note the learned editor says: "The common text, as given in the Roman Breviary, and translated in the English Prayer Book, is—'Eterna fac cum sanctis tuis in gloria *numerari*.' 'Make them to be numbered with Thy saints in glory everlasting.' But B. (Muratori's Edition of the *Antiphonary of Bangor*) and all copies of the *Te Deum* which I have seen in any MS. older than the 16th century, have 'Eterna fac cum sanctis tuis (Muratori omits 'tuis') gloria *munerari*, or 'in (or cum) gloria *munerari*,' which the old English Versions published by Mr. Maskell render, 'Make them to be rewarded with thy scyntils: in blisse, with everlasting glorie.' (*Monum. Rit.* ii. 14.) or, 'Make them to be rewarded with thy scyntils in endless blisse,' (*Ibid.* 230, 232); and every one acquainted with the black letter writing of the 15th century will at once see how easily *munerari* may be mistaken for *numerari*. That *munerari* is the true reading can scarcely, I think, admit of a doubt, but *eternam* and *gloriam* are certainly corrupt, and scarcely make sense. We ought, evidently, to read *eterna* and *gloria*, as in Muratori. It is also clear that the English Prayer Book and older versions have misinterpreted this passage by the insertion of the word 'them'—'make them,' &c.—for the construction plainly is: 'Quos redemisti fac *munerari*,' and the verse 'Whom Thou hast redeemed' ought therefore to be connected with that which follows, not with that which precedes: 'We therefore pray Thee help Thy servants; make Thou to be rewarded with Thy saints in glory everlasting, those whom Thou hast redeemed with Thy precious Blood,' Daniel says: 'Procul dubio in hac voce (*munerari*) tenes scripturam antiquissimam et genuinam. *Numerari* primum occurrit in Brev. Italis. v. c. in Franc. annu. 1495,' (*i. e.* a Franciscan Breviary, printed at Venice in that year,) and I g. by these letters he refers to the *Heures a l'usage de Lengres*, printed at Troyes without a date,) 'Seculo decimo sexto ecclesia Romana in ejusmodi libris interdum *italizans* recentiorum scripturam in textum recepit, —loc. cit.'"

It is evident, therefore, from the above quotation, that we have adopted a wrong reading in our translation of the venerable Hymn of Praise.

BENJAMIN T. H. MAYCOCK.

Severn Parish, Md., U.S.A., August 5, 1881.

### IS CHRIST DIVIDED?

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS.—The suggestion that neighboring religious bodies should be treated with respect and affection has elicited a different response from that which was expected. Extreme sentiments of intolerance and denial of their position as Churches have followed. The Baptists have received more the brunt of attack than others—the caricature of Baptist opinions by "Quero" in the GUARDIAN of 30th June—being the latest outcome; a caricature your correspondent will regret, on better consideration. As well might one quote the rabid and intolerant views of a noted advocate of Apostolical succession—the celebrated Dodwell, and take them as representing "Quero's" principles. Dodwell says:—"None but the Bishop can unite us to the Father and the Son; whence it will further follow that whoever are dis-united from the visible communion of the Church on earth, and particularly from the visible communion of the Bishop, must consequently be dis-united from the whole visible Catholic Church on earth: and not only so, but from the invisible communion of the holy Angels and saints in heaven, and, which is more, from Christ and God himself. \* \* \* It is one of the most dreadful aggravations of the condition of the damned that they are banished from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of His power. The same is their condition who are dis-united from Christ by being dis-united from His visible representative."

I would say to "Quero," the canon of Scripture is not under discussion. He knows well that history is called in to support distinctly opposite propositions in respect to the canon of the Scriptures, and sad would it be if so broken and tattered a reed as history were all we relied on in this regard. "I see plainly," said the incomparable Chilling-

worth, "and with mine own eyes that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a consent of Fathers of one age against a consent of Fathers of another age, the Church of one age against the Church of another age." In this "confusion worse confounded" of fable, tradition and contradiction, how can we find solid ground?

Do we not know that Church history is dragged in to attempt to prove the worst dogmas of the Romish Church, and used also by each subdivision of Christendom in support of its peculiar and distinctive doctrines? "Quero's" proposition, then, that history must be admitted to sustain his views of what constitutes, exclusively, "the Church," because we use it as far as we may find it helpful in reference to the canon of Scripture, is not admissible. Yet it may be conceded that when history is even as approximately agreed upon the question, which is "THE Church" as it is upon the Scriptures, then, and not till then, the pertinence of your correspondent's closing question may be acknowledged.

In the meantime, we would do well to heed the kindly words of our late visitor from the diocese of Albany—though we may not all agree with him in some points of his able sermon. "The effort to find out points of agreement rather than to dwell on points of difference, to construct with patience from such foundations as we have in common, rather than to tear down with violence the denials, is the Christianlike and the Apostolic way." To the same effect is the very recent action of the Bishop of Liverpool, (England), who has addressed a letter of friendly congratulation to the President of the Wesleyan Conference, and opened his house to some of the leading members of the Conference.

I crave permission to add a word in reference to "Layman's" last letter. I object to his eliminating the force of the Archbishop of Canterbury's words, which were, that the differences of the several Christian denominations "SANK INTO INEXISTENCE under the circumstances he was considering. I did not intimate that the ecclesiastical head of the English Church preferred the Church polity of the Presbyterians, but it is evident he saw in that Church a factor of importance in the work of proclaiming Christ, and deemed its work worthy of recognition, and its ministry possessed of authority to evangelize the world—the exact point of view in which the present writer desires to hold other Christian denominations. In comparison with this liberal and Christian judgment of the highest prelate in England—a view emphasized by recent encomiums by the same bishop upon the memory of the beloved Stanley (foremost of liberal and largeminded Churchmen), how wide is the contrast with those who fling opprobrious epithets at non-episcopal Churches, who describe them as in schism—deny the authority and validity of their acts and orders, and relegate them to the uncovenanted mercies of God!

"Layman" thinks that if Saint Paul were here to-day, and one said, I am a Baptist, and another, I am a Methodist, the Apostle would rebuke them as carnal. It is possible for any one of us to know the Apostle's mind as well as another, and my thought of the matter is, that if he were with us to-day, and heard one say, I am an Episcopalian in the sense of, claiming that all others were schismatics with no authority to minister in Christ's name, a stern rebuke would not be withheld by the Apostle whose words—Philippians i., 18—prove him to have been a liberal Churchman.

It doubtless is "Layman's" sincerity of conviction that makes him assume as granted the very point which is in controversy, namely, that there is no authority outside of Apostolical Succession; but he must concede, that in holding the converse of that opinion, others are as sincere and as firmly entrenched in their convictions as he can possibly be. With the great preponderance of Protestant Christendom opposed to the idea of exclusive authority residing in Episcopacy, with scholars of unequalled ability against it, with our own Church by formulary in the past, admitting the opposite view—with all this body of opposite thought, I suggest that "Layman's" assumption is, to say the least, but beating the air.

As to Unity; if, as claimed by "Layman," the Romish and Greek Churches, with their deadly errors and perversions of the truth, possess to the full that authority and true ministry which he denies the existence of in non-Episcopal Churches, the unity he claims for the Apostolical Succession Church is a mockery and a myth, for its different branches are confessedly wider apart than the Church of England and the Presbyterians (or Baptists), and, moreover, these Apostolical Succession Churches curse, and "devoutly each other, and hate each other, and refuse communion with each other. Yet in "Layman's" view, these are one Church, with different branches, some of which are in error—still he thinks they have unity! No allusion is made by your correspondent to the recently Reformed Episcopal Church—a standing evidence of the absence of union, though possessing the (alleged) only true Succession.

Will not "Layman," admit and lament, with this writer, that there is a sad lack of visible unity amongst us; and cannot we all join, and cannot all earnest men be moved to labor for agreement in essentials, for peace, and love, and fellowship with all who love our common Lord.

YTHUARD, 1881.

ROTHESAY.