

who may be under us, unless we have been, and are obedient to our own superiors. Make a due submission to all lawful authority, a principle all through your life. Proper respect is to be shown to those above us. If we are such fools as to think no one is above us, we shall have none to whom we will show respect. But I hope better things of you. I might put this on much lower ground; merely, proper self-respect will always lead us to give due respect to others.

Speak of and to your parents with proper respect. Do not neglect them in their old age. Your duties towards them continue as long as they live. In the 6th Commandment turn to St. Matthew v. 21-26. Anger, quarrelling, hatred will be the principal heads under which you must examine yourself about this Commandment. Observe our Lord's rule about our conduct when injured or offended by a brother Christian. It is *not* if he smite thee on one cheek, turn to him the other; if he take thy coat, give him thy cloak also. Those directions referred to the conduct of Christians towards the heathen world without. Quite different is the direction about an offending brother. You will find that in St. Matt. xviii. 15-17, and St. Luke xvii. 3, 4: If thy brother sin against thee *rebuke him*, and if he *repent* forgive him. But, now, see how the "rebuke" is to be given: "Go and tell him his fault *between thee and him alone*;" and that in the hope that thou mayest "gain thy brother." Now, if this simple rule were followed, how much ill-will would be prevented.

Too often if a person is offended, he says "I will not speak to that person again." Our Lord says "Go and speak to him about it." And worse than that, he goes and tells his brother's fault to some third person, instead of "between thee and him alone." Of course what he says is repeated and made worse. Our Lord supposes that others being brought in shall be the *second* step; and then the offending person is to be present when his offence is told. Take these rules: If I am injured, and the injury is worth taking notice of, then I must speak about it *first* to the offender alone, and to others only in his presence. The whole idea running through our Lord's directions is, that a Christian injured by a brother, is much more troubled about his brother's sin than about his own injury. His great wish is to bring his brother to acknowledge his fault "that he may be able to forgive him." Examine yourself about this.

Or to Anger, the first sudden feeling may be unavoidable, but "let not the sun go down upon your wrath." About bearing malice get an honest answer to these two questions—(1). Would I injure this person if I could. (2). Would I do him good if I could. And don't be too easy with yourself about the first. You may not wish to injure him by deed, but do you say, or would you say injurious things about him. I have not thought it necessary to dwell upon the letter of this Commandment, but this much should be said. The destruction by any means of unborn human life, is a breach of this sixth Commandment.

SOMETHING OF THE LITERARY HISTORY OF THE BIBLE.

Compiled by the Curate of Yarmouth.

No. II.—(Continued.)

Cromwell, with all his unholy ambition and pride, his unprincipled conduct, and his reckless obstinacy, certainly expressed reverence for the Scriptures. He it was who assisted, with his influence and his purse, Coverdale, the same translator already mentioned, to bring through the press the "Great Bible" so called because of its size (1538-9). They selected Paris as the place for printing it, not because of opposition at home, but simply because better work could be done abroad. Although they were working with the permission of King Henry of England, and under the license of the King of France, Coverdale remembered the past too well to be over confident, and he therefore forwarded to England the sheets as fast as printed. How well founded his suspicions were is shown by the fact that the Roman Inquisition in France, issued an order in December (1538), prohibiting the printing of this Bible. Coverdale and his assistants tried at once to send away the latest sheets printed, but this was found impossible,—it was only with the greatest difficulty they themselves escaped; the sheets were seized, some were burnt, but "four great dry fags full" were sold to a haberdasher "to lap his caps in." But happily after a little while, again through the influence of Cromwell, the workers returned to Paris, and succeeded in recovering their presses, and even, somewhat later, a good deal of the printed matter from the man to whom it had been sold. This edition was finally completed in England in London in 1539, and injunctions were issued to the Clergy (by Cromwell) to provide "one booke of the whole Bible of the *largest* volume in English to be set up in the Churches." In these same injunctions the Clergy were informed that "the charge of *this* Book shall be ratably born between you, the Parson, and the Parishioners, that is to say, the one-half by you and the other half by them."

This liberty to read the Bible without fear of persecution was received with joy, not only among the learned, "but," says Strype, the Annalist, "generally all England over, by the vulgar and common people, and with what greediness God's Word was

read, and what resort to places where the reading of it was! Everybody that could bought the Book, or busily read it, or got others to read it to them if they could not themselves, and divers more elderly people learned to read on purpose, and even little boys flocked among the rest to hear portions of the Holy Scriptures read!" The later editions of the Great Bible had a preface by Crammer, and so came to be called "*Crammer's Bible*." One matter, trifling in itself, yet interesting as shewing the way in which Henry's capricious will was watched, may be noted here. When the first editions of the Great Bible were issued, we have seen Cromwell had much to do with the work. He was then in high favour with the King. The title page bore a shield, upon which were emblazoned Cromwell's arms. In the edition of 1541 the shield is there, but it is blank! Cromwell had fallen. In the month of July he had been beheaded on Tower Hill.

In the rapidly-changing scenes which followed the death of Henry in 1547, and the short reign of the young Edward VI., the temptation is strong to wander a little from our subject and speak of the general progress of the Reformation; but we must restrain ourselves.

We all remember that simple little story which shows Edward's respect for the Bible; how that, wishing one day to reach for himself a book on a high shelf, he was offered a Bible as a footstool; but he refused to place his foot upon it, and strongly condemned the conduct of the attendant who had thus thoughtlessly treated the Sacred Volume. He reigned but six years and a half, but during that short time there were fifty editions of the Bible issued from the press—eight in each year.

No new version was attempted, but men could read those already provided without hindrance. Coverdale and Crammer were still at work, even Bonner set up a copy of the Bible in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, and Gardiner, in Convocation, spoke favorably of Bible translating. But like a sudden darkness of eclipse and storm there came a change, when Edward died, and the Roman Mary became Queen. A proclamation forbidding the reading of the Scriptures was issued. Gardiner and Bonner showed themselves apt pupils of such a mistress. During five years 277 persons suffered death for their religious opinions; among them Rogers, Hooper, Latimer, Ridley, and Crammer. Bonner was the high-priest of this holocaust as Cowper says:

"When persecuting zeal made royal sport,
With royal innocence in Mary's court,
Then Bonner, blythe as shepherd at a wake,
Enjoy'd the show, and danced about the stake."

When Mary was married to Philip of Spain in 1554, and the grand procession passed through London, among the decorations of the streets was a picture of Henry VIII. with a sword in one hand and a Bible in the other, giving the volume to his son Edward. The artist was brought before Gardiner, severely reprimanded, called "villain and traitor," and commanded to daub over the book, and paint a glove in its place, in doing which, the story goes, he spoiled the king's hand; for he "wiped away a portion of fingers withal." Bonner promulgated his decree that, within his jurisdiction texts from Scripture should no longer, as was customary, be painted on the walls of Churches; commanding all in office to "abolish and extinguish such manner of Scriptures, so that by no means they be either read or seen."

When the eminent and good men, whose names we have mentioned, fell victims to religious hate, Coverdale escaped, through the solicitation of the King of Denmark, to whose country he fled at the first opportunity. Through all these troublous times there were hundreds who were faithful, and so concealed their Bibles that officers of the law

" that volume sought in vain,
Enjoyed by stealth, and hid with anxious pain;
While all around was misery and gloom,
This showed the boundless bliss beyond the tomb;
Freed from the venal priest, the feudal rod,
It led the weary sufferer's steps to God."

(To be continued.)

"J. W. H. R.'s" communication will appear next week.

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.

APPOINTMENT TO PARISHES.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Your correspondent "J. W. H. R." is evidently an honest man. I ask him an honest question in the hope of an honest answer: Does "J. W. H. R." believe in his heart of hearts, that in the event of an appointment to the Parish or Parishes with which he is best acquainted being necessary, if the machinery he so honestly approves of were employed on the occasion, whether he believes that the choice of the "*managers*" and the wish of the great body of the "*Parishioners*" would be likely to light upon the same man?

NON DUBITO QUIN —.

WHAT IS FAITH?

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—In reply to "Catholic (Lay)." Faith and Opinion, what is Faith? Take the Creeds, and even the first nine Articles of Religion. Well, if that be the basis of unity, what becomes of *our* position? Of the 400 sects, but few would have any "appreciable difference of holding." Is there no such thing as Apostolical Succession? Is it a matter of faith or of opinion? Is prayers for the dead a matter of faith or of opinion? Now we ask, What is opinion? The bond of unity is "to tolerate such differences all around"—differences of opinion, we presume. Very well; let one priest preach, say Apostolical Succession and prayers for the dead; let another flatly deny both (they are only matters of opinion say) and let them exchange pulpits with full liberty, and see where unity will be. Congregationalism, even with life, (though preferable to sloth) is not unity. Catholic and Congregational are directly opposed the one to the other. What are the marks of the *Catholic* Church? Let it be written in letters of fire across the blue canopy. Unity is the mark of Catholicity. "X Y" is a strong and determined Catholic Churchman; but to ask him to believe that we of the Church of England do shew the mark of Catholicity, is to ask him to believe that which is untrue. Amid the war of words, and the clang of theological disputants, the Catholic Church must have a bond of unity somewhere. "Catholic (Lay)" has not touched the skirts of the question; it remains, What is the bond of unity?

Yours, etc.,

N. Y.

WHICH IS THE CHURCH?

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Your correspondent "Rothesay" says that I deny the claim of the Baptist, Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian denominations to be considered churches in an unusually extreme manner. Well, I did not intend to be either ambiguous or equivocal. Will you allow me to say a word on the reasons "Rothesay" gives for considering these denominations to be churches. If I understand him, he says we cannot accept the testimony of history in favour of the existence of One Catholic and Apostolic Church, visible in all ages from the Apostles' days till now; for this reason, history is dim and full of contradictions. I presume that he is a student of history, otherwise he could not tell whether it was dim or clear, full of contradictions or consistent with itself. How is it then that he accepts the testimony of history in favour of the claims of the book we call the Bible to be the Word of God, the inspired word of truth? If there be dimness and contradictions in the testimony history gives to the Church, there are equally dimness and contradictions in the testimony history gives to the Bible. If we must reject the One Catholic and Apostolic Church, visible from the beginning, in the world, because we think history is dim and has contradictions, we must reject the Bible also. But it is possible that history may resemble mathematics and have not quite all the dimness it is credited with. Boys, and men, too, occasionally see dimness and contradiction in the reasoning by which the fifth or forty-seventh Propositions of the first book of Euclid are proved, and for this reason vote mathematics a delusion.

Your correspondent assumes that the Mystical Body of Christ, the Church is an invisible body. I confess I cannot find any evidence of this in the Bible. But much to show that the Mystical Body of Christ, the Church, must necessarily be a visible body. Much is said touching the Church that could be said of a visible body only. Again, when Christ rose from the dead, He rose with a spiritualized human body, which, so far as we know, is naturally invisible to mortal man; Christ rose from the grave with a human body commonly invisible; but He did not require His disciples to believe that He brought a human body from the grave, because He told them so. He made that body visible to their weak sight; showed its proper signs, the wounded hands and pierced side, and not till then did He require them to believe in it; so His Mystical Body, the Church, is to be known by its proper marks. When "Rothesay" assumes that the Church of Christ is an invisible body, he puts himself in opposition to the vast majority of the Christian world. The great Greek Church does not believe the Church to be an invisible body, nor does any other branch of the Church in the East believe it; the Roman Catholic Church does not believe it; the Lutheran Church in Europe does not believe it; the Church of England does not believe it. And do these denominations which "Rothesay" is specially anxious to honour as the Church of God believe it? Let us see. Have we sufficient reason to think the Baptists believe this invisible Church theory? My own experience is they do not. I find that Baptist denominations, Calvinistic, Free Will, and all other sorts, agree in this. They deny that Churchmen, Lutherans, Methodists, Congregationalists, Roman Catholics, Presbyterians or Quakers are Christians, even nominal Christians. I am an old man, a Churchman, a communicant for many years, and I have been frequently told by Baptist people of various sorts that I would surely go to hell when I die unless I submit to be immersed by them, join their church and become a Christian; and many others, upon whose word I can rely, have assured me that Baptist people are constantly urging them to be immersed, join the Baptist Church, become Christians, and save their souls. Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists and Roman Catholics, one and all, have made this charge. Personally, I do not find any fault in Baptist people urging others to become one with them. But by denying the validity of all other baptism but their own, and refusing to acknowledge any except themselves to be Christians, they

virtually ignore this theory of an Invisible Church, unless they believe that men now living who are not Christians may belong to the Invisible Church. Then, if some heathen may belong to the true Church, why not all heathen. Then, what is the use of any religious organization; what the use of the Bible, the Christian Ministry, or preaching the Word? Since Baptist people value these things as means of grace, and deny the Christianity of every other denomination except themselves, in practice they clearly reject the theory of an Invisible Church on earth, made up of a thousand wrangling denominations.

The Congregational denominations do yet, I believe, acknowledge the Westminster Confession of Faith as their standard. The Presbyterian churches acknowledge this Confession as their standard also; but the Westminster Confession teaches that the Church on earth is Visible. What the Methodist denominations teach on this subject I am not prepared to say. However, there cannot be a doubt that an immense preponderance of the Christian world, perhaps nineteen parts out of twenty—utterly reject the theory of an Invisible Church on earth. A gentleman, who for many years was a highly esteemed minister among the Presbyterians, says of this theory: "It is like the fig leaves of Adam and Eve. They never dreamed of using the fig leaves before they sinned; so moderns never dreamed of adopting this theory of an Invisible Church on earth until they found out they had been guilty of the sin of schism and wished to hide it."

"Rothesay" mentions a passage in Christ's teaching which is often referred to as conclusive in favour of division where Christ, speaking of some irregular workers, says "Forbid them not." We are told that all who profess to be working in the cause of Christ should be regarded as standing exactly on equal ground. But the Apostles, Christ's chosen Ministers, and those irregular workers, did not stand on the same ground, they were friends and brethren; they of whom Christ says "Forbid them not" were strangers to Christ's family, only they were not enemies.

We may imagine a Presbyterian minister actively engaged in doing the work which he believed God has appointed him to do, meeting a Methodist minister, who he looks upon as an outsider, an irregular worker. If the Presbyterian minister should say to the Methodist "I will not try to prevent your working, for this reason, Christ said, 'forbid them not.'" The Methodist minister might say, if you forbid, or if you allow me, you claim to be the successor of the Apostles, appointed and sent by the Lord, and you look upon me as neither appointed nor sent by the Lord, but merely as the representative and successor of certain men who, when Christ was on earth, were merely not enemies to Him. While I know that I am personally called by God to do this work, I am the representative of the Apostles, and it is you that represents the outsider who goes to work of his own motion, and is not called or appointed by God. Who is to decide which is right, or whether both are wrong, unless we are enlightened by the history of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church. It is not all probable that the ministers of no one so-called Christian denomination will allow that they are the representatives and successors of those self-appointed, irregular, outside workers, of whom Christ saith, "forbid them not." Nor is it possible that the command "forbid them not" is in anywise applicable in our own day. There is another thing to be considered in this connection.—Christ saith, "they will not lightly speak evil of Me."

The Presbyterian minister, if he is really sent by the Lord, is the ambassador of Christ, then the Methodist minister with whom he comes in contact, ought to hear Him, follow His teaching, and cease to be a Methodist. The Lord, who sends the ambassador, says—"He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me, and he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me." To despise the ambassador of Christ by refusing to hear and follow him is a grievous sin. But the Methodist minister will not follow the teaching of the Presbyterian minister, because he believes himself to be an ambassador of Christ. Who is to decide?

"Rothesay" claims for the teachers in the various denominations all the respectful consideration that Christians should give to genuine successors of the Apostles, and all the kindly forbearance that should be shown towards mistaken, uninformed, zealous, irregular workers. It seems to me these gentlemen cannot at one and the same time be successors of the Apostles, and successors of those men, concerning whom Christ says, "forbid them not." He claims too much for them. And I presume we should avoid placing these gentlemen in a false position. At least, the Baptist, Congregational, and Methodist denominations, ordain or allow women to exercise the pastoral authority to preach the Word, and administer the Sacraments, so-called. The opinion held by these denominations is this, that the public ministry of women in the Church is as valid and good as that of men; that one is equal to the other. Now, God declares by the mouth of St. Paul, "I suffer not a woman to teach, or usurp authority over the man." When Baptist, Congregational, and Methodist denominations tell us that the ministry of women is as valid and good as that of men, they tell us that their own ministry, in their own opinion, is no better, no more valid, than the ministry of women. But women cannot occupy any independent teaching or authoritative office in the Church. It is a great sin against God for them to attempt to do so. But in their own showing, the ministry of these gentlemen is no better or worse than the ministry of women. The question is, then, do these gentlemen, when they take upon themselves the office of ministers, sin in the same way the women do? I ask "Rothesay," then, to prove that Christ established an invisible Church, and ever so many visible ones. I ask him to prove that the ministers of lately founded denominations are either successors of the Apostles, or successors of those of whom Christ said, "forbid them not." I ask him to prove, without going to history, that the whole of the Bible we now have is the inspired word of God.

QUERO.