

^a Dr. Sanday's name carries so much weight owing to his great scholarship and candid mind, unbiassed by considerations of party or school of thought, that it seems worth while to examine somewhat closely his exact position. I quote from his latest writing on this subject, "The Conception of Priesthood," composed in answer to Dr. Moberly's work *Ministerial on Priesthood*;

(a) "It does not follow that because the Church is one, it can have but a single type of organization" (p. 16). This reminds us of Hooker and, as we shall see, of Bishop Westcott.

(b) As to the development of the Ministry he writes as follows:—
"We shall form a wrong idea if we think of the growth of the Christian Ministry with its accompaniments, after the manner of the framing of a written constitution in which certain leading principles are recognized from the outset and carried out in detail with logical precision. The Christian Ministry, like most other administrative forms, it is probable, rather grew than was made. And that by a process which, if we could have seen it, we should very likely have described as quite simple and natural, though because natural it is not to be supposed that it is any the less Providential" (p. 59).

(c) Sanday maintains (like Dr. Hort) that the essential thing in ordination is the prayer not the laying on of hands. And that the essential thing in the laying on of hands is the blessing, not the transmission of office (pp. 55-58). He then proceeds: "The importance of this point is clear. Let us grant that a certain order is normal, and that it has historical prescription in its favour. Let us grant that at a certain point in history, through an exaggerated reaction, largely caused by the fault of those who administered that order, its course was broken and another substituted. Yet, when under that order ministers have been for many generations solemnly set apart and the Divine blessing solemnly invoked upon them by sincere and devout people, not without signs following that the blessing so invoked has been given, even supposing that there was an initial mistake, it seems to me, on a Biblical estimate of the relative value of things, altogether disproportioned to make that initial mistake a cause of fundamental or permanent division" (p. 58).

(d) Sanday is very clear as to the right of non-Episcopal bodies to the title of Churches although imperfectly organised. Churches without the Episcopate should be spoken of "as Churches with a certain defect of order or organisation." "Where there are so many signs of God's presence the impugned bodies must needs have a right to be called Churches" (p. 97).

So also "The more sweeping refusal to recognize the non-Episcopal Reformed Churches is not, and can never be made, a doctrine of the Church of England. Too many of her most representative men have not shared in it—Hooker did not hold it—Andrews expressly dis-