

TS,  
by the Church, in-  
thoughts on the  
the Ministry, the  
well calculated to  
ng stock as to our  
these very import-  
to us still any rem-  
ss," or are we well  
really "read, mark,  
e sacred pages that  
ys? Are we sub-  
that "preparation"  
established to carry  
ete conversion to the  
e, in fact, engaged  
"running the race  
e shirking that exer-  
ing by the wayside?  
ns, well adapted to  
f joy. They mean,  
dulse exclusively or  
e of Advent senti-  
lly, depends on that!

ION.  
REAL PRESENCE?  
KINSON, BISHOP OF  
S.

presence? If asked  
at your questioner  
ou believe in "Bap-  
at is meant. If you  
sary to salvation is  
ed—that if only he  
l goes to Holy Com-  
right—it is not true.  
early that you have  
m (look at the office  
ollect for Christmas  
this that you are  
are baptized, it is  
stand by it that you  
family—have been  
true. You cannot  
thing of the Church  
eading the baptismal  
honest meaning of

you believe in the  
do you mean?" If  
longer bread—that  
are contradicted by  
d remains bread as  
Churchman who has  
eves in the real, true  
Communion.

versally: I am not  
t be argued against.  
elligent meaning of  
lways present, in a  
if you are sweeping  
use, or making up  
s wherever we are.  
which He is pleased

o or three are gath-  
there He is, in the  
ieve that in a special  
s, because He has  
ie way, we believe  
erein He gives Him-  
eed not argue how or  
pt we are obliged to  
and for the good of

others. Arguing only ends in vexation and bit-  
terness of spirit. He is with us everywhere, but  
especially when He spreads a table for us in the  
wilderness; when He Himself gives Himself to  
us, and "verily and indeed" the Body and Blood  
of Christ are taken and received. Try to put all  
this together. There are many things *not* worth  
fighting for. But there is a battle which all must  
fight for *Christ*: whether Christ our Lord is in-  
deed a *living* Lord; whether Christ has given any  
real blessing to His Church; whether we have  
been baptized into a living Head; whether in Holy  
Communion we are really fed with the Body and  
Blood of Christ, or whether Holy Communion is  
merely a something to remind us of what happened  
1,800 years ago. Times will come to you when  
it will be hard to pray and to meditate; when  
faith will seem gone, and love grown cold;  
times when life will seem more than you can bear,  
and though you may know that you received par-  
don once, all will seem gone.

Then, it will be worth every battle that Christ's  
ministers can wage, to have kept for the weakest  
of God's children this great truth: that when we  
come, in all our weakness, with no *consciousness*  
of His presence, only casting ourselves at His feet,  
and saying, "Lord, I believe it; Thou hast said,  
this is my Body, this is my Blood; I believe it; I  
bring my poor heart to be fed and cleansed,"—  
then, "we dwell in Him, and He in us." It is  
worth dying for, to keep for every village child  
this great truth. Not feeling, but faith! We  
dwell in Him and He in us. But *how*?—I do  
not know. I know that it is true. I know that  
*Christ* is true: and He said it. In Holy Com-  
munion we plead that once-offered sacrifice. And  
in Holy Communion we are really *fed*, even  
though we may not *feel* the better for it. There  
is a story in the Gospels which will help us to  
realize it. When He was on earth, He had com-  
passion on the hungry multitudes. "From  
whence," the disciples asked, "can a man satisfy  
these men with bread, here in the wilderness?"  
So now, His ministers ask "how can we feed and  
guide these multitudes, one by one—we, with all  
our sins and shortcomings?"

"Make the men sit down," He said; as now  
He says, "Bid them kneel there—at that holy  
table!" And then he took the bread in His  
sacred hands, and gave thanks, and then by  
means of His disciples, went up and down in the  
hungry crowd, till "they did all eat and were  
filled." *How* it was done the multitude never  
asked. When He had said, "Give me the bread  
you have," it was given to Him; and it became  
an abundant feast. That same Jesus is here. He  
gives thanks; He makes an Eucharist, He blesses  
—the bread. His ministers go on, from age to  
age, dispensing the feast; and you are called to  
"draw near with faith and take this Holy Sacra-  
ment," not depending on your own righteousness,  
nor on the preparation that you have tried to  
make, but depending on the Word of God. You  
draw near: you receive the wondrous gift, the  
Body and Blood of Christ, into your soul; and you  
are "satisfied." A blessed thing it is for you to  
draw near! Blessed be forever that first Sunday  
when you come to Holy Communion. Come and  
tell Him all your past guilt, all your present weak-  
ness, and trust Him! "Be strong in the Lord."  
Circumstances may alter; feelings may change;  
but Christ will be always the same, always there  
to meet you; to give you the sense of sins for-  
given, to give you fresh strength to fight the fight  
and maintain the strife. Whatever else alters,  
Jesus is still "the same, yesterday, and to-day,

and forever;" the same, at your first communion;  
the same, when you receive that communion for  
the last time on your deathbed; the same when in  
the Kingdom of Glory. You shall sit down with  
that multitude which no man can number, and  
He Himself shall feed you at the marriage supper  
of the Lamb for eternity.

A PROTEST ADDRESSED BY BISHOP ANSON, A  
MEMBER OF THE CHURCH CONGRESS, HELD  
AT BIRMINGHAM, TO THE REV. LORD BISHOP  
OF WORCESTER, PRESIDENT OF THE CON-  
GRESS.

(Continued.)

In the Rubric at the beginning it is also ordered  
that there shall be a Sermon or Exhortation "de-  
claring . . . how necessary [not expedient merely]  
that Order [whether Deacon or Priest] is in the  
Church of Christ."

The Articles were published three years after, and  
the 24th (our present 23rd, says:—

"It is not lawful [surely God's law is here meant]  
for any man to take upon him the office of public  
preaching or ministering the Sacraments in the  
Congregation, before he is lawfully called, and sent  
to execute the same. And those we ought to judge  
lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called  
to this work by men who have public authority given  
unto them in [not by] the Congregation [Ecclesia]  
to call and send Ministers into the Lord's Vineyard."

When we read these words in connection with the  
Preface to the Ordinal published only three years  
before, and coming probably from the same authors,  
though being very similar to the Article of 1538, it  
is impossible not to believe but that the expression  
"lawfully called and sent" was meant to refer to  
those and to those only who had received "*Episco-  
pal Consecration or Ordination*."

But to come down to our own time, I affirm that  
the One Hundred and Forty-Five Bishops of the  
Anglican Communion assembled at the Lambeth  
Conference, at which I had the privilege of being  
present, in 1888, re-asserted this same principle with  
no uncertain voice.

In the subject of the relation of our Church to the  
Scandinavian and other reformed Churches, the  
chief question enquired into was whether they had  
maintained the continuity of the ancient three-fold  
Ministry. With regard to Old Catholics and others,  
the Encyclical Letter said, "Nor again is it possible  
for members of the Anglican Communion to withhold  
their sympathies for those Continental movements  
towards Reformation which, under the greatest  
difficulties, have proceeded mainly on the same line as  
our own, retaining *Episcopacy as an Apostolic ordinance*."  
But this was chiefly manifested in the treatment of  
the subject of Home Reunion. The very greatest  
and deepest desire for such reunion was expressed.  
But the Encyclical, put forth, it must be remembered,  
by the unanimous consent of the Bishops then as-  
sembled, says, "We lay down conditions on which  
inter-communion is, in our opinion, and according to  
our convictions, possible. For, however we may  
long to embrace those now alienated from us, so  
that the ideal of the one flock may be realised, *we  
must not be unfaithful stewards of the great deposit  
entrusted to us. We cannot desert our position either as  
to faith or discipline. That concord would, in our  
judgment, be neither true nor desirable which should  
be produced by such a surrender.*"

And one of these conditions on which inter-com-  
munion is stated to be alone possible is, as is well  
known,

"The *Historic Episcopate*, locally adapted in the  
methods of its administration to the varying needs  
of the nations and people called of God into the unity  
of His Church."

Could it be possible to declare more emphatically  
than these words do, before the world, that the  
Episcopate is one of the things *essential* for the true  
Church? I know, of course, that attempts have  
been made to distinguish between the Episcopate as  
an historic fact and as a doctrine, and it is alleged  
that the former alone is here meant. But, if people  
are told that they must accept Episcopacy as a fact,  
as the manner of the Ordination of their Ministers  
before they can be admitted "into the unity of the  
Church," it is surely a mere quibble of words to say  
that they need not, with it, pledge themselves to  
any particular doctrine as to why it is a necessity.  
The Bishops of the American Church who first  
suggested the four Articles accepted by the Lambeth  
Conference as the basis of a possible reunion, while  
declaring their willingness to make all reasonable  
concessions on "*all things of human ordering and of  
human choice*," named these four, viz.: the Holy  
Scriptures, the Creeds, the Two Sacraments, and  
the *Historic Episcopate*, "*as inherent parts of the  
sacred deposit of Christian faith and order, committed by  
Christ and His Apostles to the Church, and as, therefore,*

*essential to the restoration of unity.*"—(See Report of  
Committee, Lambeth Conference.)

It is indeed a matter of notoriety now, that there  
were some Bishops who desired that opinions, similar  
to those expressed by your Lordship, should be put  
forth on this subject, but the very general dis-  
approval with which those opinions were met proved  
even more clearly and unmistakably the mind of the  
collective Episcopate as representative of our Church.

Such an assertion, then, of the need of Episcopacy  
as a condition for any reunion with other bodies,  
outweighs immeasurably the opinion that may be  
expressed by any one Bishop.

But, my Lord, I believe the witness that our  
Church does consider Episcopacy *necessary* to the  
existence of a Church, is even deeper and stronger  
than such evidence as this. I believe it to be en-  
shrined unmistakably and indelibly in the formu-  
laries that we have all continually to use. When the  
Article, "One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church,"  
was inserted in the Creed, there can be no doubt  
whatever that the Church therein meant was a duly  
visible body, having a Ministry of Bishops, Priests,  
and Deacons: and to interpret that Article of our  
Faith as though it was intended to mean, as your  
Lordship seemed to imply, "the whole body of  
Christian men dispersed throughout," irrespective  
of their organization and of their ministry, seems to  
me to be using most solemn words in a most loose  
manner, absolutely contrary to the sense in which  
they were intended, and are, as I believe, intended  
still, since the Church has never declared her in-  
tention that they should be interpreted in any other  
sense than that which they had when they were  
first used.

But, further, what can the restriction of the power  
to use the words of Absolution, to celebrate the  
Holy Communion, and to pronounce the Blessing,  
to those who have been admitted to the Order of  
the Priesthood mean, but this same thing? Can it  
for a moment be thought that our Church means  
that *inside* the Church none but Priests may execute  
these Offices, but that *outside* anyone is at liberty to  
do so with equal validity and efficacy?

But the chief witness is undoubtedly in the Ordi-  
nal itself. There, in the Prayers, as in the Ember  
Collects, it is distinctly asserted that God, by His  
"Divine Providence, has appointed *divers Orders* [not  
one only] in His Church."

Further, no body of Christians that does not claim  
to have received the Commission of its Ministry in  
direct succession from our Lord, through the  
Apostles, has ever ventured to use anything like the  
solemn terms of Commission with which you, my  
Lord, send forth Priests to minister to Christ's flock.  
Those words of the Ordination of Priests are either  
a most solemn reality, conveying with authority a  
commission that none but God, whether directly or  
indirectly, could possibly give: or they are an awful  
mockery, if not blasphemy. When you use those  
words and commission Priests to preach the Word  
and dispense the Sacraments, are you really doing  
nothing more than any little congregation of  
Christian men that meets together and chooses to  
appoint a minister is as fully competent to do? If  
not, where is the line to be drawn between those  
who may and those who may not call and send  
Ministers? Your Lordship did not, indeed, say *what*  
you considered necessary for the validity of the  
Sacraments. You only said that you did *not* con-  
sider Episcopal Ordination necessary. But, if once  
the necessity of the Commission being passed on  
from generation to generation through individuals  
who have had power given them in the Church to  
call and send others, and that is the essence of  
Episcopacy, is given up, I confess that I, at least,  
cannot see any reasonable standing point between  
that and the acknowledgment of a power inherent  
in the smallest and newest congregation that may  
meet together to appoint one of their number to  
minister to them. But if such a congregation may  
appoint a man to represent it in religious acts, I do  
not see how it can make him, as you, my Lord,  
make the Priests whom you ordain, "Ambassadors  
for Christ," and "Stewards of the Mysteries of God."

My Lord, you told us that you "were alive to the  
evils of Dissent," and were eager for the reunion  
of Christians, and that it was this feeling that took you  
to Grindelwald. You told us also that you "loved  
and cherished Episcopacy with all your heart," and  
that you "believed it to be the best form of Church  
government." I cannot say that we were thankful  
for the avowal. We took it for granted, or other-  
wise you would assuredly not have been where you  
were.

But, my Lord, I have seen and had cause to feel  
the practical "evils of Dissent," and of our divided  
Christendom, far more evidently than it is possible,  
I venture to say, for any one to do in this country.  
I have seen something of the character and temper  
of Dissent, where there is no excuse of an "Estab-  
lished" Church for it to pretend to excuse itself with  
semi-political reasons for its existence, and I can,  
without the least hesitation or any fear of contra-  
diction, say this, that it is not because your Lord-