

bishop Parker, the chief translator, took the place of the royal favourites. *Biblia Pauperum*, or Poor Man's Bibles, on the other hand, introduced art for a laudable purpose. The most remarkable incidents in Scripture were engraved and formed into a book, their influence in this way being made to bear on the illiterate.

The first complete printed Bible, sometimes known as the "Mazarin," because a copy happened to be found in Cardinal Mazarin's library, was the work of Fust, or Faust. It was printed in Latin and offered for sale in 1455. Wishing to keep the art of printing a secret, Faust passed the copies off as manuscript at first. He came to Paris with a stock, which he sold at various prices, according to the means of his customers. The King bought a copy for seven hundred crowns, the Archbishop of Paris another for four hundred, and some were disposed of at as low a figure as sixty. Their cheapness and uniformity of lettering raised suspicion; stories got abroad, and the capital letters in red were alleged to be done with his blood. Fust was apprehended, and, to save himself from the flames, had to reveal the art of printing.—*John Sutherland, in the British Workman.*

THE CHURCH AND DISSENT.

BY REV. C. GORE.

No serious Christian can contemplate the existing divisions of Christendom without the gravest searchings of heart. The evil is so tremendous, the hindrance to the spread and deepening of Christianity so profound, that a thoughtful man is apt to resent lamentations over it, or schemes for remedying it, because they seem almost necessarily superficial; and to regard it as a burden to be borne mostly in silence, or to find expression only in prayer. If he sees no present prospect of corporate re-union, he remembers that in the old Jerusalem the mark of the Divine approval was set on those who, if they could not remedy the social evils, at least had felt them. "Set a mark," says the Word of God to Gabriel, "on the foreheads of the men that sigh and that cry for the abominations which be done in the midst thereof." It may well be that God will heal our ills, as He healed in a great measure those of Israel, through the profound humiliation of all parts of Christendom. Deeply set evils do not yield to superficial treatment. But in spite of the peril of superficial treatment, I must try to approach the subject of "our divisions" and their remedies. When an Anglican Churchman thinks of re-union, two great classes of Christians from whom he is separated present themselves chiefly to his mind—the magnificent communion of Rome on the one hand, and on the other the various Nonconformist bodies. The heart of anyone must beat with excitement and joy at the mere thought of ministering in any way to the re-union of the Anglican Church with the great apostolic see of Rome—(cheers, and cries of "No, no," and hisses)—with its unique traditions—(renewed cries of "No, no,")—and its world-wide privilege of Christian communion. The same thrill of joy must come over one at the prospect of seeing the breach healed which separates us from Nonconformists. (Applause.) All the more because the Anglican Church will be conscious how much responsibility for disunion we have incurred in both directions. But our first generous impulse towards re-union at any cost is checked by respect for what we know of the truth and our obligation towards it. It is "peace in the truth" that we are to seek. We cannot, for the sake of fellowship with Rome, submit to accept terms which we do not believe to correspond to the original apostolic truth—(hear, hear)—nor for the sake of fellowship with Nonconformists abandon what we believe to be a part of the Apostolic deposit for which we are responsible. (Applause.) The obligation to drive away "erroneous and strange doctrines" significantly in our ordination service precedes and controls the obligation to set forward quietness, peace, and love among all Christian people. Here is my central point, then. As one says to an individual: You will best do your duty to society and help others by developing your own faculty in being true to yourself.

To thine own self be true,
And it must follow as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

So we say to societies of men; so we say to our Anglican Society—"Do not evacuate thyself, but realize thyself. Promote re-union by being such a Church as may make all Christian men desire thy fellowship." Now the Anglican Church has, as all men recognize, a peculiar position and genius. This who believe in Providence know to be not an accident, but God's gift to us. It has been noted equally by foreign Catholics and foreign Protestants, who, because of this special position of ours, have seen in us a body with remarkable opportunities as a mediating power in a divided Christendom. Now, our opportunities lie in this: that we have combined the tradition of the Catholic Church with that

special appeal to Scripture which was the strong point of the sixteenth-century Reformation. We have retained the Catholic tradition in creed, in sacraments, in liturgy, in the apostolic succession of the ministry through the episcopate, and we have prevented this original Catholic tradition from becoming corrupted or unduly narrowed, according to the constant tendency of tradition to one-sidedness and accretion, by restoring and emphasizing the appeal to Scripture as the unceasing criterion of Catholic faith, "so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith." (Applause.) It is this combination of two main elements in the Christian religion—tradition and Scripture—which is the characteristic distinction of the Anglican Church, and it is along the lines of fidelity to this characteristic that lies our duty and our opportunity. Thus, as against Rome, it is worth while maintaining the Scriptural aspect. We could individually obtain the Roman Communion by submitting to the doctrine, for instance, of the Treasury of Merits, of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, and the infallibility of the Pope. As in fact these doctrines did not belong to the original Christian faith, so no candid inquirer can reasonably ever pretend to find them certified in the New Testament. Now, this appeal to the New Testament, as the final criterion of what belongs to the faith of our salvation, is the essential for maintaining the Catholic Church not only in purity, but also in its original largeness. Rome has narrowed the Catholic Church along lines effectual in their own way, but along lines which are narrower than the original limits. We are trustees for humanity and the future, to keep open the Catholic Church, to exhibit her before the eyes of men as wide and inclusive as she originally was, without the hindrance presented by dogmas contrary to historical truth, free inquiry, and legitimate liberty. We must maintain, I say, the Scriptural appeal, though it prevents us from submitting to the claim of Rome. On the other hand, we must maintain the whole fabric of the tradition that is really and historically Catholic. There is an original apostolic tradition and doctrine, committed in apostolic days to the Churches, adequately represented in the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds, a verified but frank enquiry in Scripture. Again, the Apostles, acting under Christ's intention and in His spirit, devoted themselves to the spread of a visible society or Church, intended to be universal and permanent to the end, as the house of redemption, grace, and "the pillar and ground of the truth." Once more, as part of this visible society, the Apostles, again acting for Christ, instituted a system of social worship and sacraments as the only covenanted means by which the life of Christ was to be perpetuated in the society; lastly, as the link of continuity in this society down the ages, the Apostles for Christ instituted the "Apostolic succession," i.e., that succession in the Christian ministry which secures in each age and part of the Christian society stewards of the Divine gift of grace and truth, appointed by succession from the Apostolic fount, representing, so far as their ministerial commission goes, God the giver and not man the receiver. These four elements—the Catholic Creed and Scripture, the visible Church, the sacraments, the Apostolic ministry—we are bound to maintain unimpaired. (Applause.) Of course I should think differently if I thought that, for instance, the Apostolic succession was, like the Papacy, a later accretion of original Christianity. But I am convinced on the contrary by the most candid study I can give the matter. I have discussed this at length in an article on the Ministry of the Christian Church. It cannot, clearly, be discussed as a matter of historical evidence in a fraction of twenty minutes. But I would say this. How anyone who with an open mind reads the Acts, the Pastoral Epistles, the Epistle of Ignatius, the Epistle of Clement, and the record of the second century tradition as represented by Hegesippus and Irenæus—a body of literature that can be read through in a few hours—can doubt the immense strength of the doctrine of the Apostolic succession I am at a loss to imagine. (Hear, hear.) Once again, then, we must maintain the four Catholic elements which I have enumerated above, and amongst these the Apostolic succession of the ministry through the episcopate, which alone can be shown to have possessed the authority to confer valid orders. Now, as the maintenance of the Scriptural appeal precludes a hope of immediate re-union with Rome, so the maintenance of the Apostolic succession precludes the hope (if it otherwise existed) of rapid re-union with the Nonconformist bodies as well. We cannot admit Nonconformist ministers as validly ordained ministers of the Word and sacraments. (Applause.) If there are some Anglicans who, with nothing but amiable motives, would desire to do this, I would ask them to consider two points only. (1) Are they seriously prepared, in their own principles, to contemplate a step which—whatever would be gained by it—must inevitably cut them off

from communion with the whole of the vast proportion of Anglican Churchmen in Britain, America, and the Colonies taken together, who by no stretch of the imagination can be conceived as likely to accept the ministry of persons whom they believe to be not so rightly ordained as to admit of their celebrating a valid Eucharist? Could the fact of such a measure in the way of possible re-union appreciably weigh against the certain loss in the way of disunion and destruction of what has always constituted the Anglican glory? (2) Are they serious in their appeal to the Caroline divines? I find myself in the most profound general agreement with those divines, but I am not prepared to accept them as infallible in all their views, any more than any other school of great theologians. (Hear, hear.) However, if others appeal unto these Cæsars, let them go. It is true that many of these would have admitted the position of Presbyterian ministers in foreign countries where ex-hypothesis episcopacy could not be had consistently with an open Bible. That exception to these general principles of the necessity of episcopal ordination which they unwillingly made does not apply to Anglican Nonconformists, and, in fact, these very people, in their dealings with separated Christians at home, assuredly did not take a view of them which erred on the side of favour. If I were a Dissenter, I had rather be dealt with by a modern High Churchman than by a Caroline Bishop. (Laughter.) I resume then: We cannot admit Nonconformist ministers as on an equality of title in the ministry with those who have been episcopally ordained. Granted this, it follows also that we cannot attempt corporate recognition at all, because to admit them on an inferior basis is a proposal which they on their side from their own principles would rightly regard as an insult. (Hear, hear.) For example, it would be felt as an insult to recognize their ministry as part of the ministry of the English Church, but on an inferior grade, so that they could not celebrate the Communion without episcopal ordination to the priesthood, in fact, as a sort of irregular diaconate. This, I say, or a similar half-measure, would—apart from other considerations of a very grave sort—only aggravate matters by intruding a fresh element of exacerbation. Positively, then, how are we to work towards re-union? I reply, primarily by making our Church of England such as gradually will incline Christianly-disposed people to desire communion with her. We shall make our catholicity manifest by promoting the understanding of the doctrine, and giving repeatedly, as we also ask for, positive and clear explanations of what we mean—positive and clear explanations I say, not negations and vague platitudes. We shall exalt the best human and social ministry of the sacraments, and bring out the idea of the Church as the family of God, in which the appointed stewards minister to each in due season; we shall exalt the idea of worship as embodied in the central service of the Eucharist. Next we shall emphasize the appeal to Scripture as the restraint on the arbitrary teaching of the clergy. We shall press it home that the clergy may not say "the Church this and that" unless they can convince reasonably attentive people that what they are teaching really admits of being "taught out of Scripture," or, for example, on behalf of the Eucharist as the chief Christian service, there is no doubt about the validity of the appeal to Scripture. Thirdly, in view of an age of science and criticism, we shall repudiate with eagerness all obscurantism and welcome all legitimate research into our sacred records. We may be sure that if criticism will demand of us some change of views as to some of the documents of the Bible, it will not impair the historical value of those records of the New Testament with which our faith is bound up, or reduce the value of the Bible as a whole, as certainly the Word of God in its several stages of deliverance. Lastly, in a democratic age, we shall consider the constitutional, untyrannical character of early Christian institutions, and not shrink from recognizing that the episcopate and ministry of the Church have been encrusted with forms of mediæval feudalism and English aristocracy which may be well suffered to drop off by a gradual restoration of more constitutional action of the Church as a whole. For example, it is quite certain that the laity (legitimately so described, not the ratepayers) ought to have more control over Church appointments. If the Church of England will become more manifestly catholic, scriptural, scientific, constitutional, we cannot doubt she will attract more and more the best spirit of the future; she may appear as the true mother of the people, and act, therefore, as a real centre of unification. Meanwhile, let us not be in a hurry. We cannot complain if Romans do not recognize our catholic character when, for example, we for so long have displaced the Eucharist from its true position. We cannot complain of Dissenters as if mere schism accounted for their existence, when, in fact, it was to an extent it is difficult to exaggerate the sin of our Church which caused separation to seem right to purer consciences in the past; when, in fact, it is to Nonconformists that we owe, in many parts of

the cou
ideas c
so man
Let us
of vali
nec
can ac
is not
men, if
fellows
so. I e
true t
come m
of God
natural
while l
by ima
remedie
experie
can rec
as the l
sent th
they on
the Ch
an inqu
among
constitu
mere re
evils.
the posi
them.
to cont
a peril
regard
one frie
is a Not
the tenc
of oppo
formist
ligious
cause w
for we
Such pe
is a far
tempt
religio
heart-b
shrine
ship in
form, t
religio
towards
develop
basis, n
instituti
really
children

How

Church
Boys' F
to St.
hearty
practica
Geoghe
the ever
very the
bas' Chi

St. B
Guest C
kindly v
ing the
the Sou
St. Dav
the Uni
Blind.

St. C
Shutt,
Europe
gathered
bid him
ed as we
extended
hearts
as well
Mr. E.
presente
To Rev
Bar

REV. A
bers of S
to you
to your
You v
absence