

faith need be kept with heretics'; how can they imagine that the hatred of Jesuitism to the circulation of Holy Scripture is any less raging in our days than when they filled France with the blood of the poor Huguenots, and hunted Bibles out of cottages and palaces alike, with fire and sword? 'Oh! but the times are changed, you know,' etc., etc. Such is the cuckoo-cry of cowardice and stupidity everywhere, in our land. Now, look at this story of the Bible in France—nay, of only the Four Gospels in the French Republic, in our own times.

On Dec. 4, 1886, the work of Laserre was approved by the Pope himself, and began to be circulated as aforesaid. And on Dec. 20, in the year following, the same book was condemned, suppressed, and forbidden, by the same good and venerable Pope Leo XIII., who is no more his own master than you are 'Infallible' though he is styled, he was overruled, humiliated, and forced to swallow down his own words; and to make himself a pillar of remembrance, as to the utter nothingness of the 'White Pope,' in the modern sect. The Jesuits have revolutioned not only the doctrine and testimony of the Fathers; they have created not only a new sect, but another Papacy. Leo is supreme only when seated on the Jesuit tripod, and letting the 'Black Pope' speak oracles through his lips.

What might not have been hoped for France had Leo's approbation of the Gospel according to Laserre been permitted to mean something for a year or two more? Credit McAll, or credit the marvellous voice and persistency of the Pere Loyson; France was discovered to be in a condition to receive the Scriptures which nobody imagined. As when Moses smote the rock, the people rushed to the fountain to drink 'the water of life freely.' Five-and-twenty popular editions in a twelvemonth. And next a 'Family Edition,' with columns for births, deaths and marriages, gotten up by a society of Roman Catholics—'regardless of expense' as the phrase goes—the superb edition I have in my possession. It is full of engravings—scenes in the life of our Lord, from the old masters. A book for mothers and their children; and for the eyes of the aged as well. Henri of Navarre wished that every peasant should have 'a chicken in the pot, every Sunday.' But Leo, the good Leo, permits all France, rich and poor, to read the Gospels every day in the week. 'Vive le Pape! vive Laserre!' But dream not that 'Peter speaks by the lips of Leo'—the true Papacy had yet to be heard from. Shall the Jesuits authorize a new Port Royal; nay—shall the Huguenots rise up out of the blood of St. Bartholomew's Day? In the midst of all this unlooked for hunger and thirst for 'the words that are spirit, and are life'—a year and a few days after the Papal License had been granted—what's this? 'The Holy Gospels, a new translation by Henri Laserre, Paris, 1887,' is forbidden by the same authority and put into the Index of prohibited books. Tell us, Monsignore, is it prohibited for America? 'Having been referred to our Most Holy Lord, Pope Leo XIII.,' (so runs the proclamation of suppression), 'his Holiness approved the decree, and ordered it to be issued.' Give it to us, then, O Alegate, in all the charming liberality of the original; and hear it, O American Christians, as follows: 'And let no one, of whatsoever rank or condition, dare, in any place, or in any tongue, to publish in future, or if published to read or retain, the aforementioned condemned and proscribed works; but let him be held bound to deliver them to the local ordinaries, or to the Inquisitors of heretical iniquity, under the penalties proclaimed in the Index of Forbidden Books.' Now, please, 'denounce the Freemasons' designs,' as you are bidden, but be sure to announce your own designs, in accordance with the aforesaid decree. It applies to 'any place, or any tongue.' It provides for an 'Inquisition of heretical iniquity.' It threatens

everybody with 'the penalties proclaimed in the Index of Forbidden Books.' What those penalties are, you will please inform us, when you give us your authorized translation of the Jesuit 'Monita Privata.' Meantime here is food for reflection. Pope Leo XIII., for a whole year, has officially approved, blessed, set forth and encouraged 'heretical iniquity.' 'It is necessary,' says one of your hierarchy, 'for everybody, from all surrounding parts and places, to agree with the Roman Pontiff.' This he ignorantly understands to be the sentiment of Irenaeus, who went from Lyons to Rome on purpose to correct and overrule one of its earliest bishops: but in a spirit very different from that of the 'Black Pope,' who overrules Leo XIII. in his own court, convicts him as an abettor of heresy and iniquity, and makes him sign and seal his own condemnation, as aforesaid! Truly, as Edgar Quinet has shown, ever since the Council of Trent the Roman Church is revolutionized. It is a modern sect, in which the ancient Church of Rome and even the ancient Papacy exists no more. The sect of Laynez with a new creed, a new system of polity, and a Black Pope to govern the nominal pontiff—this is 'the Roman Religion,' as the Jesuits delight to call it. It dates from A.D. 1564, with additional Articles of Faith that only date from 1854. Such a Church to call itself the entire Church of Christ! Such a religion of yesterday to claim identity with the Ancient Church, 'Catholic and Apostolic,' of the Nicene Creed!

[N.B.—Concluding paragraphs of this letter will appear next week.]—*The Churchman.*

THE STARTING POINT OF CHURCH UNITY.

(From the Living Church.)

A correspondent thinks that if men in the various divisions of Christendom could only set out with the "desire above all things to know the will of God as to His Church and the truth of His Holy Word," a great step would be achieved towards Christian unity. He rightly thinks that no true unity can ever be reached by "agreeing to disagree" upon such points as these. Here is clearly revealed one of the fundamental mistakes in much current discussion on the subject of unity. One suggestion is that representatives of Christian Churches or societies shall come together and agree upon some basis of union or co-operation which shall leave each free to teach what it prefers, as truth.

But it is generally seen that this is not at all what is meant by unity. Such co-operation could not extend much beyond certain forms of charity and methods of moral reform. There is no difficulty about this, as matters stand already. United movements of this nature are frequent enough. In fact when it seems necessary for the general good, there is no difficulty in bringing about co-operation not only of Christians with Christians, but also with Jews, agnostics, and infidels of all sorts. As soon as the position is examined, it is seen to have nothing to say about Christian unity whatsoever.

Another idea is that there is a certain amount of divine truth in which all Christians are agreed, and that this common element ought to be considered as the only necessary truth. Agreeing upon that, the various denominations of Christians might establish a friendly confederacy, interchange pulpits, hold union meetings and "agree, to disagree" about the rest of their tenets.

The difficulties in this scheme are obvious. At the outset, the question arises, which Christian denominations are to be included in this programme? Shall it be "all who profess and call themselves Christians," or shall some line be drawn? In the latter case, there would be a beg-

ging of the question at the threshold, an antecedent definition of this "common Christianity," and a rejection before hand of large numbers who claim the Christian name. Probably the line would be drawn between "evangelical" and "liberal" Christians. But the very term "evangelical" is an assumption; for many, if not all, liberal Christians claim to follow the teachings of the Gospel, and so to be evangelical in the truest sense. It must be acknowledged that such a method would be purely arbitrary, and therefore could not be satisfactory.

But allowing that a convention or congress were brought together, even of those who arrogate to themselves the title of "evangelical," and that they succeeded in formulating a declaration of things in which they were agreed, and which must be the sole basis of all preaching in the sphere of pulpit interchange and united meetings, what would be the relation of this to the individual teachings of the several sects within their own organizations? Would it not be a plain acknowledgment before the world that it is only the common belief that is essential; in other words, *divine truth*, unmistakably revealed and necessary to salvation? Would it not imply that the distinctive teachings of the several bodies were not essential, not known to be divinely revealed, mere matters of individual preference, private opinions? Surely no one who is convinced that the tenets of his own denomination are matters of essential faith necessary to salvation would consent to any arrangement which would compel him to leave them out of his preaching. But if they are only matters of preference, of private opinion, what becomes of the right of the body to a separate existence?

It was not on such a basis that Christian sects were founded. They were firmly convinced that their belief and their polity were right, and the only right, and that all others were wrong. If they have changed their minds, why should they cumber the ground, and by increasing the number of Christian divisions confuse the minds of men and repel many in disgust from all religion, about what they now confess are non-essential things? Can Baptists any longer insist upon immersion as a term of membership, if it be a thing indifferent? Can the Presbyterian reject the application of an Arminian, if Calvinism be not essential? or is there to be a new class of Christians, those who accept only the platform agreed upon as containing the "common Christianity" adopted as the term of interchange and religious co-operation? And if so, shall this class of persons, upon their assent to these few things about which all are agreed, be admitted to the rights and privileges of membership in all the confederated bodies, or shall there be some special arrangement made for them?

With such embarrassments are we confronted in any scheme of union which begins by making union the first thing and truth secondary, which is content to regard as truth the residuum obtained by first taking a selected number of Christian bodies, and then waiving all points of difference.

The only method which can ever conduct to any sure results is that which our correspondent suggests, that which begins with a consuming desire to know what the will of God is as touching His Church and the truth of His holy Word. Unity must be sought through truth. It is only in this way that the unity of which Christ spoke can ever be attained, for that unity is based upon truth.

But new difficulties await us when we ask, what is truth? How shall we attain it? One answer is this: Let representative men come together and begin the prayerful study of the Bible, putting aside all prejudice and opening the mind to what is there revealed. Strange as it may seem, this is the very method out of which all sectism has come, and it is not likely