

Zeitschrift: Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review
Band: 11 (1903)
Heft: 42

Artikel: Anglicana
Autor: Symonds, Arthur / G.K. / Oxenham, F. Nutcombe
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403564>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 07.09.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

ANGLICANA.

I. I begin with some news on the present state of our Church.

The "Guardian" of Dec. 31, 1902, has published an important article entitled: "Establishment and Disestablishment". After having examined the "pro et contra", the author says:

"We can hardly go so far as to say that disestablishment has no terrors, because the change which it would involve is so vast that it might check or starve, for a time, in hundreds of places, spiritual agencies of enormous value, but we can and do endorse the view that there are many greater evils than disestablishment, and that it is quite possible that Parliamentary control may be exercised in such a fashion as to make Churchmen agitate actively for what would be in a real sense 'Liberation'. But that time has not come yet, and we hope that it may not come.

"If we are to be obliged to enter upon another period of Church Defence, it is important that our defence should be conducted upon right lines. We cannot maintain that the Church is coextensive with the nation. We cannot deny the numbers and the activity of Nonconformist bodies. We cannot assert that the present system is perfect or free from anomalies. Many of us feel that under such circumstances as prevailed in Ireland disestablishment was inevitable and just, and that if those circumstances were repeated in England it would be inevitable and just here also. We know that in all our self-governing colonies the principle has been given up, and we must admit that if we were settling the relations of Church and State in England *de novo* it is improbable that Establishment would be accepted as a solution. But we can justly claim that so vital and far-reaching a change should not be made without clear proof that it would result in a balance of spiritual good to the nation at large. We can claim that some better reason should be shown than the jealousy of the religious bodies which have seceded from the Church. We can ask that due weight should be given to the principle of the recog-

nition of some form of Christianity by the State, and to the fact that the Established Church can, by its parochial system, cover ground which purely voluntary bodies hardly attempt to cover, both in the poorer districts of our large towns and in sparsely populated country places. It is possible that if disestablishment were effected, there might be some compensation in the way of increased voluntary effort and self-sacrifice, and we are not amongst those who fear it on the ground that it would mean the removal of the only tie which holds together strongly opposed parties in the Church. In so far as we fear disestablishment, we fear it because it would mean a great break with history, a great uprooting, and a great waste, and because it would inflict a spiritual injury upon the nation, without bringing with it adequate compensation in the removal of injustice on one side or the development of freedom on the other."

This article has caused many answers, of which two are of special interest. They appeared in the "Guardian" Jan. 14, 1903. The first concludes as following:

"The impotent position of the Established Church to-day, in face of the great problems urgently needing to be solved, is largely owing to the paralysing effect of the State connection, and there are few who in their inmost hearts do not recognise this. If the circumstances to which I have referred above do not justify us in seeking freedom to exercise our commission untrammelled by the fetters of the State, would you, Sir, I again repeat, kindly inform me what those hypothetical circumstances are for which we are to look, and who is to tell me when they have arisen?"

ARTHUR SYMONDS."

The editor adds:

"Mr Symonds's letter was written before our article on 'Church Reform and Church Nationalisation' had appeared. That article specified one set of conditions which would fully justify Churchmen in asking for disestablishment."

The second answer is this:

"In your article upon 'Establishment and Disestablishment' you give as a modifying excuse for acquiescing in the appointment of the Bishops of the Church of England by a Presbyterian Prime Minister the fact that his appointments will possibly compare favourably with those of Lord Melbourne, Lord Palmerston, or Lord John Russell, but surely that is to miss the whole point. Nothing but rank Erastianism (with all its fatal consequences) could ever excuse an Episcopalian Church submitting to the present state of

things. Moreover, in spite of the manner in which Mr Balfour worked the Kenyon-Slaney clause into the 1902 Education Bill, there are possibly still some who consider him an honourable man and worthy of trust; therefore that is all the more reason why the protest should be raised now. Let any one contemplate the possible future Prime Ministers in either party, and he will then see what is in store for the Church of England. At present we have a bench of Bishops true to the principles of the Prayer-book. It is not likely that there will be the same quality of Bishops a generation, nay, a dozen years hence. The truth of the matter is the loyalty of Mr Gladstone and Lord Salisbury to the Church of England has blinded our eyes for the moment to the inevitable results of the abolition of the Test Acts and the passing of the Reform Bill. *The Establishment has become an anachronism; disestablishment is sure to come.* If Churchmen are wise, they will steadily prepare for it and keep the question as much as possible from becoming a party one. G. K."

It is certain that in the Church of England there are many discontented members, especially amongst the clergy. A proof of it is the following letter signed "Loyalty", published in the "Church Family Newspaper" of Jan. 2:

"At a gathering of clergy—between 20 and 30 present—a few days ago, the subject of ordination vows in respect to obedience to episcopal authority was under discussion, and a resolution was moved that the clergy are bound to render hearty obedience to the godly admonitions of their bishop, in accordance with the solemn vow and promise made at ordination. Several, however, contended that no priest or deacon was bound to obey his bishop's injunctions unless they were in agreement with 'Catholic doctrine and practice', it being contended that 'godly' admonition could only mean this. With this reservation in the minds of perhaps half of those present, the resolution was passed (with three dissentients), and has been forwarded to the Bishop of the diocese as an expression of loyalty. It is evident that by 'Catholic doctrine and practice' is meant mediæval teaching and ritual not sanctioned by the Church of England, and the claim put forth, that one is not bound to obey, or rather that one is bound to disobey, the bishop really comes to this, viz., that every clergyman is to be his own judge in such matters, and has the right of conducting services and preaching doctrines which appeal to his notions of Catholicism. One would like to know what this 'Catholic doctrine and practice' really is. The phrase is constantly used, but we never get a definition of it.

Now, sir, the contemplation of the foregoing raises serious thoughts in my mind.

(1) The bishop will be under the impression that his clergy on their own showing are ready to yield him hearty obedience, and to acknowledge his authority as their Father in God, while all the time he will be under a false impression, for he will not be aware that many of them regard their ordination promise as a very conditional one.

(2) If there is such a disingenuous spirit among the clergy of the Church of England, it is a most melancholy fact. It must influence their lives, and the whole Church will suffer for this lowering of the standard of righteousness and truth.

(3) The ordination vow of disobedience becomes a farce, and had much better be omitted. It is by reason of this very vow that ordination is conferred, and yet it seems as though, to many, it is a meaningless form of words, and nothing more. What is the value of a promise which is only intended to be observed just as it may suit the fancy of the one making it?

(4) What would be the result if this notion of obedience were prevalent in the family, the schools, the Army, the State? Simply anarchy; and that is what we are approaching in the Church. The most lawless member of a State would be quite prepared to take an oath of obedience to lawful authority on these grounds.

(5) Where are these principles, or rather want of principles, inculcated? Is this the outcome of the teaching found at some of the theological colleges? It would almost seem so. The bishops are ignorant of the real state of affairs in the Church; they are nourishing nurseries of disloyalty, and they are content to cry, 'Peace, peace, when there is no peace'. And it is these very men whom they delight to honour.

God help our dear old Church! She is in troubled waters, and the rocks and breakers are not far off.—Yours truly, LOYALTY."

Whit regard to the Bishop of Southwell and the Church Reform League, the "Quarterly Chronicle" has published the following reference to the Bishop of Southwell's New Year's greeting to his diocese:

"So far as the 'Church reformers' who are members of the Church Reform League are concerned, we may say plainly that they have not 'elaborated schemes for the lay management of the Church', neither is it strictly accurate to say that they 'have defined Churchmen and their franchise', or that they 'have concluded that it was all academic'. They have never either asked or

desired that Parliament should take up 'a Bill to reform the Church', and they have never expected 'an unlimited franchise'. Their desire is not to see the Church 'managed' by the laity, but by the Church—by Bishops, clergy, and laity, each according to their order, and performing their own proper functions. They believe that the Church reform movement has got beyond the academic stage, and is already a question of 'practical politics', though the franchise remains to be determined.

"We cannot understand how any thinking Churchman, least of all a Bishop, can dream of any such thing as an 'unlimited franchise'. The object of the 'Church reform' movement is to secure the self-government of the Church, in order that Church reform may be, as we have so often expressed it, reform of the Church, by the Church, and for the Church. The very term 'self-government of the Church' implies some limitation in the matter of the franchise, which must obviously be based upon Churchmanship if the Church is to be self-governed. We may in this connection quote once more the resolution passed at our meeting held during the Brighton Church Congress in 1901:—

"'That a mere rate-paying qualification for the right of voting for lay representative Churchmen is not compatible with the recognised position of the Church as a spiritual body, and cannot be accepted as part of a scheme of Church reform.'

"The Bishop of Southwell appears to be of opinion that the maintenance of 'establishment' demands an unlimited franchise; but we would warn his lordship and others who may be inclined to hold that opinion, that if the alternative were self-government with an unlimited franchise without disestablishment, or self-government with a limited (*i. e.*, Church) franchise with disestablishment, success would not be with the former."

In a sermon, which the Bishop of London has recently preached, he expressed himself on the "Via media" of the English Church as follows (*Guardian*, Jan. 21):

"Let them be hopeful about their Church, so capable of being misunderstood because it was the *via media* between Romanism and mere Protestantism. The Church of England was Catholic and Protestant. It protested against mediæval corruptions and errors while clinging to primitive traditions. He was proud to belong to the Church of England, an undoubted branch of the Holy Catholic Church, with its old ceremonial, traditions, and creeds, undisturbed and unbroken, with its appeal to the Primitive Church and Holy Scripture. His learned predecessor—Bishop Creighton—and Bishop Lightfoot, two eminent theologians, had both held this view, the

latter in his last sermon (which he himself heard) saying that the English Church, with its own Bible and unbroken tradition and Orders, was an ensign to the nations which in time she might make all one."

Worthy to be mentioned is also the excellent counsel of the Bishop of Ripon for Christian Harmony (*Church Family Newspaper*, Jan. 9):

"In an eloquent address, the Bishop said that what we wanted to realise in the present day was that Christianity was being sown and accepted in the world, and that, in spite of many things that we deplored, the divisions of Christendom were lessening every hour. There was not a single question which split up Christendom years ago which had not either been entirely absorbed, accepted, or relegated into the background altogether, and disturbed the peace of the Christian soul no more. Who was going to fight the battle of Calvinism or Arminianism over again? Not that there were not grounds for still being earnest to understand and realise whether we accepted the whole of the freedom of the Gospel of Christ in our own souls. *It seemed to him that the Christian Church needed to fasten its mind not upon the conflicts of the past, but upon the wide and comprehensive duties of the present.* The religious communions of Christianity were bringing forth fruit for God. An ideal Christendom was one that was acting together for the purpose of carrying on the work of Christ in the world."

In the same Periodical a "Canonicus" writes the following on "Our Needs in the twentieth Century":

"We need to reform Convocation, not so much by altering its constitution as by sending proper men there as representatives. We do not want comfortable, wealthy, optimistic, and somewhat supine ecclesiastics of the dominant ecclesiastical colour, but men of spirit, sense, and activity who will insist on a thorough overhauling of our antiquated ecclesiastical system. We need combined effort, too, to force on the attention of the Government the necessity of appointing to the Episcopate, not mere ecclesiastics, but *men*—men who will grapple with the task of reconstruction and bring the practical working of the Church of England into harmony with the requirements of to-day. *Above all, we need to insist, ubique, semper, et in omnibus partibus*, that, while of course many improvements in detail are desirable and possible, the principles enshrined in the Prayer-book are not played out, but are capable, if intelligently applied and adapted to existing circumstances, of guiding the course of the Church throughout all time."

II. On the Roman Church in England and on our position towards her I have found several notes for your readers.

First of all a letter written by the Rev. Oxenham published in the "Church Times", Jan. 16, on: *Papal claims again*:

"As you did me the kindness last year to publish some correspondence between Mgr. Merry del Val and myself, relating to some lectures which he had delivered in criticism of a book of mine, and as the Monsignore has now published an edition of these lectures, may I ask your courtesy to allow me to draw your reader's attention to one palmary example of what we may expect from a Papal controversialist in these days.

At the beginning of his first lecture Mgr. Merry del Val writes:—

The two chief texts of Holy Scripture from which the Catholic teaching is drawn by the Vatican Council, by the present Pope, by the Fathers, and by our theologians, are the following.

Then he proceeds to quote, printing in capital letters, that there may be no mistake, 'Thou art kephas (Rock), and upon this kephas (rock) I will build my Church,' etc.; obviously leading us to suppose that the word—kephas (rock)—is the same word in one half of this text as it is in the other; whereas it is not the same word; it is *πέτρος* in one half and *πέτρα* in the other.

Now, it is absolutely impossible to suppose that Mgr. Merry del Val does not know how this text stands in the Greek. And it is almost impossible to suppose that he does not know how large a part of the age-long controversy on this text is made to turn on the difference in meaning between these two words. And yet he deliberately, and somewhat ostentatiously, represents them as being the same.

Very possibly Monsignore will endeavour to defend himself by falling back on a suggestion (one of the well-known shifts in this controversy) that in this conversation with St. Peter our Lord probably spoke in some dialect of Hebrew or Aramaic, and that He may have used a word which might have been rendered in Greek either by *πέτρος* or *πέτρα*; and so, that our Lord may have used the same word where St. Matthew represents Him as having used two different words. We are not, however, concerned with what our Lord *might have said*, but with what the Evangelist records that He *did say*. The Evangelist records what our Lord said by the use of two different words, it is, therefore, simple falsification to quote him as having used the same word.

Here, then, we have, at the outset of this little book, a deliberate falsification of one of 'the two chief texts' in question, in the hope (no doubt) of imposing on the guileless ignorance of

those 'converts' to whom, as Monsignore naively informs us (Preface, p. 16), these lectures 'were addressed'.

To trade upon guileless ignorance in the (supposed) interests of the Church is a well-known method of Roman controversialists; but Monsignore might have remembered that when he published these reassuring lectures he was no longer addressing himself exclusively to guileless ignorance.

This rather flagrant attempt to mislead the unwary is not a promising beginning if we wish to arrive at *The Truth of Papal Claims*—so this veracious little work is entitled.

I shall take means, without trespassing further on your courtesy, to comment on this book more at length, if it should seem worth while to do so; but if the book goes on as it begins it will not be worth while.

F. NUTCOMBE OXENHAM.

18, Piazza del Popolo, Rome. — Epiphany, 1903.

P. S.—I delayed sending this letter until I had just read through 'The Truth of Papal Claims'. Having done so, I will, with your permission, here add:—

(1) That I find Mgr. Merry del Val has not *disproved* a single important statement in my book, although he has *contradicted* most of them. He has indeed attempted, with some success, to refute several statements, which I have not made—*e.g.*, that 'Infallibility' implies 'Impeccability' (p. 11) which, of course, I did not say, or suppose. Or, 'That the Council, or the Pope, asserted that all the Venerable Fathers and orthodox doctors of the Church *at all times*, and *on every occasion*, even when dealing with a subject other than the supremacy of St. Peter, have expressly described or expounded at length the position of St. Peter' (Introduction, p. 3)—an assertion which no one in his senses would think of making. Others, like ninepins, Monsignore sets up and solemnly knocks down, making believe thereby to be demolishing me.

(2) As to Monsignore's re-statements of modern Roman distortions of the testimony of Holy Scripture and of the Fathers, there is nothing in his book which has not been already abundantly refuted again and again, especially of late years by the present Bishop of Worcester in his "*Roman Catholic Claims*", by Father Puller in his "*The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*", by Dr. Salmon in his "*Infallibility of the Church*".

It would be mere waste of time for me to repeat anew what has been sufficiently said by others already.

(3) On one point only (because, so far as I know, it is a new departure in misrepresentation in these days) I will ask leave

briefly to comment:—At p. 29 of ‘The Truth’, etc., Monsignore refers to ‘the famous Epistle of St. Clement, Bishop of Rome, to the Church in Corinth’. He tells us that ‘in that Epistle, St. Clement claims Divine authority for *his* right to intervene’, etc.; and again (p. 30), ‘The importance and authority of this intervention on the part of *the Bishop of Rome*, who thus asserted *his* universal jurisdiction, may be gathered’, etc. (The italics are mine).

Now, as a matter of fact, notorious to any one who has ever read this Epistle, Clement (if he was the writer of this Epistle, which he never claims to be, although he probably was) never makes any mention of himself; nor is there any mention of, or reference to *any Bishop* of Rome from the first word of this Epistle to the last! It is an Epistle ‘from *the Church* of Rome to *the Church* of Corinth’. Whatever claim is made here is made for ‘the Church’ as a whole; no claim whatever is made on behalf of the Bishop either personally or officially. ‘Not only’, says Bishop Lightfoot in his great work on St. Clement, ‘have we no traces of a Bishop of Bishops, but *even the very existence of a Bishop of Rome could nowhere be gathered from this letter.*—(*Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. I, Part I, p. 352.)

And yet Mgr. Merry del Val has the courage to tell us that in this Epistle ‘the Bishop of Rome asserted his universal jurisdiction’.

Whether it be the graver fault to falsify a single text, or to falsify a whole Epistle, we need not stay to inquire.

As to Monsignore’s remarks, which are merely personal to myself, they are of no public interest, and do not need any rejoinder.”

We read in the “Church Bells” of Jan. 16:

“An Irish clergyman has written to the (Roman) ‘Catholic Times’, suggesting that if it could be proved that Rome was infallible, her triumph would be complete. Canon J. S. Vaughan attempts to indicate the lines upon which he thinks the arguments would run. The pith of his attempt is the suggestion, that ‘if the Roman Catholic Church declares that she herself is the said Infallible Church, and if no other Church claims such a prerogative or can trace its foundation back to Christ, then there is reasonable ground to accept her authority’! There is a savour of Donatism in the argument, and because the claim is made it does not follow it is a just one. Moreover, the modern Roman claim was not known in the early days of the church, and the Roman Church herself did not make it. She neither claimed to be the whole Church, or to be the Infallible Church. Pope Innocent III. has been frequently

quoted as declaring that the Roman is only a part of the whole Catholic Church. That no other portion of the Church claims to be the whole Church or to be the Infallible Church only shows their love of truth, their true Catholicity, and their humility. As regards the ability to trace the Papal Succession right up to our Lord, the mere printing of a list of names and dates is not enough, and the difficulties in the way of proving the validity of every Papal election are simply insurmountable.—The Eastern Church would not for a moment accept Canon Vaughan's suggestions."

We also mention a work of the Rev. Isaacson: "*Roads from Rome*", with a Preface by the Bishop of Durham (London, Religious Tract Society). This work contains many facts. After having quoted several of them, an English theologian adds:

"It is evident from the general trend of these narratives that doubts as to the infallibility dogma, doubts as to Transubstantiation, and as to priestly absolution, difficulties as regards the doctrine of Intention are more common in the Roman Church than is generally thought. Many of these converts from Rome doubted for years on these points before they were so convinced as to sever old friendships, old associations, and join those whom they had been taught were heretics. We may, therefore, fairly assume that the process is still going on, and that there are many Romanists who, at the present moment, are doubting, as these men were, and who are almost prepared to renounce Roman error, but find it difficult to overcome the prejudices of a life-time. We hope that the volume will prove a warning to those who are inclined to look kindly on the extreme section in our own Church, who are defying their bishops, and are preaching Transubstantiation, Reservation, and prayers to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints."

One ought to read on this matter "*Rome and Reform*" by Kington Oliphant, of Balliol College; a work very well written, but which does not show enough the true Catholicism between the Papal System and the Protestantism. A correspondent of the "*Church Times*" (Jan. 2) says on this subject:

"The several chapters on the history of Italy are among the most brilliant. It is a history of Italy written from the standpoint of an Englishman with more than common insight. Occasionally there are lapses from good taste. For example, in dealing with the Council of 1870, Mr Oliphant says:—

The Virgin Mary was plainly told that since Pius had proclaimed her Immaculate she should create him Infallible. We cannot help contrasting the two assemblies . . . The Council of Trent had

thrown its proceedings open to all the world; that of the Vatican allowed as little as possible to leak out. It is to be feared that no Sarpi, no Pallavicino, will chronicle the sayings and doings of the latter assembly. Here, on one side, were the German, Hungarian, and American Bishops, who took their stand on the old paths, and thought that an appeal to history was anything but treason to the Church. On the other side were the Spanish and Italian fanatics, strong at least in numbers, the men who howled down Strossmayer for pronouncing a mere commonplace in favour of Protestant good faith . . . Vain were the protests of the dying Montalembert, of Newman, of Döllinger . . . The eighty-eight Bishops of the minority slunk away, not daring to face the wrath of the aged Pope—cowardice that would have provoked the scorn of the Tridentine Fathers.

The first sentence is in the grossest taste, and the whole statement is very short of satisfactory. We know from Döllinger that there were causes far more potent than the mere terrorism of Pio Nono. But as it stands it is a fair record of the actual council, and indicates quite fairly M^r Oliphant's attitude. There is a matter of peculiar interest in the chapter devoted to the history of Sweden and of Poland. M^r Oliphant looks with a very kindly eye on the Church of Sweden. 'The Churches of Sweden and England bear a curious resemblance to each other, their reformation in both cases proceeding from the Crown.' This sentence, as it stands, is hopelessly unfair to the Church of England, and is completely answered by M^r Oliphant himself in his chapters on the history of England in respect to movements towards Papal reform. But we gain an inkling of M^r Oliphant's position in the same chapter, since he bewails the absence of Dissent in Sweden, and he adds a fervent prayer that the land of Gustavus Adolphus may feel henceforth more of the 'glowing fire that kindled Luther's heart'.

Our readers will be more directly interested in the author's treatment of the Church of England . . .

We have examined the volumes thus carefully because they are worth it. In estimating the respective merits of 'Romanism' and 'Protestantism' at the close of his treatise, M^r Oliphant has some noteworthy observations to make. He accuses Rome of un-
veracity; he accuses 'Protestantism' of lack of devotion. He deals very capably with the decay of Latin countries, and with the weaknesses of the Teuton races. It is all judicious and full of insight. The wonder to us is that M^r Oliphant has failed entirely to see that his distinction between Rome and Protestantism is a vicious distinction, for it ignores Catholicism, the very Catholicism which would impart order and corporateness to Protestantism and

freedom from the Papacy as a political system, or a dominating system, to Rome. In saying this we by no means minimise the value of a solid, learned, and, on the whole, fair-minded contribution to the most interesting phase of the history of Europe."

Why not mention the "Revolt from Rome"?

"The first reliable particulars appeared in the Rev. Arthur Galton's article in the *Fortnightly Review*, but the whole story was ridiculed by the Roman authorities. Gradually it came out that there was some basis for the statements made. Father O'Halloran, the Roman Catholic rector of Ealing, in letters to the *Daily Chronicle* presented himself as one of the hundred and fifty Roman priests, and indicated that others would make themselves known as they found it convenient. Father O'Halloran is carrying on an independent mission on his own account, and is repudiated by the Roman authorities as a rebellious priest. We have already pointed out that the revolt is not so much against Roman doctrine as against Roman methods. There is rebellion among the secular priests against the arbitrary conduct of their Bishops, and against the privileges accorded to the Jesuits and other religious orders. The burden has, they say, become greater than they can bear, and a number of them have determined to resist at all costs, and to open as they see opportunity independent missions. Roman Catholic in character, in doctrine, and in worship, but independent of Rome and Roman authorities. Our representative gives in another column an account of the opening by a Roman priest at Gunnersbury on Sunday of the first of these new missions, which is entitled St. Cyprian's Catholic Church, and of his interview with the priest, the Rev. Herbert Ignatius Beale. The Rev. Father O'Halloran spoke in his earlier communications of being ordained a bishop, and thus affording episcopal superintendence to the revolted priests. It will be seen from the remarks made to our representative by Mr Beale that the latter are in communication with the Old Catholics in the Netherlands, Germany, and Switzerland, and, it is said, that the Archbishop of Utrecht will consecrate a bishop for them before long. The features of interest to Englishmen are that it is a movement from within the Roman Church, that it seeks to connect itself with the Old Catholic movement on the Continent, to cultivate friendly relations with the Anglican Church, and seems inclined at least to reject the infallibility dogma with a tendency to further departures from Roman error." (Ch. F. N., Jan. 30.)

The Rev. O'Halloran has communicated his grievances in a letter to the prefect of the Propaganda Card. Gotti. It is to

be noticed that the leaders of this movement will not touch the Roman doctrine, but only resist to the spiritually tyranny of their Superiors. An Anglican writer has said:

“But it is difficult to see how it can justify secession. Something perhaps might be said for Father Beale’s movement if it were based upon doctrinal grounds, as was the case with the Old Catholics in Germany and Switzerland. Your interesting report leads one to suppose that it does not turn upon doctrine at all, and that it is merely the result of a quarrel between seculars and regulars. Why, if that is so, should English Church-people mix themselves up with the business?”

Perhaps this timidity is only an act of prudence in order not to frighten the timorous of the Liberal Romanists. Probably it will disappear after the first success.

I also mention a pamphlet by the Rev. Carson, English Priest, which has gone to Rome and who remained moderate in his views. He pretends that the presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist is spiritual only and that the word spiritual just characterises the mode of his presence. And he cites texts of theologians belonging to the Church of Rome for his opinion. This is very true; but *de facto* it is contrary to the philological sense of the word Transubstantiation and also to Council of Trent.

III. Some notices on the relations between the English and the Orthodox Churches.

(1) *Letter of the Archbishop of York to the Patriarch of Constantinople* (“Guardian”, Febr. 4, 1903).

The Rev. *M. R. Swabey*, chaplain of Christ Church (Crimean Memorial Church), Constantinople, writes under date of the 22^d ult. to the Archbishop of York acknowledging the receipt of a letter from his Grace, with enclosures, for delivery to the Patriarch. Mr Swabey proceeds:—

“I have been this morning to the Patriarchate to deliver your Grace’s letter, and the copy of the letter of the Marquis of Lansdowne addressed to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, to his Holiness the Œcumenical Patriarch of the Orthodox Church, as you directed me.

“It was the first day of the session of the Holy Synod after the Christmas recess; his Holiness received me in Synod—both his Holiness and all the Metropolitans, members of the Holy Synod, standing as I presented to his Holiness your Graecs’ letter.

“His Holiness then addressed me, saying that in his own name and in the name of the Holy Synod he desired to transmit to your Grace his acknowledgments of your courtesy in writing to him. He said that he was very glad to get an answer to the letter of congratulations which he and the Holy Synod had sent to the late Archbishop on the Coronation of the Sovereign, and to receive the copy of the letter of the Marquis of Lansdowne, Secretary to the King. He added that it was his great desire that the friendly relations existing between the Greek Church and the Church of England might be strengthened and improved.

“Your Grace will doubtless receive, in due course, a formal letter in answer to the letter which I presented to-day.

“Perhaps I may be permitted to assure your Grace that your letter, and the formal manner in which it was sent, gave very much satisfaction to the Patriarch and Holy Synod.

“The letters will be translated into Greek and, I expect, published in the *Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἀλήθεια*, the official organ of the Patriarchate; I will send your Grace a copy of the Greek translation of your letter when it appears.”

These letters have in fact appeared in the *Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἀλήθεια* of Jan. 17 (old style), p. 25—27 *).

*) *Bemerkung der Redaktion*: Wie der «Guardian» vom 11. Februar unter vorstehendem Titel meldet, hat die *Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἀλήθεια*, das offizielle Organ des Patriarchen von Konstantinopel, in ihrer Nummer vom 17. Januar die Briefe veröffentlicht, die anlässlich des Hinschieds des Erzbischofs Dr. Temple von Canterbury zwischen dem ökumenischen Patriarchen und dem interimistischen Haupte der anglikanischen Kirche gewechselt worden sind. In der Einleitung wird die Feierlichkeit beschrieben, mit welcher das Schreiben des Erzbischofs von York durch Mr. Swabey dem Patriarchen von Konstantinopel überreicht worden ist. (Die Würdenträger des Patriarchats waren zu der Audienz beigezogen worden; bei Verlesung des Dokuments erhob sich die ganze hohe Versammlung von ihren Sitzen.) Dann bemerkt das Organ des Patriarchen:

«Damit man eine genaue Kenntnis von dem Anlass erhalte, durch den das Schreiben Seiner Gnaden, des Erzbischofs von York, hervorgerufen worden ist, veröffentlichen wir zunächst mit Rücksicht auf die chronologische Abfolge den Brief vom 22. August, den Seine Heiligkeit der ökumenische Patriarch an den unvergesslichen Erzbischof Friedrich von Canterbury gerichtet hat. Die drei (vorliegenden) bemerkenswerten Briefe bekunden die brüderliche Gesinnung (sentiments of fraternity) und die christliche Liebe zwischen den beiden Kirchen, und dienen zur Charakterisierung der Geschichte der gegenwärtigen Beziehungen zwischen der anglikanischen und unserer orthodoxen Kirche — der Beziehungen, welche vom zweiten Patriarchate des ruhmvollen ökumenischen Patriarchen Gregor VI. an enger geworden sind.»

Wir sprechen unsere herzliche Genugtuung über den Ton aus, in welchem diese offizielle Kundgebung gehalten ist. Während der römische

(2) "A very interesting personage has passed away in Manchester—the Rev. Eustathius Metallinos, Archimandrite of the Greek Church, Higher Broughton. A native of Corfu, he came to England in middle life, and by dint of wonderful perseverance made himself thoroughly acquainted with the works of English divines. For the Church of this country he had the highest regard, being sincerely convinced of the reality of its Orders. Only a short time ago we noticed an interesting little work of his, *Imperial and Royal Coronation*, in which he compared the service used at the sacring of English Sovereigns with the ancient Greek rite and that used at the Coronation of the Tsar. One of the features of his book was the translation of the English Coronation rite into ecclesiastical Greek, in which guise it was remarkably impressive. One of the Archimandrite's last acts was to pay a warm tribute to the late Primate, who, like himself, was born in one of the Ionian isles. The Greek community in Manchester loses a worthy priest, and the English Church a real friend." (*Church Times*, Jan. 23.)

A Correspondent of the "Church Times" has published (Jan. 30) on that Archimandrite the following details:

"It has been wondered why he was not a Bishop; I remember, when he was lunching with us four or five years ago, he told me that he had been offered a Bishopric; and on my asking him why he had not accepted it, he reminded me that, in the Greek Church, a Bishop's wife must retire into a convent, the Bishop retaining the care of the children. Surely, this is a weak point in the Greek Church. Papal infallibility may be grounded on a misinterpretation of Scripture, but we all have read how, at Nicæa, when Paphnutius urged 'the ancient tradition of the Church', that none should be separated from a wife he had married before Ordination, 'the whole assembly' assented to his reasoning. The Emperor Justinian forbade a married Episcopate; and the Council in Trullo confirmed the decree: thus it happens that Greek Bishops must be taken from the monasteries, which have no practical experience in parochial

Papst der anglikanischen Gemeinschaft den Titel Kirche ebensowenig gibt, wie den lutherischen und reformierten Landeskirchen des Kontinents, verkehrt der ökumenische Patriarch mit den Häuptern der anglikanischen Kirche wie mit durchaus ebenbürtigen Würdenträgern, spricht von der anglikanischen Kirche mit der *gleichen Achtung* wie von der eigenen Gemeinschaft und äussert seine Freude darüber, dass zwischen den beiden Kirchen *brüderliche* Beziehungen bestehen. Das hat zur Voraussetzung, dass der Patriarch die bischöflichen Würdenträger der anglikanischen Kirche als *wirkliche* Inhaber des *katholischen* Episkopats anerkennt. Von da bis zur förmlichen Kirchengemeinschaft scheint uns kein grosser Schritt mehr zu sein.

work; or in the case of a married priest being elected, he must refuse the offer, unless he assents to the principle that those whom God has joined together man may put asunder. Thus the Greek Church loses the services of Bishops who are so eminently fitted to govern a diocese, as Mr Metallinos.

But it is not of his services to the Greek Church, but of the strong affection which he bore towards the English Church, that I wish to speak. He was not a peace-at-any-price man. I well remember how, some years ago, but for his gentleness, our correspondence would have come to an abrupt end. We were discussing the Filioque, concerning the introduction of which into the Creed we were both agreed; but as to doctrine, I maintained that the Church of England is right, without the Greek Church being wrong. However, he gave me another chance; and later on I was able to satisfy him that we hold the doctrine of St. John Damascene.

Since then he held that the differences between the Churches admitted of adjustment. I am writing a few of my reminiscences of him, and I will mention one more: I remember the satisfaction with which he wrote to me, when he was setting about his 'Imperial and Royal Coronation', that the coronation services of the Greek, Russian, and Anglican Churches formed another connecting link between them.

I cannot affirm that he considered that action might be taken on the correspondence between Archbishop Temple and the Patriarch of Constantinople, Constantine V.; but he was the first to draw my attention to it; and I know that he considered it of the highest consequence, as conducive to that which he had at heart, the union of the Greek and English Churches; with regard to which 'he being dead yet speaketh'.
A. H. H."

(2) One will read with interest two following works:—*Student's History of the Greek Church*, dedicated (by permission) to the Tsar of Russia by Rev. A. H. Hore, Author of "Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church".—*Hymns of the Holy Eastern Church*. Translated from the Service-Books, with Introductory Chapters, by the Rev. J. Brownlie.

IV. After these general questions, some more special ones:

(1) With regard to *Biblical criticism*, which is much discussed amongst us, one must mention the following Works:—*The Bible and Modern Criticism*, by Sir Robert Anderson, with a Preface by the Right Rev. Haudley Moule, Bishop of Durham.—*The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*, by Theoph. Pinches.—*Graduated*

Lessons on the Old Testament, by Rev. Rule, edited by Rev. Bebb, 3 vol.—Sermon by Prof. Kirkpatrick on *the Old Testament* (Ch. T., Jan. 16).—Sermon by Prof. Swete on *the Trustworthiness of the Gospel Narrative* (Ch. T., Jan. 30).—Sermon by Bishop of Stepney on *the Old Paths* (Ch. F. N., Febr. 13).

(2) On the pretended *Athanasian Creed*, we read in the Anglican Periodicals (Jan. 1903):

“The new Dean of Westminster has introduced into the Abbey Church a liturgical feature for which he has no warrant but his own will. It is called ‘A shortened form of the Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius’, and omits certain passages, including the final clause relating to the Resurrection and the Judgment, which are so often misunderstood. We see no reason why, on this principle, other passages should not be omitted at Canterbury, others at York, and others, again, in the Chapel Royal, until the whole of the *Quicumque Vult* is whittled away. The Dean, of course, is a very important personage, and holds a Royal peculiar, but as a priest he is restricted to the use of the Church’s offices, and even he cannot over-ride that statutory provision, ‘none other or otherwise’. We are entirely in favour of a revised translation of the *Quicumque Vult*. We are, therefore, driven to the conclusion that the Dean, in restoring that which has been unknown at the Abbey since the time of A. P. Stanley, has decided to proceed with caution. That is possible, but we are bound to add that it sets an example of lawlessness which other law-breakers will not be slow to follow in other directions.”

It will be useful to read on the same subject: *The Creeds: an Historical and Doctrinal Exposition of the Apostles’, Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds*, by Rev. Mortimer.

(3) *Some Statistics*. The “Daily News’” Census is interesting. We read in the Ch. F. N. (Jan. 23):

“There has been some discussion of late as to the growth of Roman Catholicism in England, and the conclusion reached by the best authorities is that the numbers remain about stationary, notwithstanding the considerable immigration of Romanists from Ireland. Exact particulars cannot be had, as the Census, owing to the objections made by Dissenters, gives no information as to the number of the various denominations. It is interesting to note that the Government statistics just published in the United States show that the Roman Catholics, who are a larger proportion of the total population than in this country, are not increasing as rapidly as

the Protestant population. With a membership of nine millions, nearly one-third of the total membership of the Churches in the United States, which is 28,689,028, they have not quite increased one per cent. The Protestant Episcopal Church has increased at the rate of about two and one-fifth per cent., the Presbyterians by about two and two-fifths; the Congregationalists two per cent.; the Methodists one and a quarter per cent.; and the Baptists a little more than a quarter per cent. A similar result is noted in Australia and New Zealand, where the result of the last census just issued shows a Romanist gain of a half per cent., while Anglicans have gained nearly one and a half per cent. (1·43); Presbyterians about the same (1·48); and the Wesleyans one and three-quarters per cent. It would seem that where Roman Catholicism has to meet on equal terms the competition of other Churches it is not succeeding. In America, Australia and New Zealand, as in England, Romanists have to lament a continual leakage which immigration only just about succeeds in balancing....

“The *Daily News* is still proceeding with its religious census for London, and in our issue of last week we gave the figures for the City of Westminster. The Church of England still shows up well. In Westminster, notwithstanding that the early morning services were not counted, and the Abbey afternoon service was omitted, owing to two services only being taken in any church or chapel, the total for the Church of England was 29,307, for Nonconformists 11,837, Roman Catholic 7,705, other services 660. Out of a total attendance of 49,509 the Church of England numbered 29,307. Up to the present the enumeration has dealt with boroughs of a total population of 1,523,710. The Church of England attendances have been shown as 166,298, Nonconformist 108,209, Roman Catholic 29,533, various 12,983, and the total 317,023. Roughly the Anglican attendances have been rather more than half, the Nonconformist very slightly over one-third, and the Roman Catholic about one-eleventh of the total attendances. The Nonconformist attendances are not quite two-thirds of those of the Church of England.”

Briefly, the questions which remain open in our Periodicals and Reviews are especially those of the birth and resurrection of Christ, of the Biblical Criticism, of the Athanasian Creed, of the Disestablishment, of the rights of laity in the Church, of Catholicism and Romanism, of the *Via media*, &c.

Allow me to draw your attention on our *Association for the Furtherance of Christianity in Egypt*. You know that the Mo-

hamedanism shows a great resistance. At last I conclude by mentioning a very full account on the last number of the “Revue internationale de Théologie”, which has appeared in the “Church Times” Febr. 13, in which we read: “We have no other learned periodical so unique in character and so full of matter which is of moment to the Church of England, and tending, at least indirectly, to justify her standing before the rest of Christendom.”
