Zeitschrift: Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review

Band: 15 (1907)

Heft: 60

Artikel: Questions anglicanes

Autor: Popham Blyth, G.F.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403693

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: 22.01.2026

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

QUESTIONS ANGLICANES.

* **Continuation des discussions sur la loi scolaire.** — On sait que la loi scolaire actuellement en vigueur en Angleterre favorise les anglicans et les catholiques aux dépens des protestants non-conformistes, en accordant de larges subsides à des écoles confessionnelles qui tiennent lieu, dans beaucoup d'endroits, d'écoles publiques, et où les dissidents ne peuvent remplir l'office d'instituteur, tandis que leurs enfants n'y sont admis comme élèves que sur un pied d'infériorité. Aussi la réforme de la loi scolaire a-t-elle été l'un des principaux articles du programme que le parti libéral a arboré aux dernières élections parlementaires, et qui l'a fait triompher grâce à l'appui presque unanime des non-conformistes.

Le nouveau Cabinet libéral a donc cherché, dès son avènement, à tenir compte des griefs de ses alliés dissidents. Mais le Bill sur l'Education présenté en 1906 au Parlement par M. A. Birrell, fils d'un pasteur baptiste et alors ministre de l'Instruction publique, bill adopté par la Chambre des communes, a été rejeté par la Chambre des Lords. Depuis, M. Mackenna, qui a succédé à M. Birrell, a vainement tenté de faire voter par les communes un projet de portée moins radicale, mais qui retirait néanmoins une petite partie des subsides de l'Etat aux écoles primaires confessionnelles, lorsque l'enseignement religieux donné dans ces écoles ne s'en tiendrait pas à un certain minimum biblique sans caractère proprement ecclésiastique (système Cowper Temple).

Désespérant, vu la résistance de la Chambre haute, de résoudre la question pendante par une loi scolaire, M. Mackenna a profité de ce que les Lords n'ont pas le droit d'intervenir en matière financière pour essayer d'arriver à son but par la voie budgétaire et par de simples arrêtés ministériels. Il a demandé aux communes un premier crédit de fr. 2,500,000 pour

la construction d'écoles publiques non-confessionnelles dans les localités où il n'existe encore que des écoles confessionnelles. Il a ensuite arrêté qu'aucune école normale ne pourrait exiger de ses élèves une profession de foi ecclésiastique déterminée sans se voir retirer la moitié des subsides qu'elle recevrait de l'Etat. Ces diverses mesures, destinées à favoriser la neutralité religieuse des écoles officiellement subventionnées, ont été vivement combattues à la Chambre par M. Balfour, l'ancien chef du Cabinet conservateur, et par divers orateurs anglicans ou catholiques, mais les communes ont cependant approuvé la politique de M. Mackenna par 220 voix contre 97.

Les évêques attaquent cette politique; le *Church Times* déploie contre elle une véritable violence (voir les numéros des 9 et 23 août, etc.).

* **Discussions sur le Désétablissement.** — Dans cette agitation, la question du désétablissement ne pouvait manquer d'être soulevée. Un membre du parlement, M. Napier, a déclaré que le désétablissement ne pourrait faire que du bien à l'Eglise, mais que la question n'était pas mûre. Le Rev. W. C. Thomas l'a, au contraire, combattu sous toutes ses formes; M. Laurence Hardy, membre du parlement, a pensé qu'il serait très nuisible à l'Eglise d'Angleterre; et l'archevêque de Cantorbéry, qu'il serait pour l'Eglise moins la perte d'un privilège que la suppression d'une responsabilité formidable. Il importe de remarquer que, dans cette discussion, de nombreuses protestations ont été émises contre ceux qui font de la politique dans l'Eglise: le jour où l'Eglise anglicane deviendrait un corps politique, elle cesserait d'être une Eglise nationale.

* **Discussions sur le mariage entre beaux-frères et belles-sœurs (with deceased wife's sister).** — Les journaux en sont remplis; voir, par exemple, le *Church Times* des 23 et 30 août.

La Chambre des Lords a fini par adopter, le 26 ou le 27 août, par 98 voix contre 54 (il y a eu une foule d'absents ou d'abstentionnistes), le projet de loi, — déjà voté par la Chambre des communes, — qui autorisera, dans la Grande-Bretagne, le mariage entre un veuf et la sœur de la femme défunte. L'Angleterre était restée le seul pays du monde où les unions de ce genre fussent considérées comme illicites. Depuis 1835, époque à laquelle la question avait été mise sur

le tapis, la Chambre des Communes votait de temps en temps une loi autorisant ces mariages, mais la Chambre des Lords se mettait toujours en travers de ce progrès. L'an passé, toutefois, elle avait consenti à légaliser dans les Iles Britanniques les unions de cet ordre régulièrement contractées dans les colonies anglaises. Cette première concession, qui avait fait cesser une foule de situations douloureuses, avait marqué le commencement de la déroute des ultraconservateurs.

Les adversaires du changement proposé assuraient qu'en enlevant à un homme la possibilité d'épouser jamais la sœur de sa femme, la législation anglaise avait garanti le règne des bonnes mœurs et le repos des ménages dans un pays où des sœurs célibataires vivent souvent sous le toit de leurs sœurs mariées. Mais le vrai motif de la résistance acharnée de la plupart des évêques et de tous les législateurs du bord ritualiste, c'était que l'interdiction des mariages entre beaux-frères et belles-sœurs figure dans les canons que l'Eglise anglicane a empruntés à l'ancienne Eglise catholique indivisée, et que, pour les partisans de la Haute-Eglise, les sept premiers conciles œcuméniques doivent continuer à tout jamais à faire autorité dans l'Eglise anglicane. Dans l'Eglise catholique, les mariages dont il s'agit sont aussi proscrits en théorie; mais on s'en tire, en pratique, en achetant une dispense. Or, cette combinaison mercantile était à juste titre réprouvée par les anglicans, qui se trouvaient de la sorte contraints par leurs principes à être plus catholiques que les catholiques eux-mêmes.

La nouvelle loi prévoit qu'aucun clergyman de l'Eglise établie ne sera forcé de bénir lui-même un mariage qu'il jugerait contraire aux lois de cette Eglise, et l'évêque de Londres a adressé à ses subordonnés une lettre pastorale où il les exhorte à refuser, en pareil cas, soit d'officier, soit même de concéder l'usage du sanctuaire dont ils ont les clefs. Mais son mot d'ordre ne sera point universellement suivi.

En vérité, ce respect pour un article de la discipline de l'ancienne Eglise, a lieu de surprendre dans une Eglise qui, malgré les anciens canons, procède sans difficulté aux secondes noces des évêques.

* **Discussion sur la revision du « Prayer Book ».** — Les uns la réclament, d'autres la combattent. Il semble que la majorité

reconnaît l'utilité de certains changements, mais trouve ces changements trop dangereux dans les circonstances actuelles, et en somme désire que les évêques intreprètent les rubriques avec largeur d'esprit, en dehors de l'étroitesse des « Actes d'uniformité ».

Les opinions de l'évêque Gore, en particulier, ne plaisent pas à tout le monde. « Un Anglican » publie à son sujet, dans le *Guardian* du 24 août, la lettre suivante :

SIR—May I, as an old-fashioned Anglican, ask some of your readers if they can explain what Dr. Gore really means in his new Preface, which was quoted in *The Guardian* of July 31st? The Bishop says that "The main object of the book is to set the specifically Anglican teaching of our formularies on a larger background by going back behind the Reformation and the middle age upon the ancient Catholic teaching and upon the Bible". "I have to admit that Anglican standards are in certain respects defective and even misleading when taken by themselves."

The Bishop seems to desire to make certain additions to "Aglican standards"; he seems to wish to go back "behind the Reformation" and, I presume, behind the Prayer Book. As one who has the most intense reverence for the Prayer Book, may I ask whether such language as this is quite compatible with loyalty to the Prayer Book and loyalty to the Church of England? If individuals are allowed to go back "behind the Reformation", where will they stop? If "Anglican standards are in certain respects defective", how can men who think they are defective say at the most solemn moment of their lives that they will "minister the doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded and as this Church and Realm hath received the same"? I write in no carping or unkind spirit. I wish merely to be informed how the Bishop's views, as laid down in this Preface, agree with the formularies and the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer. AN ANGLICAN.

Bon nombre réclament la liberté de se conformer aux principes et au coutumes « catholiques ». On lit, par exemple, dans le *Guardian* du 17 juillet, la correspondance suivante :

SIR—In the Rev. L. S. Wainright's report and in his speech at St. Peter's, London Docks, his disobedience to the Bishop in the matter of the use of incense and the method of Reservation is represented as necessarily following from a belief in one Catholic and Apostolic Church. I fancy that most people who have really

studied the history of the Church and its worship would agree that, if the unity of a Church depended upon uniformity in outward devotional practices, there would be and would have been quite a number of churches, while the duty of obedience to the Bishop has been generally recognised as a Catholique principle. As to the method of Reservation, I am not aware in what precisely the divergence of view between the Bishop and the priests consits, but the following statement of principle from an eminent mediæval authority, wo cannot be suspected of Protestantism, probably touches it; it is given as a reason for not enclosing the Blessed Sacrament in an altar when this is consecrated: — "Corpus Christi est cibus animae, qui non debet servari nisi ad opus infirmorum et refectionem animarum" (Johannes de Turrecremata, 1388-1468 A. D., quoted by Duranti, *de Ritibus Ecclesiae Catholicae*).

As regards incense, its uses are proved to have been of rather late introduction, particulary the censing of persons and things (see Duchesne, *Christian Worship, its Origin and Evolution*, especially note on p. 163), and in *The Case for Incense* (p. 153) documentary evidence is given showing that in more than two-thirds of the parish churches of England incense could not have been used at all just before the Reformation, St. Peter's is a parish church. Were two-thirds of the English parish churches of that time outside the Catholic Church? The principle contended for really amounts to nothing higher than this—that a priest may disobey his Bishop if he happens to disagree with him, perhaps on partial or inaccurate information. It brings down the Bishop near to the position which he held for a time in a part of the Celtic Church, making him a sort of dignified machine for confirming, ordaining, and consecrating churches, without jurisdiction. It makes one doubt whether (according to this view) the Church of England is really an Episcopal Church, as is commonly supposed, and not Presbyterian or rather Congregationalist. It shows a strange absence of a sense of proportion. And it erects into a Catholic principle one or more practices (not beliefs) which were demonstrably not used *semper* or *ubique* and still less *ab omnibus*. Mr. Wainright's character and work make the position the more lamentable. ARTHUR C. CHAMPNEYS.

On le voit, on est loin de s'entendre. Ce qu'il y a de plus déplorable dans toutes ces discussions, c'est qu'elles se font sans norme. Chacun va au hasard de son opinion plus ou moins fantaisiste, et ne se préoccupe nullement d'établir d'abord ce que l'Eglise chrétienne a enseigné et pratiqué (si tant est qu'elle ait eu un enseignement et une pratique identiques partout et

toujours). On n'a pas le sentiment de l'universel; le vrai catholicisme est ignoré; les romanisants croient qu'il consiste dans la conformité avec Rome! Lord Halifax et ses disciples ne voient que cela, ne comprennent que cela, ne veulent que cela.

* **Continuation des discussions sur l'eucharistie.** — On sait que la Commission royale de Discipline ecclésiastique, dans un Rapport célèbre, s'est prononcée contre certaines pratiques qui ne lui paraissent pas conformes à la doctrine de l'Eglise d'Angleterre, notamment en matière eucharistique. Lord Halifax, président de l'*English Church Union,* a prononcé, le 20 juin, un discours contre cette décision. Ce discours a fait bruit [1]). Les évêques, les prêtres, les simples fidèles, sont divisés. Les uns sont avec les Commissaires, les autres contre. Il faut lire les nombreuses correspondances publiées à cette occasion, dans le *Guardian* des 17 et 24 juillet, des 14, 21 et 28 août, etc. Il va de soi que Lord Halifax, laïque, défend les droits des laïques contre les évêques qui se permettent de ne pas penser comme lui. «Quand des évêques, leur dit-il, sont choisis par des hommes qui peuvent n'être pas, et qui parfois ne sont pas des ecclésiastiques; quand de toutes façons, ils sont dirigés et influencés par des considérations tout autres que celles que doivent leur inspirer les fonctions apostoliques, ils ne peuvent guère se soustraire aux conséquences d'une position *si anormale.* Ils ne peuvent guère attendre que ceux-là se taisent qui pensent que *la vérité est trahie.* Le temps est passé où l'on n'osait pas parler hardiment: l'expérience prouve qu'on ne gagne rien à étouffer les *scandales* et que, si les choses vont mal, il vaut mieux le reconnaître et essayer d'y porter remède. Et d'abord . . . le Rapport d'une Commission royale, quelle qu'en soit l'importance, n'est pas de ceux qui font autorité en matière ecclésiastique. Donc, un évêque qui, dans ses actes épiscopaux, prend pour guide et pour excuse les recommandations et les déclarations de ce Rapport, va contre tous les vrais principes de l'autorité spirituelle, et en revient aux pires et aux plus dangereux excès de l'époque des Tudors». Cette

---

[1]) L'orateur y traite de l'eucharistie, de l'*Ave Maria* et de l'invocation des Saints, ainsi que des prières pour les morts, de la Réunion, de l'Eglise méconnue, de la revision du Prayer Book, etc. La traduction française en a été publiée dans la «Revue catholique des Eglises» (juillet 1907), p. 440—452.

sortie était surtout dirigée contre l'archevêque de Cantorbéry et ses partisans.

Je n'ai pas à prendre parti dans ce débat, je ne suis que simple rapporteur. On lira avec utilité l'article suivant, publié dans le *Guardian* du 7 août:

Eucharistic Doctrine and the Royal Commission.

The correspondence we hawe recently printed on this subject has indicated the existence of a serious misapprehension of the intentions of the Ecclesiastical Discipline Commission and of the range of Eucharistic doctrine. The Commission has been charged with the intentional use of ambiguous terms, and the Bishop of Oxford, together with his colleagues, has been denounced for denying the doctrine of the Real Presence and declaring it repugnant to the teaching of the Church of England. The Bishop of Oxford has now replied, and his answer is so complete that it sets us inquiring how the misapprehension under which his opponents labour can have arisen. We think that in regard to both points above mentioned there has been misunderstanding, and that the intention of the Commissioners and the nature of doctrinal statements have both been misconceived.

Though the charge against the Commissioners that they have intentionally used ambiguous language is at the present moment the more vexatious of the two, it is of less permanent importance than the other. The Commissioners were not intrusted with the task of defining doctrine, and they have not done so. They had to investigate ritual irregularities. They find, on inquiry, that a large number of these exist, of every degree of importance, and not confined to one party in the Church. To have reported that all, being irregular, were equally deserving of condemnation would have been absurd. But, unless they had so reported, they were bound to find some principle of distinction. In the last resort, the doctrine held by any ecclesiastical body must determine all its outward corporate acts; and though in times of tranquillity it may not be necessary to refer to fundamentals at every stage, yet, at a time when the practice of the Church has moved away from the Prayer-book type in very various fashions, the only possible hope of peace lies in a common recurrence to principle. If the Commissioners had intended to define doctrine, they must have considered and deliberated upon the problems involved and given their judgment. Instead of doing this they have gone to the Judgment in the Bennett case, as being a *de facto* declaration of the law and as endorsing the carefully weighed words of Dr. Pusey in regard to the

Eucharist, and have used the determinations in this case as a test of the practices in question. It is irrelevant to the issue what the private opinions of the Commissioners on the subject may be. Taken in conjunction with Dr. Pusey's definition the Judgment is held to declare a limit beyond which it is impossible to go without departing from the English doctrinal standard. The misapprehensions here seem to have arisen because it has been hastily assumed that the Commissioners were attempting to define doctrine, and not applying rules already laid down in a leading case. It may be well in this connection to call attention to the exact words in dispute in the Bennett case. In the earlier edition of his work Mr. Bennett had used the expression, "The real, actual, and visible Presence of the Lord upon the altars of our churches" and "Who miself adore, and teach the people to adore, the consecrated elements, believing Christ to be in them—believing that, under their veil, is the sacred body and blood of my Lord an Saviour Jesus Christ". Of these words Sir R. Phillimore says, "I have no doubt that Mr. Bennett has contravened the plain meaning and clear intent of the formularies of the Church". In the later editions of his book under the advice of Dr. Pusey, he substituted for these expressions "The real, actual presence of our Lord, under the form of bread and wine, upon the altars of our churches", and "Who myself adore and teach the people to adore Christ present in the elements, under the form of bread and wine". These last phrases were decided to be "not contrary to the law", and "not to have exceeded the liberty which the law allows upon these sujects". Thus the standard to which the Commissioners refer involves a distinction between adoration of "the consecrated elements" and adoration of "Christ present in the elements"; and the Commission has condemned no doctrine but that renounced by Mr. Bennett upon the advice of Dr. Pusey.

The other charge, that of denying the doctrine of the Real Presence, is more serious, because here there is a confusion between doctrine and certain implications of doctrine, which cannot but create widespread difficulty and distress. All Eucharistic doctrine goes back upon the words of institution. All Christians put some meaning on these words, but, unfortunately, not the same meaning. In the present connection we may be said to be concerned with two variations of interpretation. There are those who believe in a spiritual Presence of the Lord dependent on the faith of the recipient of the Sacrament. Others go further. They hold that, in accordance with His promise, the Lord comes to the soul through the sacramental elements, or, further, that this Presence is not constituted by the faith of the recipient, but is, in a true sense, inde-

pendent of it. Those who hold the second of these views, which is equivalent to that of Mr. Bennett, and is recognised in the Bennett Judgment and by the Commissioners, cannot in fairness be described otherwise than as fully accepting the Real Presence. On the basis of this doctrine there has been raised a vast superstructure of inference and speculation. Efforts have been made to express the Presence in terms of current metaphysical theory—the doctrine of Transubstantiation is a conspicuous instance of this. Inferences have been drawn as to the relation of the Presence to time and space, and a number of practices have come into use illustrating and depending on these inferences. Among these is the tendency to separate the consecrated species from the Eucharistic Office, and treat it as an independent vehicle of the Divine Presence. To this tendency we owe the adoration of the Reserved Sacrament, and, in more recent times, the service of Benediction and the like. The Lord's promise contains nothing that bears on the subsequent effects of consecration, and the inferences on the subject depend upon a number of uncertain considerations—the degree in which it is possible to apply ordinary logic in matters of this kind, the exact meaning of the use of material things as a vehicle for spiritual forces, and the like. Hence, it is perfectly legitimate to hold strongly the doctrine of the Real Presence, and yet to question the desirability of Reservation for purposes of adoration or Benediction. These practises are not necessary consequences of the doctrine. It is true that a large number of persons in the Western Church draw them and think them valid; but it is also true that persons who, like Dr. Pusey and Mr. Keble, firmly held the doctrine of the Real Presence, made no effort to recommend or enforce the practices. The English Church has not formally and fully defined its doctrine of the Eucharist or of the Eucharistic Presence. It has, however, discontinued all the practices which flowed from the inference mentioned above. It is difficult to believe that if it accepted the inference, it would have ceased the practices.

Happily the question can be discussed on its merits, and not as a case of confidence in Dr. Pusey and Mr. Keble. Various citation from the works of these great and holy men have been brought forward, and the Bishop of Oxford has been challenged to say what he thinks of them. Surely this is irrelevant. The Bishop might accept *ex animo* every word that has been produced from these authorities, and yet condemn the practices scheduled in the Report. The citations would only be valid against him provided it could be shown that Dr. Pusey and Mr. Keble were themselves prepared to sanction the practices in question, and used their words for this purpose. No attempt whatever has been made to show

this. What has been said of the Tractarian leaders applies with no less force to citations from other authorities. There is no subject in regard to which it is more imperatively necessary to be sure that language cited as authoritative refers to the exact phase and aspect of the problem under discussion than the Eucharist. For in the nature of the case it raises questions of the greatest subtilety, lying on the very edge of the knowledge possible to man. Its use as a source of health and strength tho the soul needs no subtilety; the theoretical treatment of it soon takes the deepest thinker out of his depth.

* **Les principales fractions de l'Eglise anglicane.** — Les points de vue de la *Low Church* ne sont ni ceux de la *High Church*, ni ceux de la *Broad Church*, et réciproquement. Les lecteurs désireux de constater ces divisions, peuvent lire les deux articles suivants, publiés, le premier, dans le *Church Times* du 9 août, le second, dans le *Guardian* du 14.

(1) *The future of the Low Church Party.* In using the historic designation "Low Church" rather than "Evangelical," we apprehend that we offend no susceptibilities, for the party of which we speak avowedly repudiates a too lofty and mysterious conception of the Church and its ordinances. We also guard ourselves against giving away a name which, in its true sense, belongs most rightly, we consider, to Catholic Christians, and which it would be obviously absurd to refuse to the writings of an à Kempis, a St. Theresa, a Law, or a Pusey. Every spiritual awakening has in a sense been Evangelical—certainly the Tractarian Movement was so. It has been an austere preaching of repentance and a tender declaration of the pardoning love of God in Christ. Such a doctrine has no apparent affinity with Zwinglian views of the Sacraments and Erastian views of the Church. In the teaching of the early Methodists it was associated with a high doctrine of both. It is true that the thought of Christianity as simply a proclaiming of glad tidings, apart from any complementary aspect of it, was easily made to fit with religious individualism, with rejection of ecclesiastical authority and of a corporate, Catholic ideal of Church life and discipline. It was such a one-sided presentment of the Gospel which came to be called Evangelicalism. But in the Bible the Gospel or Word is always the Gospel or Word of the Kingdom, and the severance of the one from the other, of the message from the fold, of the life from the organism, was easy and human, but was certainly not Scriptural or « spiritual. »

It is, moreover, a question which the party of inorganic Churchmanship has gravely to consider, whether it will be possible

for long to be Protestant individualists and at the same time to remain Evangelical. What is to save Low Churchmen from the fate which has overtaken Continental Protestantism and which is overtaking English and American Dissent? The former is scarcely distinguishable from Socinianism. The latter, long on the downgrade, and now hovering at the gates of the new theology, will in another generation, as far as we may judge by appearances, have reached the same goal. The Rector of Bermondsey, in the current *Nineteenth Century*, after some plain speaking on the shortcomings of his party, holds, nevertheless, that its best days are yet to come, his chief reason for this confidence being the John Bull characteristics of Protestantism. "The Evangelical claim for the Christian's right of private judgment, and the demand to subject all religious teaching to the test of Scripture, are but expressions of the passion for liberty which has coursed for centuries in the flow of English blood." But when the same passion for liberty claims to apply the inalienable right of private judgment to "the test of Scripture" itself, what barrier has the "Evangelical" left to interpose against a disintegrating rationalism? Everyone knows that the authority, authenticity, truth, and traditional interpretation of the Holy Scriptures are being fiercely challenged. It can no longer be assumed that every seriousminded man accepts the Bible as a rule of faith. Some leading Low Churchmen are themselves among the destructive critics. It may be safely affirmed, then, that a party which discards Catholic consent in religion will soon have to surrender the Catholic Scriptures. It will also find it difficult to retain the Catholic Lord's Day. Nor is it clear how it will save the Catholic Creeds—in the lands of Calvin and Luther even to recite the Apostles' Creed is coming to be considered reactionary—or the Catholic doctrine of the Fall and Priestly Atonement, or the Catholic conception of wedlock, or indeed any other mystical and supernatural element of the Catholic religion.

Canon Lewis, in the article we have referred to, blames Low Churchmen for thinking that Popery, rather than materialism, is still the enemy, for drifting without any defined policy or leadership, and for readiness to work on undenominational lines with political Liberationists and bitter assailants of Voluntary schools—in fact, they subscribe, he says, much more generously to undenominational institutions than to their own societies inside the Church, and, instead of starting a publishing organization for themselves, rely on the Religious Tract Society, which may not publish anything of a directly Church of England character. He further criticizes their absorption in foreign missions to the neglect of the „condition-of-England question," quoting Sir Charles Booth, who says in his

Religious Influences in London: "To a world that demands vitality these oldfashioned Evangelical churches offer a worn-out presentment of the Gospel, lacking the power to move anyone." We must say that we are not quick to join in denunciations of preaching which mounts above the facts of daily life or in talk about „the heathen at home." It is its other-worldliness and its enthusiasm for the spread of the Gospel which has been the salt saving party "Evangelicalism" from death. Still, anyone who remembers what the ordinary town church was like thirty years ago, after a century of dreary and cold Protestantism, will have marvelled at the blindness of Low Churchmanship in the day of its ascendancy to the opportunity at its doors. It was especially neglectful of childhood, and pushed away the poor into corners and „free seats." Even in its emotional Clapham form, it tended to be the religion of the suburban rich man with the gold ring. Nor has it yet got rid of pew-rents and plutocracy.

Canon Lewis, however, boldly claims for "Evangelicalism" that it is the religion of the masses, and that at least two-thirds of the nation are in sympathy with it. This may merely be another way of saying that it has entirely lost its hold over the cultured classes and its touch with literature and thought. For a religious mode which once relied so greatly on the drawing-room to appeal now only to the parlour is a confession of intellectual impoverishment. Nor can we admit that Low Churchmanship has gained with the young the ground it has lost with their elders. It may be, as the Rector of Bermondsey affirms, essentially democratic, regarding, as it does, every layman as a priest and all Christians as equal. But it is a fallacy to suppose that brotherly fellowship is hindered by those hierarchical distinctions in the Church which Christ Himself ordained. If "Evangelicalism" still has its successes, they are due to what it retains of its old earnestness for the cause of Jesus Christ, not to the substitution of a "simple," in the sense of a non-sacramental and non-mysterious, Christianity for the fuller teaching of the Bible and Prayer Book. A less creditable side of the attractiveness which Mr. Lewis says that the new Evangelicalism has for the rising generation is, we are bound to say, its use of sensationalism. Do the crowded audiences which he speaks of come Sunday after Sunday to be told how they may take up the Cross daily and live lives of mortification? Protestantism rejects such primitive and Scriptural modes of self-discipline as fasting, voluntary poverty and obedience. Does it put anything in their place? If not, its power to reach the conscience of mankind must be evanescent.

We consider that for a long time to come the fear of Rome will keep in existence a party opposed to the recovery of the Church of England's Catholic heritage. This party will also be the defenders of the view of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and ministerial commission as being immediately of human rather than Divine appointment, and will, therefore, extend a semi-recognition, tempered by social exclusiveness, to Dissent. It will sincerely think that it holds a spiritual view of the Church of Christ, yet it will be tempted to accept the alliance of the world against "priestcraft," and slow to cease to lean upon the Parliamentary Egypt, which it still calls the voice of the laity. It will have its irresponsible Bashi-bazouks in the Kensitites. In fact, this party will become, as the Huguenots became, increasingly "Protestant" and less and less "Evangelical." It will be Low Church in the sense of Walpole and Palmerston, not in the sense of Simeon and Venn. Its more spiritual elements will, we firmly believe, find more and more their true home in the tradition of Andrewes and Ken and Wilson and Keble. For no school of thought can live without a philosophy or sundered from theology and history. Calvinism will soon be extinct. The Augustinian, Dominican, Port-Royalist, and anti-Pelagian conception of religion can never, it is true, be extinct, and this may be claimed as in tone Puritan and Evangelical. But if so, it is that higher Puritanism and fuller Evangelicalism which is merely Catholicism meditating upon sin and its redemption. Is not this the point where all spiritually-minded Churchmen can meet?

(2) *An Apology for the Broad Church.* — July 30, 1907. The current number of the *American Journal of Theology*, published at the University of Chicago, contains an unsigned article on "Recent Changes in Theology in the Protestant Episcopal Church." The article appears to have its place in a series of papers in which representative writers are confessing and defending the changes that have recently taken place in the statements of theological doctrine in their several religious bodies. In this instance the *Journal* departs from its usual custom and withholds the name of the writer—at his request we are told, and for special reasons. This prepares the reader for some startling expressions of opinion or interpretation; but in reality the paper is sober and thoughtful, and any exaggeration which it shows is evidently honest. It is, in fact, an apology for the school of Broad Churchmanship in our Church to-day, almost entirely free from the *odium theologicum*, whether *suggestivum* or *comparativum*. And, as written in large part for readers who are not in sympathy with the position of the Anglican and "Episcopal" Church (or Churches), it makes a clear

statement of concepts which, says the author, "are primary and fundamental in determining and describing the Anglican Church:"—

„First, historic continuity of idea and organisation from the New Testament Church to the present time; and secondly, the expression by the historically continued Church of the essential religious genius and life of the people or of the State. The Anglican Church claims authenticity by reason of historical continuity with New Testament Christianity, and by reason of her true and vital expressions of the life and genius of the English State. . . . . Nevertheless, it is not claimed that the State Church idea is any part of the New Testament tradition, but rather an evolution from political necessity."

The writer goes on to say, and apparently as a Broad Churchman he expresses and holds no dissent from the statement, that the Anglican Church is, strictly speaking, not a Church, but a branch of the Catholic Church, and that "the Catholic Church is practically in a state of suspense," by reason of the divisions in the world between East and West and in Europe between North and South. Thus, "the Anglican Church, like the Roman and like the Greek, is unable to get a quorum, and therefore unable to act;" and consequently she is unable either to make or to modify doctrine. Since, therefore, the Anglican Church cannot change her Creed, she is obliged to resort to an increase of the function of interpretation. Then follows an interesting and, in my judgment, instructive assumption—or perhaps I should say argument—that the Broad Church of to-day is really the Low Church of history, dominant in the English Reformation—for it took time for the High Church party to come into full consciousness of itself and of its position—but "restrained by the native tendency of the English mind to compromise." Passing on to our own ("the Episcopal") Church, the writer holds that at the time of its organisation, after the Revolution, the demand for Catholicity was as strong as it was in England at the Reformation, but that the circumstances of the case required that the expression of the genius of our people should be "strictly moral and spiritual, not political and official;" and in the way in which this showed itself he finds the working of Broad Church principles. Then he proceeds to sever the Broad Church "ideal and spirit" from the Low Church party—why did he ever bring them together?—declaring that the latter was always and almost exclusively Protestant, politically Liberal, yet theologically unelastic and non-progressive, and tracing the former to the new social consciousness of modern times and to the new methods of intellectual and religious thought. And of the Broad Church

movement, as a process of interpretation, it is affirmed that it has three fundamental characteristics:—

"The conception of religious development by evolution as well as by revelation, profound sympathy with universal humanity, and love of truth. These characteristics are themselves, however, the result of three great propositions of faith, two of which at least are cardinal faith-propositions of the Episcopal Church—faith in God, faith in the Incarnation, and faith in man as the child of God."

I have written thus at length in regard to this article in its former part, because it will help you to understand the strong and honest position held by the really leading men among us in what could be called the Broad Church party or school. But it would not be honest to the High Churchman's convictions, or, indeed, to those of the writer of the article, to refrain from mentioning the two examples which the author finally gives of recent changes in Episcopal theology. One has to do with the manner of the Incarnation, the other with the manner (if it may be so called) of the Holy Trinity. While the writer affirms that "the Episcopal Church never held more firmly than she does now the belief in the Incarnation as a fundamental fact of Christianity," he limits its meaning when he declares soon after "that God was in Jesus Christ reconciling the world unto Himself is the unquestioned belief of the whole Episcopal Church." From this more than questionable exegesis of St. Paul's words (for ἐν Χριστῷ must be taken with κόσμον καταλλάσσων and not immediately with ἦν), he derives a substitute for the specific historical statement of the Creed, or a sort of interpretation of it; not, as he is careful to say, because the doctrine of the Creed is not true, but because it is not essential to the religious consciousness of our time. And, again, he claims that whereas in ancient times Catholic theology, using the phraseology of the Councils, kept itself monotheistic, Church theology finds it hard to do so to-day except by a kind of "renaissance of the old conception of the modal"—perhaps he had better have said the economic—"Trinity." He apparently thinks that the Unitarian reaction in America was in the direction of Sabellianism, and that as such it influenced Horace Bushnell and some leaders of thought in our Church. This is a serious historical error, for, as I wrote recently in referring to the changes at the King's Chapel in Boston, the beginnings of Unitarianism were in Arianism, which was accepted in revolt from Calvinism. And that early Arianism was very different from what some think that they can be satisfied with just now, because they are impatient of definitions—that is to say, impatient of clear thinking.

One cannot but recognise the danger; one is glad to confess that soberness and honesty and the search for clear thinking will avoid it. I am minded to add from this article a sentence which will commend itself to many who might not accept all its possible applications:—

"To the mind of a Churchman the right to blunder theologically, if he blunder honestly, is as sacred as is to a democrat the right to blunder politically; for he feels that the free life of the Church is sufficiently powerful to restrain and combine in healthful growth the free life of her individual members."

Remarquons, à cette occasion, que le *Church Times* et même le *Guardian* sont, chaque jour, envahis davantage par des correspondants *romains*, qui y exposent, comme chez eux, la politique du Vatican, le nouveau Syllabus, les affaires de Rome, les récriminations des ultramontains de France, etc. Les ouvrages et les Revues du parti romaniste y sont analysés pieusement et favorablement; c'est du miel sur leurs lèvres. Les publications qui réfutent les erreurs romaines sont, au contraire, tues avec prudence, ou, si l'on fait mine de les analyser, c'est avec une superficialité qui fait sourire les connaisseurs[1]; les habiles analystes glissent sur tout cela comme chat sur braise...

* **The coming Lambeth Conference. The Programme. Letter from the Primate.** — The following letter has been addressed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishops of the Anglican communion who are entitled to attend the Lambeth Conference of 1908:—

"Lambeth Palace, S. E., July 24th, 1907.

"Right Reverend and dear Brother—I write to give you definite information with respect to the arrangements which have now been made for the Conference of Bishops of the Anglican communion to be held at Lambeth, if God will, in the summer of 1908.

"It is proposed that the Conference shall assemble for deliberation on Monday, July 6th, and shall sit till Saturday, July 11th, when, in accordance with precedent, it will adjourn for a fortnight in order that the Conference Committees may have full opportunity of deliberation. The Conference will re-assemble on Monday, July 27th, and will conclude its session on Wednesday, August 5th. A detailed programme notifying the special services to be held before

[1]) La *Revue internationale de Théologie* en sait quelque chose.

the opening day and other particulars will be circulated at an early date. I am able now to give you information as to the subjects which will be discussed.

"In conjunction with the Bishops, who have been good enough to co-operate with me in making the preliminary arrangements, I have given careful consideration to the many suggestions which have reached me from my Episcopal brethren in all parts of the world as to the subjects upon which it is thought desirable that we should deliberate. The following have been definitely selected for discussion:—

"1. The Christian Faith in relation to Modern Thought, scientific and philosophical.

"2. The Moral Witness of the Church in relation to:—(*a*) the democratic ideal; (b) social and economic questions.

"3. Supply and Training of Clergy.

"4. Foreign Missions.—(*a*) The growth of the Church on racial and national lines—1. Asia; 2. Africa; 3. America. (*b*) Correlation and co-operation of missionary agencies.

"5. Reunion and Inter-Communion.—(*a*) Episcopal Churches; (*b*) Non-episcopal Churches; report of Committee appointed to consider the question of the *Unitas Fratrum.*

"6. Organisation within the Anglican Communion.—(*a*) A central consultative body; (*b*) a tribunal of reference; (*c*) the relations of Primates and Metropolitans in the Colonies and elsewhere to te See of Canterbury; (*d*) the limitations of the authority of a Diocesan Bishop.

"7. Interchange of Service at Home and Abroad.—Temporary foreign service; cautionary regulations; Colonial Clergy Act.

"8. Prayer-book adaptation and Enrichment.—(*a*) Rubrics, Text, Lectionary; (*b*) *Quicunque Vult.*

"9. The Conditions requisite to the Due Administration of the Holy Communion.

"10. Marriage Problems—(*a*) divorce; (*b*) prohibited degrees; (*c*) artificial restriction on population.

"11. Religious Education in Schools.

"12. Ministries of Healing—(*a*) the unction of the sick; (*b*) faith healing and 'Christian Science'.

"13. Report of the Committee on Communities and Deaconnesses.

"Resolutions will also be moved on international peace; Sunday observance; the opium question. I would again ask your earnest

prayer that the Providence of God may assist our undertaking, and His Holy Spirit guide our counsels and our hearts.

"I remain always

"Your most faithful servant and brother,

"RANDALL CANTUAR.

"The Episcopal Secretaries of the Conference are the Bishop of Wakefield, Bishopgarth, Wakefield, and Bishop Montgomery, D.D., S.P.G. House Westminster, S.W."

* **The Finances of the Church.** — On lira avec intérêt la correspondance suivante, parue dans le *Guardian* du 17 juillet:

SIR—I think it was the Bishop of Manchester who said, when speaking on the question of new bishoprics, that he did not believe in "piecemeal legislation". As there is so much piecemeal legislation being advocated, I want to put in a plea for some general official scheme for the adequate subdivision of the whole country. I rejoice to see that one of the subjects for discussion at the Church Congress is the re-distribution of the finances of the Church. I trust this will lead those in autority to see the need of putting forward a general scheme for the proper organisation of the Church.

What obtains at present is that you have a huge army of many millions in the field, and you give to each General the oversight, in some cases, of millions—in all cases of hundreds of thousands—scattered over large areas, with an inadequate number of officers to work under him. The Generals must do one of two things—either kill themselves with ower-work or leave their work half-done. In either case the result is disastrous, and the enemy, better organised and disciplined, is gaining all along the line. The remedy you propose is to put a General here and there in the hope that he may pull the men together a bit. This is a short-sighted policy, and I earnestly appeal to the leaders and organisers of the Church forces to set to work about the proper re-organisation an re-distribution of districts and of money.

To take a few instances. The Diocese of Manchester has a population of 2,972,166, and the Bishop and income of 4,200 £; the Diocese of Carlisle has a population of 428,587, and an income of 4,500 £. The Diocese of Southwark has a population of 2,039,418, and the Bishop an income of 3,000 £; the Diocese of Salisbury a population of 374,669, and the Bishop an income of 5,000 £. It is surely time that these and such-like inequalities were brought to an end, and the whole country properly organised for Church work. If 3,000 £ is sufficient pay for Southwark with 2,039,418 people, why should Carlisle get 4,500 £ for under 500,000, or Truro

3,000 £ for 319,214? Or, again, if it is fair to ask one Bishop to rule over a population of 3 millions, why should another be allowed to have only 288,175? The obvious reply is that thorough rearrangement is necessary. The Church is paying 170,000 £ per annum for thirty-seven Bishop—a number admitted by nearly every one to be inadequate. Some general principles are necessary. I would suggest—no Diocese to execed a population of 500,000; no Diocesan Bishop to receive more than 2,000 £, with house and expenses; or Archbishop more than 5,000 £ per annum, with house and travelling expenses; no Archbishop to be a Diocesan also; no living or ecclesiastical preferment to be more than 1,000 £ per annum; only two residential canonries to be allowed in each Cathedral Chapter.

With these general principles to guide our reformers not only would there be an adequate increase of Diocses, but plenty of money to provide episcopal and archi-episcopal incomes, and the new Dioceses could provide adequate—I should say for preference small—houses. There would also be the means for making every living worth 200 £ per annum, and also for materially assisting the scheme for clergy pensions put forward by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. If the Church would set to work to effect such reform as this, the revival so much needed would come. If she does not, I very much fear that she will be weighed in the balances of the twentieth century and found wanting. Let every one who is interested in Church progress press for a comprehensive scheme of redistribution on common-sense lines, which will commend itself to all reasonable men.

NB. It is worth while setting out the division as it actually stands to-day:

Diocese.	Income.	Area.	Population.
York . . .	£ 10,000	—	1,677,593
Durham . .	7,000	776,591	1,107,622
Carlisle . .	4,500	1,478,416	428,587
Chester . .	4,200	611,288	816,020
Manchester .	4,200	—	2,972,166
Ripon . . .	4,200	—	1,135,165
Liverpool . .	4,200	—	1,352,419
Newcastle . .	3,569	1,271,515	606,253
Wakefield . .	3,000	—	753,249

The acreage of Yorkshire is 3,721,094, of Lancashire 1,299,816. A glance at the above table will show the inequality of division all round. Now what is obviously wanted is redistribution. Is it quite impossible that an Enabling Bill should be passed to enable the

Church to redistribute and reorganise? Suppose it possible, on what lines could we proceed? First, let us note that the heads of great State departements, with few exceptions, receive from 5,000 £ to 2,000 £ each.

Now, the question arises, Is there any need for a Diocesan Bishop to be paid more than the head of a State Department? Assuming that 2,000 £ per annum with a house and out-of-pocket expenses is enough for any man to exist upon, and that 500,000 people is a sufficient population for any single Diocese, how would this work out as a preliminary basis of redistribution? The population of the Nothern Province would require twenty-six Diocesan Bishops. Give each 2,000 £, and you would require the sum of 52,000 £, or 7,104 £ per annum more than our nine Bishops receive at present. In addition to this, an Archbishop should certainly not receive less than 5,000 £, with all out-of-pocket expenses, but, and this is important, he should not also be a Diocesan. A province with twenty-six Bishops would certainly be enough for one man without also having the cares and worries of a Diocese. That would give us at least 12,000 £ per annum to raise, in addition to existing expenditure, and the cost to each Diocese of a Bishop's residence and out-of-pocket expenses. I am bold to suggest two ways in which this could be raised. Allow no other preferment to exceed 1,000 £, and pool the rest—from deaneries, 2,080 £ per annum; livings, 10,000 £ per annum, perhaps. Reduce existing Cathedral establishments to two resident canonries, and pool the rest. That would bring 8,000 £ per annum, and let each Bishop be his own Dean, which would mean 8,580 £ per annum. By adopting either of these plans the 12,000 £ per annum is in sight. The latter would be the more easy of accomplishment, and it certainly seems obvious that since Liverpool, Newcastle, and Wakefield manage excellently without a Dean, the office of Dean could be easily performed by the Bishop in the smaller reconstituted Dioceses. In early days the Cathedral was the Bishop's church. Why cannot it be so again now that we are returning to more primitive ideals? Two questions remain—What to do with the historic palaces of the Bishops; and what about those Bishops who have seats in the House of Lords? 2,000 £ is not enough for them. The first difficulty would solve itself, I think, as soon as the redistribution scheme began to work, and we need not trouble about that now. In reply to the second I should advocate the adoption of the late Mr. Stables's suggestion that an extra 1,000 £ per annum should be found for each Bishop who had a seat in the House of Lords. I do not suggest now where that extra 1,000 £ is to be found

I only wish to point out that it is possible by a bold scheme of redistribution to make the Church in the Nothern Province an effective instrument, thoroughly organised and equipped for the great work that lies beyond her, without the labour of raising huge sums of money. It is not money we want so much as the power of adapting ourselves to the changing needs of the age. Let us do that, and money will come right enough. I have outlined a redistribution for twenty-six Dioceses; but suppose we made it twenty. It would be easier, perhaps, of accomplishment, and oh! what a blessed change from our present condition.

May I say one word more? The Primate of Australia receives 2,700 £ a year, the Archbishop of Melbourne 2,000 £, the Primate of India 3,500 £, the Primus of Scotland 664 £, the Archbishop of Dublin 2,500 £, the Bishop of Dunedin 400 £, the Bishop of Singapore, with a Diocese more than twice the size of the British Isles, 660 £. Is there such a difference between a Bishop in England and in the Colonies as to justify such distinctions as these? Do we not need to set our house in order? F. L. H. MILLARD.

Carlisle. (*Guardian*, August 28, 1907.)

CHURCH ORGANISATION. — The following notes from a letter from the Bishop of Massachusetts are printed by permission:—

"Our Missionary Bishops are paid about $ 3,000 and their travelling expenses. Some of them may have allowance for rent. Our Diocesan Bishops are paid what each Diocese can afford. A few, I think, have not more than $ 2,000, with, perhaps, travelling expenses; one or two possibly less. The average Bishop, I should say, might have $ 4,000 and travelling expenses, with or without a house. My salary is about $ 6,500, with a house, and without travelling expenses. This Diocese will have to pay the next Bishop a larger salary; having property of my own, I do not need more. The highest salary, that of the Bishop of New York, is, I think, about $ 12,000 and a house. The Diocese also pays the salary of the Bishop-Coadjutor. There is no tradition that the Bishops should head subscription papers and give largely. Without doubt, every Bishop gives largely as compared with his income. As to funds put at the disposal of the Bishop, in this Diocese there is $ 100,000, the income of which is subject to the direction of trustees, who usually turn to the Bishop for advice in its expenditure. Some Bishops take an offering at their Visitation for expenditure by themselves in Diocesan and charitable purposes. There is probably no obligation on the part of the Bishop to give an account of such offering, but no doubt most Bishops do either at the Diocesan Convention or in some semipublic way. . . . . As a matter of fact,

our Dioceses have so few parishes and Missions as compared with the English Dioceses (for instance, New York, the largest, has only 257 churches and chapels, and they run from that down to only thirty or forty). Most Bishops make a Visitation of every parish or Mission every year, and at some parishes perhaps twice a year. Our system of having every clergyman canonically connected with some Diocese enables each Bishop to know every one of his clergy and their characteristics. Each man is responsible to his Bishop, and no one can move from one Diocese to another without a Letter Dimissory. Such a thing, therefore, as a roving clergyman without Diocesan connection is impossible. In this way each man has the protection as well as the personal oversight of his Bishop."

(*Guardian*, Aug. 14, 1907.)

* **Relations between the Church of England and the orthodox Church.** — (Voir le *Guardian*, 31 juillet, 28 août, 4 septembre).

(1) The Unrest in the Lebanon. Anglican Refusal to Proselytise. — The following letter has been written by Bishop Blyth. The general subject was treated at length in our issue of the 26th ult.: --

FROM THE BISHOP OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN JERUSALEM AND THE EAST TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ORTHODOX GREEK CHURCH AT EL KOURI AND THOSE ASSOCIATED WITH THEM.

Jerusalem, June 26th, 1907.

Dear Brethren in Christ—I am sorry to be unable to give your written petition an answer more favourable to your wishes than I was able to give to the friendly and courteous deputation which met me personally at Beyrouth. I, and those who are acting with me as advisers, feel a very sincere sympathy with you under the agression which was made upon your rights of proper representation in the councils of the Government under which you live. But, in proposing to leave your Church, I do not think that you have taken the wisest or the most likely step towards obtaining the redress of your wrongs. It is true that the authorities of your own Church do not appear to have been able or willing to offer you natural protection in support of your claims. But I think that, as dutiful sons of your most ancient Patriarchate, in which "the disciples were first called Christians" (and wherein it is certainly my duty to "exhort you all that with purpose of heart you should cleave unto" your Church) you might have done more than you have done to conciliate the support which you have a right to claim and expect.

The succesful intrigue of a foreign dragoman seems to be the insignificant point on which the whole movement has turned. A strong representation through your Patriarch, to the Russian Consulate, with a formal refusal of the representative forced upon you, should have been first pressed by you, and had it failed, there is legal appeal. There does not seem to me to be any sufficient religious reason for your desiring to separate yourselves from the Church of your baptism; nor for your being incorporated into another branch of the Holy Catholic Church. You intimate that, should the Church of England not accept you, you will apply elsewhere. Archdeacon Dowling has very carefully and patiently considered your statements and proposals, and he was present with me at Beyrout; and his report, and those of various laymen of our Church (who have, wyth miself, been greatly interested in your case), have been thoroughly considered by me; and I have carefully weighed the record of all that was alleged at our interview at Beyrout.

I can quite understand that under provocation, and with such hesitating and inadequate support as you have had from the authorities of your own communion (whose help, however, I think you might have more fully sought), the religious and political freedom of the Anglican communion has somewhat naturally attracted you. And I can understand, too, that at the bottom of this, and other similar movements within your Patriarchate, which of late years have made appeal to our Church, there is a certain religious aspiration. I feel also that, as there may arise cases where the officials of any civil Government may become conscious of the claims of common humanity, so there may arise cases where we should recognise the religious claims of membership in the holy Catholic Church, as well as those of some foreign or national branch of the sisterhood of the Churches in Christ. But what is really now before us is almost entirely of a political character, and with regard to Church questions you have very little knowledge of the Church which you propose to join, and you seem to consider very lightly the seriousness of the step you contemplate in severing yourselves from the Church of your baptism.

On the other hand, there would be no justification of my action to the Bishops of our communion—more than 300 in number—whom I represent here, in receiving you under the circumstances of your present appeal. With the political and social relations of another branch of the Holy Catholic Church we have no immediate right of interference, and though your own Church seems to be apathetic towards you in matters of education, and in such instructions as should teach you what are the historical claims of your

own venerable Church and your duty towards her, still these are not points which come forward in your application for acceptance into the Anglican communion. And, further, though at our interview at Beyrout on May 6th I pointed out to you that I had no finances with which to meet a demand for clergy and teachers, on the scale that you require (something like the clerical and educational staff of a Diocese) the demand is again urged in your letter, without any personal co-operation for self-help. There is a business side to such large movements, as well as there are religious, educational, and political aspects to be considered.

Still, the distress and wrongs of members of Christ's Catholic Church have naturally claims on our sympathy and action, and we have done our best to express this to you. We have had interviews with the Patriarch of Antioch, with the Metropolitan of Beyrout (and Archdeacon Dowling also with another Bishop of the Patriarchate), with the Governor-General of the Lebanon, with the British Consul-General, and Archdeacon Dowling at my request had an interview with the Russian Consul-General at Haifa. With all these, and with various laymen of sound judgment, your case has been fully and anxiously discussed. All that we could do to aid your cause (so far as we were able to press it within limits proper to ourselves, and with benefit to you) has been done. And I have reason to think that a fair hearing will be given to you, if you take suitable steps to put forward your case on the coming changes of representation in the Lebanon, provided you have returned to the position which gives you the right to urge your interests according to custom.

I do not think that the friendly representations which I and my colleagues have made in your behalf will be thrown away. The attitude taken towards us by the Patriarch of Antioch, and his Bishops, and by the Governor-General, and also by the Russian Consul-General, on our placing your case before them, justifie our confidence that your own legitimate and conciliatory representation of your rights and wishes will now be met by them in a like conciliatory spirit, and we exhort you to do your utmost as loyal sons of your Church to put forward such things as make for peace. We find no feeling against you that a kindly and loyal firmness in pressing forward your rights will not overcome. And I believe that already steps have been taken in your favour, with members of his staff, by the Russian Consul-General, and the Governor-General and your own Patriarch have expressed themselves about you in a friendly way. And in all that you do on such lines you will have the advocacy of the English Church. We appreciate the

trust and kindliness of your present appeal to us, but I must not hide from you our impression that you have as hastily and on impulse appealed to us, as your co-religionists think that you have hastily proposed to abandon them.—I beg to remain, very faithfully yours in Christ,

G. F. POPHAM BLYTH,
Bishop in Jerusalem and the East.

Since the foregoing letter was written it is but fair to the Synod of Antioch, lately assembled at Damascus, to state that they have sent to the district of El Koûri Germanus, Metropolitan of Mâ'lûlu and Zahleh, to exhort those Syrians to remain fàithful to their religion. My informant, Prince Alexander Gagarine, Russian Consul-General in Syria, assures me that "he cas carried out his mission succesfully, except for some people who are waiting for Bishop Blyth's answer, thinking that it may prove more advantageous to become Anglicans."

(2) During a visit paid to the Œcumenical Patriarch at Constantinople by the Bishop of Gibraltar some two years ago his Holiness said, in the course of conversation, that they would be glad to welcome an English student at the great Greek Theological College at the Halki, in order that he might study their Church polity and obtain a first-hand acquaintance with Greek theology. It has not been easy to find a student who could avail himself of this suggestion; but at length, through the interest in the matter taken by Dr. Mason, Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge, one has been found in the person of Mr. P. R. B. Brown, M. A., lately Scholar of Pembroke, who obtained a First Class in the Classical Tripos of 1903. On further inquiry being made by the Bishop of Gibraltar (through the Rev. M. R. Swabey, Chaplain of the Crimean Memorial Church at Constantinople), a cordial reply has been received both from the Patriarch and from the Metropolitan of Nicomedia, who is the President of the Council of the College, to the effect that they will gladly receive and welcome him. Accordingly Mr. Brown hopes to leave England at the end of the month for a year's residence at the College. It should prove a very interesting and valuable experience for him, and the knowledge which he will gain may have valuable results in the future as regards the relations between the two Churches.

(3) *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Anglican Baptisms.*—The following is a translation of a memorandum on the above subject communicated by the Patriarch of Jerusalem to Archdeacon Dowling:—

His Beatitude, most Holy and Beloved of God, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Lord Damianos, has read with attention the communication which Dr. Dowling, the senior priest of the Anglican Episcopate in this place, handed to him, containing an inquiry concerning the canonical character of Anglican Baptism from the Orthodox point of view, in order that upon the strength of his reply, with the concurrence of the Bishop, most Beloved of God, Dr. Blyth, the assertions made by the Rev. C. T. Wilson, in his book on the Holy Land [1]) to the effect that "the Orthodox Greeks are very exclusive, denying the validity, not only of the Orders of every other Christian Church, but even of their baptismal rite," may be definitely refuted. His Beatitude, most Holy and Beloved of God, has great pleasure in telling the most Venerable Dr. Dowling in reply, that, desiring a careful answer to be given to his question, he forwarded it to the Professors of the Theological College of the Venerable Cross, that they might take a comprehensive view of the whole Orthodox Church upon this question, both as regards history and doctrine. The solution resulting from this study on the part of the Reverend Professors, endorsed and approved by his Beatitude, most Holy and Beloved of God, and his holy Synod, is as follows:—

The Orthodox Church has always regarded as canonical Baptism that which is administered in the name of the Holy Trinity by means of triple immersion. According to the 7th Canon of the Second Œcumenical Council, every Baptism not administered by means of three immersions is invalid. The Orthodox Church has often, in departure from the express direction of the canon, acknowledged as valid even a Baptism administered by means of sprinkling or affusion, and, in fact, even by a secular person. But this it has always characterised as concession. Of the Christians of the West the Anglican Episcopalians are found to be nearest to the Orthodox Church in respect of Baptism, because, in accordance with the directions of their Prayer-book, they administer the Sacrament of Baptism sometimes by immersion, but permitting Baptism by affusion [2]), and from the directions issued on different occasions by the Anglican ecclesiastical authorities, it follows that in the Anglican Church the same opinion is entertained regarding this sacrament as in the Orthodox Church. The Anglican Church enjoys great respect and esteem in the Orthodox Church, without

---

[1]) *Peasant Life in the Holy Land*, on "Oriental Churches," p. 37.

[2]) *Teaching of the Church of England*, by John, Bishop of Salisbury, translated by John Gennadius, A. D. 1901; p. 21.

implying doctrinal unity and Sacramental communion between the two Churches.

For these reasons the Baptism of the Anglican Episcopalians, until their union with the Orthodox Church, as being administered outside her communion, and not by means of triple immersion, must be regarded as not canonically valid, but as acceptable, by way of concession, so long as from this concession no injury redound to the Orthodox Church through proselytism. The most Venerable Dr. Dowling is at liberty to make public use of this reply of his Beatitude, most Holy and Beloved of God, the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

Jerusalem, 10 March, 1907.

—From the Patriarchal Registry.

* **Amérique.** — On lit, dans une correspondance de Chicago, publiée par le *Church Times* du 30 août:

The *Churchman* of July 13 contains a somewhat remarkable letter, adressedd by Bishop Johnston of West Texas to Pope Pius X, on the subject of Christian unity. The letter was written last Christmas from Manilla, in the Philippines. It appears that the good Bishop sent a similar letter to Leo XIII. during his pontificate. No aknowledgment of this last letter has been vouchsafed, but its reception in Rome is proved by the comments on it that have appeared in the Roman press. The papers referred to agree that "there is a tone of manifest sincerity and desire for Good's glory in the letter, which leads one to hope that sooner or later he (Bishop Johnston) will find the rest and comfort he so desires in the bosom of our Holy Mother the Church". It is thus that every approach to the papal see on our part is apt to be regarded, as indicating the beginnings of conversion to the papal claims.

The contents of the letter warrant no such inference. It is true that he addresses the Pope as elevated to a "high and responsible position", and his whole letter implies that the Papal See is in a position more favourable than any other for taking the initiative in a world-wide movement for unity. But the Bishop does not conceal his conviction that the modern claims and novel theachings of Rome constitute formidable barriers to visible unity. With characteristic American candour—even bluntness—he writes, "Surely to a man of your sound judgment and good commonsense, it must, ere this, have appeared utterly quixotic to expect that the so-called Protestant peoples, who are now the dominant political, intellectual, and moral forces of the world, could, by any possibility short of a Divine revelation, be persuaded to stultify every conviction of their consciences, and to accept, as necessary to eternal salvation,

dogmas which have no sanction in the undivided Church, of the early and purest days of it, when the purging of persecution kept it free from false doctrines as well as false disciples; and which have no basis in the written Word of God".

He suggests that the existing state of dissatisfaction in many parts of the Papal obedience should convince the Pope of his opportunity to readjust differences on the lines of the bare essentials of Catholic faith and order. He urges that the Apostles' Creed summarizes these essentials "briefly and clearly". "All outside of this is theory—*i.e.*, theology."

"Can you not", he says, "rise to the occasion and call a congress, not a council, to discuss, with a view to future action, the necessary steps to restore to Christianity that splendide influence it once exerted on humanity, but which it is in danger of being deprived of by 'our unhappy divisions'?... When the world-powers, including heathen nations, are preparing to meet at the Hague, to endeavour to secure the peace of the world, is it not an unspeakable shame that all Christians cannot hold a similar meeting to secure the peace of the Church? And as this conference owes is existence to the temporal head of the Eastern branch of the Church, how eminently fitting would it be that the congress I propose should be called by the spiritual head of the largest branch of the Western Church!"

He employs enthusiastic terms in describing the effect of such action; and says in part, "Such a beginning would be taken as an earnest of better things to come, and all Christians, everywhere, would begin again, as in the early days of Christianity, to look to Rome as a leader in the great forward movement of humanity toward its final goal of redemption from the power of evil," etc. He signs himself, "Your brother in the bonds of the Gospel of Jesus Christ".

No doubt Bishop Johnston has been quixotic, and this is seen in the discourtesy of silence with which his letter has been received; and the Pope's *non possumus* attitude displayed in his new Syllabus of Errors. But I cannot believe that the letter was written in vain. It formulates a vision which pleads for itself, of a return to foundation principles by that see which is chiefly responsible for modern departures, and which has more power than any other to undo the wrong. The vision will not materialize in our day, but its formulation may have unexpected results some day—not directly perhaps.

In this connexion it is proper to mention a little book that has just appeared on our side of the Atlantic, *The Prince of the*

Apostles, written jointly by your own Spencer-Jones and our Fr. Paul of Graymoor, Garrison, New York. The book pleads for a return of the Anglican Churches to the Papal obedience, and defends the Papal claim to a supreme *magisterium* over the Universal Church, by Divine appointment. Some of your readers have seen this position advocated in a previous book of Spencer-Jones.

One of the premises of their argument, is an alleged impossibility of a formal change on the part of Rome; from which it is deduced that, if reunion is to be realized, we must do the changing. For my own part, I think Bishop Johnston is in the right. It is possible for Rome to change. To believe otherwise is to concede by implication that the Vatican position is Divinely ordered—the point at issue. We hear much of development from certain defenders of the Papal See. They say that it is a legitimate growth of the original hierarchy appointed by Christ. If it is a growth, it can grow on, and the law of its growth must be adjustment to changing environment. In short, Rome must outgrow Vaticanism or die. She will not die. She may, indeed, never repeal the Vatican decree in a formal way: but many of her writers are doing their best to repeal it by interpretation. The Vatican decree is sufficiently ambiguous, thanks to the minority that had to be won to submission, to make it susceptible of being interpreted into the limbo of antiquated archives. What is needed is patience, grounded in the twofold conviction that Rome will not cease to grow—on lines that the future intelligence of the faithful will control; and that much time is still necessary before the inevitable materialization of Bishop Johnston's vision. Present procedures looking to reunion are doomed to fail. There is no reason on that account for ceasing to labour and pray for the hastening of the gathering of all into one visible fold.

— *Opinions du Dr. Briggs.* — Le Dr. Briggs, de New York, est un ex-presbytérien qui a passé à l'Eglise épiscopale, et qui cherche à y répandre des idées très romanisantes. Relativement à l'union des Eglises, il trouve que le *Lambeth quadrilateral* de 1888 n'est pas une base suffisante [1]). Il propose

[1]) Il consiste dans les quatre propositions suivantes:

1° S'en tenir à l'Ecriture, comme expression de la parole de Dieu, indépendamment de toute théorie relative à l'inspiration.

2° Reconnaître le Symbole de Nicée (sous sa forme de Constantinople), comme suffisant pour faire l'union en matière de dogme.

3° Conserver le Baptême et la Communion avec l'usage intégral des termes de l'Evangile, et des éléments primitifs institués par le Christ.

4° Reconnaître l'épiscopat historique, avec l'adaptation qu'il comporte aux besoins des pays et des époques.

de « partir du projet soumis par Spinola en 1677 dans ses *25 Propositiones novellorum discretiorum et præcipuorum* [1] ». Il dit, entre autres choses:

« Molanus écrivait à Leibniz que la papauté devrait être une Monarchie constitutionnelle. La limitation, la définition de la juridiction papale est, en effet, une condition indispensable de la réunion: des isolés, groupes ou individus, peuvent bien se réunir au catholicisme; mais aucune grande organisation ecclésiastique ne consentira à se soumettre à une juridiction papale absolue, ou non limitée.

Il en est de même pour ce qui touche à l'infaillibilité: mais, ici, la question a été résolue. Le concile du Vatican me paraît avoir une portée tout autre que celle qu'on lui attribue généralement: en *définissant* il a *limité;* il a restreint la matière de l'Infaillibilité à la foi et aux mœurs; il a exigé, pour qu'une décision pût être regardée comme infaillible, des carractères tels, qu'aux yeux des théologiens catholiques aucune des décisions rendues depuis le concile du Vatican n'est infaillible.

Il faudrait qu'un nouveau concile définît à son tour la *juridiction* du pape. De plus en plus, les nations ont des constitutions définies, où les droits du pouvoir sont nettement déclarés. Si les évêques de l'univers se réunissaient à nouveau, il serait certainement question d'une définition ou d'une limitation semblable: et ce serait là un pas décisif vers l'union, car *c'est moins l'importance de l'engagement à prendre que son imprécision même qui retient aujourd'hui les Eglises séparées.* Beaucoup d'entre elles, sans doute, seraient prêtes à se soumettre, pourvu qu'elles connussent précisément ce à quoi elles se soumettent. Or, actuellement, dans les affaires d'ordre civil et intellectuel, bien que le pape ne soit pas revêtu de l'infaillibilité, ses décisions ont plus de portée efficace dans le monde que ses décisions infaillibles touchant la foi ou les mœurs. »

Le Dr. Briggs s'abuse manifestement quand il voit une *limitation* et une *restriction* des pouvoirs du pape là où il faut voir une *extension* et une *énormité.* Sa naïveté n'est pas moins grande, lorsqu'il propose de remplacer le mot « transsubstantiation » par le mot « conversion ». On voit qu'il ignore les dogmes du concile de Trente et en général l'esprit même du romanisme d'après la marche de son histoire. Même naïveté, quand il propose au pape de réunir un concile où les protestants seraient admis. Tout cela part d'un bon naturel, mais manque de critère.

---

[1]) Voir, sur cette question, les articles de la *Revue* relativement aux tractations entre Leibniz et Bossuet (nn. 41 et 42, janvier et avril 1903).

— *Fédération des Eglises évangéliques.* — On lit dans la *Semaine religieuse de Genève* (3 août):

« Il y a déjà quelque mois, 500 délégués de 32 dénominations religieuses différentes se sont rencontrés dans la Salle Carnegie, à New York, pour poser les bases d'une Fédération entre les Eglises évangéliques des Etats-Unis. Ces délégués représentaient 18 millions de chrétiens « communiants » et près de trois fois ce même chiffre d'adhérents ou ressortissants des Eglises. L'assemblée a créé un « Concile fédératif des Eglises du Christ en Amérique » qui aura pour but: d'établir, autant que possible, l'unité entre les dénominations protestantes pour le service de Jésus-Christ et de la société humaine; d'encourager l'échange des idées concernant la vie spirituelle et l'activité religieuse des Eglises; d'accroître l'influence des Eglises dans les questions morales et sociales, afin que la loi du Christ soit appliquée à tous les départements de la vie humaine. Le Concile ou Conseil ne s'arrogera le pouvoir ni d'imposer aux Eglises fédérées une confession de foi, une discipline ou une liturgie communes, ni de limiter d'aucune façon l'entière autonomie de ces Eglises.

On dit que 24 dénominations ont adhéré à la Fédération dès cette première assemblée. D'autres suivront sans doute. Quelques membres de l'assemblée ont plaidé l'admission des Eglises unitaires, mais leur proposition a été repoussée à une très grande majorité, et l'assemblée a adopté, dans le préambule de ses statuts, la déclaration qu'elle désire obéir au Christ comme à son « *divin* Seigneur et Sauveur ».

***