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

Band: 17 (1909)

Heft: 66

Artikel: Anglicana

Autor: [s.n.]

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403733

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: 01.02.2026

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

ANGLICANA.

* *Discussions graves. « High Church » contre « Low Church » et contre « Broad Church ».* — Le *Church Times* du 20 janvier dernier a publié un article intitulé: « Pseudo-Unity », duquel nous extrayons les passages suivants:

« It has become necessary to say very plainly and distinctly that the so-called Christian Unity movement, if it continue on the lines that influential persons have marked out for it, is incompatible with Churchmanship, the essential principles of which it subverts and attacks. For one thing, the united Christianity of the future, Dr. Guinness Rogers declared lately at the Memorial Hall, must have no formulated confession of faith. "When," he asked, "shall we learn the mischief done to the Gospel of Christ by an insistence upon Creeds which, descending to particulars, lead to endless differences between men on both sides who are equally consecrated to God's service? It matters little what creed people believe: the great test is the service of God." If this were an isolated utterance, it might be discounted as mere rhetorical talk to the Farringdon-street gallery. But creedlessness as the primary note of the "Reunion Church" has come to be the accepted formula of a "Movement." We need not say that it is as irreconcilable with Evangelical as with Catholic conviction . . .

» *The only Christians* who must stand aside and for whom there can be no place in the Church of the Reunion—besides, of course, members of the ancient and vast unreformed Communions of the East and West—*are High Churchmen.* It is admitted, then, that the point of view described disparagingly as sacerdotalism or ecclesiasticism is prejudged as false and mischievous. We hear, for example, of "an interesting movement in the direction of Christian unity" which is going on at Hampstead, and of conferences, in which clergy—including an

Archbishop's son—and representatives of Dissent take part. Dr. Horton has penned a message to his congregation defining Church unity as something different from "the artificial unity of an organization." He does not see, however,

"Why the divisions of Evangelical Christianity should not be incorporated, unchanged, into one wide Church of England. If Christ is Head of the Church, and not Bishops or Archbishops, He can include in His Church Societies that are governed by presbyters, and Societies like our own that seek for His direct guidance ond headship."

Clearly, Dr. Horton's conception is not some kind of temporary recognition of diversity in a scheme of gradual corporate reunion, such as the Lambeth Conference seems to have thought possible, but the direct contradictory of the article of the Creed, in its historic and proper sense, which affirms, "I believe in One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church." Can an "external and formal unity," he protests, be a unity of the spirit? Every Churchman, by the name that he bears, is bound to reply, "Yes." There is one Body and one Spirit. That is no true Gospel which disjoins outward and inward, ordinance and grace. That is no true philosophy which severs life and organism. But the prophets of pseudo-Reunionism think otherwise. At any rate, in the concrete, the "wide Church" of their dream is to be based on the denial of "ecclesiasticism." . . .

» Dr. Horton claims for Presbyterians and Congregationalists the right to associate themselves with the "wide Church of England" that is coming, under arrangements made, not by Bishops and Archbishops, but by the Church's real Head. He has probably forgotten the words, "He that rejecteth you rejecteth Me." "It is the community of Spirit-filled people," he said recently, "which administers the Spirit—bishops and priests cannot administer it." . . .

» It is absolutely certain that, in a Church of England which shall have accepted the Rogers-Horton basis of unity, there can be no place, we will not say for the disciples of Keble, Pusey, and Liddon, but for any convinced Churchman at all . . .»

Nous savons que ce n'est pas toute l'*Eglise anglicane* qui désire le rétablissement de l'union des Eglises chrétiennes;

que ce désir n'est exprimé que dans une partie de cette Eglise, les autres parties ne croyant cette union ni possible, ni même désirable. Cet état de choses est déjà inquiétant par lui-même; mais, même si l'on se borne à ne voir que la fraction qui désire l'union, n'est-on pas surpris que cette fraction ne comprenne pas qu'elle n'est pas séparée, de fait, constitutionnellement, des fractions rivales, et que, par conséquent, avec des divisions *dogmatiques* si profondes, il ne saurait être question d'union chez aucune des Eglises qui tiennent essentiellement à l'unité du dogme catholique ou orthodoxe *objectif?*

Quelquefois on cite tel ou tel cas particulier d'intercommunion entre anglicans et anciens-catholiques, et l'on conclut que l'union est faite entre l'Eglise anglicane et les Eglises anciennes-catholiques. C'est s'abuser, parce que c'est conclure du particulier au général. Une paroisse ancienne-catholique peut admettre à sa table eucharistique telle personne qui s'y présente. Nous ne sommes plus au temps des billets de confession. Nous pensons poliment et charitablement que toute personne qui vient communier dans une église ancienne-catholique est assez loyale pour professer la même foi que l'Eglise ancienne-catholique. Mais qui ne voit qu'une paroisse ou plusieurs paroisses ne sont pas l'Eglise; que l'union complète et parfaite doit se faire *entre Eglises* et non seulement *entre personnes isolées;* que c'est à l'union *entre Eglises* qu'il faut viser, parce qu'elle est la seule officielle? Or, lorsqu'on en viendra là, il est clair que l'unité dogmatique *objective* et *officielle* devra être établie de part et d'autre sans ambages. Certains anglicans trop pressés oublient ces notions élémentaires.

* *La grande colère du « Church Times »*, — Le *C. T.* du 15 janvier dernier s'est enfin décidé à reparler de la *Revue internationale de Théologie.* Mais, au lieu de rendre un compte objectif des articles qui y sont contenus, il se borne aux *Anglicana.* C'est tout son horizon! Et au lieu de remarquer que la plupart des renseignements publiés dans cet article spécial sont extraits du *Guardian*, quelquefois même du *Church Times*, il préfère nous accuser de partialité, et cela parce que nous lui reprochons ses tendresses envers Rome et le parti ultramontain. Il ferait mieux d'essayer de nous réfuter. Nous lui répétons: que nous connaissons Rome mieux que lui; que

Rome veut la domination sur les autres Eglises, et non l'union; et que, par conséquent, le projet du *C. T.* d'unir l'Eglise anglicane avec Rome est une utopie, s'il est vrai que l'Eglise anglicane veuille sauvegarder son catholicisme antiromain et son autonomie ecclésiastique. Là est toute la question. Qu'il nous fournisse des preuves du contraire, nous serons heureux de les publier. Que pouvons-nous dire de plus? Quant à ses personnalités et à ses injures, nous en sourions et nous les lui laissons pour compte. L'impolitesse haineuse ne nous touche pas.

* *Comment le « Church Times » essaie de railler le jésuite Coupe.* — On lit dans ce journal (January 29) le fait divers suivant :

« A Jesuit Father, the Rev. Charles Coupe, has been making merry over the Bishop of London's recent visit to Bournemouth. It appears to be F. Coupe's view that a man is not a Catholic for believing the Articles of the Christian Faith, as contained in the Creeds, but in his acceptance of the Supremacy of the Roman See. The Bishop of London does not accept that Supremacy, therefore he is no Bishop, and no Catholic; he is a mere Protestant layman. Q. E. D. It would have been well if the *facetious* Jesuit had stopped there, while he was *amusing*. Unwisely, he assumed the further *role* of historian. Here is one elegant extract from his sermon in the Church of the Sacred Heart:—

'Then Henry VIII. hanged, drew, and quartered Catholics, seized their lands and their goods, and in place of the Catholic Church he created the Protestant "Establishment," appointed in place of Catholic Bishops certain functionaries, members of the Civil Service, and stationed one of them, the "Bishop" of London, in Fulham Palace, where the Catholic Bishops lived for 1,000 years, and where the Protestant "Bishops" have lived for 300.'

The Protestant Civil Servant in question was, as we know, Edmund Bonner, appointed to London in 1539, suspended by Bishop Ridley, and reinstated in the See by Queen Mary, to be again displaced by Elizabeth. The odd thing about it is that those Protestant Sovereigns, Eduard VI, and Elizabeth, disowned this Protestant Civil Servant, while the Papist Mary recognized him as the Catholic Bishop of London, and, as

F. Coupe may like to know, the learned Benedictine, Gams, names him as the last Bishop of London. After this example of F. Coupe's historical erudition, we need not be surprised at his ignoring the fact that Queen Mary, like her father, retained for a time the title of Supreme Head of the Church, but her Protestant sister was content to assume the less ambitious title of Supreme Governour.»

Donc, selon le *Ch. T.*, le jésuite en question n'est qu'un *facétieux,* un *amuseur*, un historien *ignorant.* Cet aimable et perspicace journal ne voit pas les raisonnements sur lesquels repose la conclusion du P. Coupe, raisonnements qui sont ceux des jésuites, de Pie X, de Léon XIII et de tous les catholiques-romains qui rejettent la validité des ordres anglicans. Au lieu de réfuter ces raisonnements, le rédacteur innomé du *Ch. T.* se borne à railler et à injurier. Il a tort: car l'ironie, loin d'être une réfutation, n'est souvent que la dissimulation de l'embarras et de l'ignorance. Le *Ch. T.* croit-il qu'avec ce procédé il puisse réaliser une union entre l'Eglise anglicane et l'Eglise romaine? S'il le croit, il nage en pleine fantaisie. La question est plus grave qu'il ne semble le croire; et lorsque le temps viendra de la reprendre sérieusement, il ne sera pas malaisé, je crois, de montrer que, si les raisonnements papistes sont faux en grande partie, ils contiennent tout de même quelque vérité, vérité plus forte que la simple raillerie du *Ch. T.* Un peu de patience.

En attendant, le P. Coupe a adressé au *Ch. T.* la lettre suivante:

Sir,—In your issue of January 29th, you say that I "made merry over the Bishop of London's recent visit to Bournemouth." I did not. His lordship claimed to be a lineal descendant of the pre-Reformation Bishops of London, and I denied that claim. Not I was the aggressor.

Again, you make me say that Dr. Winnington Ingram is not a Catholic Bishop because he does not accept Papal Supremacy. I did not. His lordship is not a Catholic Bishop, because he is not ordained; and I said so.

In the report of my sermon, by a printer's omission, Henry VIII., instead of Elizabeth, is made to station an Anglican Bishop in Fulham Palace. Charles Coupe, S. J.

The Catholic Presbytery, Bournemouth.

Febr. 2.

* *La polémique du "Church Times" jugée par M. G. Henslow.* — M. G. Henslow a adressé au *Ch. T.* du 5 février la lettre suivante :

Sir,—I am at a loss to understand your reviewer's motive in being *sarcastic* over my little book, by calling it "a monument of misplaced ingenuity." Readers usually look to reviewers to tell them what a book is about; they can then form their own opinion. If it be erroneous, then let the reviewer prove it to be so, not give his own baseless abuse of it. It is not a question of what I "consider" to be erroneous; but what I have shown to be so...

I am glad to be able to state that I have several reviews of strong approval of the book. *The Church Times is the only clerical paper which adopts the sarcastic, if not cynical tone.*

George HENSLOW.

* *Une lettre de M. le recteur Baddeley sur les ordres anglicans.* — Voici cette lettre publiée dans le *Guardian* du 3 février dernier :

« Sir— Bishop Mathew writes to you that "he is happy to be in a position to inform your readers that the Commission of Inquiry which years ago began investigation of the claim of the Church of England to possess a valid Apostolic ministry is about to resume its labours." Surely this is quite a needless task. It is very good of Bishop Mathew to inform your readers about it, but I do not think members of the Church of England, whether laity, Bishops, priests, or deacons, will feel any more settled in their minds than they are at present by the Church of Holland making such an investigation. We know, and are fully persuaded, that we have the unbroken and undoubted continuation of the Apostolic ministry, and no result of an investigation by the Church of Holland would tend to make us change our belief.

I hope, therefore, your readers will save themselves the trouble of responding to Bishop Mathew's patronising invitation to send information on the subject, and I hope the Old Catholic brethren will save themselves a useless task. The Bishops of the Old Catholic Church have already, I believe, practically acknowledged the claim of the Church of England to a valid Apostolic ministry.

J. J. BADDELEY, Rector of Chelsfield, Kent.

January 29, 1909. »

A la bonne heure, voilà qui est parler franc. Nous aimons cette franchise, et M. le Recteur nous permettra de lui répondre avec la même franchise.

1° Il est évident que les anglicans qui affirment que leur Eglise a conscience de la validité de ses ordres, c'est-à-dire que son sacerdoce et son épiscopat sont certainement catholiques et vraiment conférés par un vrai sacrement de l'ordre, dans le sens catholique, il est évident, dis-je, qu'ils se trompent: 1° les documents officiels de l'Eglise établie rejettent ce sacrement; 2° il est permis de penser que la *Low Church* et la *Broad Church*, qui font partie de l'Etablissement aussi réellement que la *High Church*, n'admettent nullement le sacrement en question dans le sens indiqué. Personne ne soutiendra que l'Eglise anglicane croit à une chose qui est rejetée expressément par deux de ses fractions sur trois.

2° M. le Recteur se déclare indépendant, dans sa croyance, du jugement de l'Eglise de Hollande. Il a parfaitement raison. Si les anciens-catholiques ont *commencé* à s'occuper de cette question, ce n'est pas pour s'ériger en juges de l'Eglise anglicane; qu'il se rassure. Leur intention était bonne et pacifique. Ils voulaient savoir si l'Eglise de Rome, qui repousse la validité des ordres anglicans, se trompe ou non, et si, malgré l'opinion romaine sur ce point, une solide union ne pourrait pas être contractée entre l'Eglise anglicane et l'Eglise ancienne-catholique. Il est possible que M. le Recteur trouve que son Eglise n'a besoin d'aucune autre Eglise, et qu'elle est parfaite dans son île et dans les colonies anglaises. Il a ce droit. Mais il est d'autres anglicans qui pensent aussi que, si grand que l'on soit, on a quelquefois besoin d'un plus petit que soi. Ce sentiment humain est aussi chrétien, et c'est dans le désir d'une union que les grands anglicans et les petits anciens-catholiques cherchaient à étudier la question. Ni les uns ni les autres ne feront violence à M. Baddeley et ne nieront son titre de recteur.

3° Il pense que cette étude est inutile, car, dit-il, les évêques de l'Eglise ancienne-catholique ont déjà reconnu *pratiquement* cette validité. Il se trompe. Son mot «pratiquement» n'est pas clair. Quelques théologiens anciens-catholiques ont étudié la question à certains points de vue, mais non à tous les points de vue, et malgré eux des doutes subsistent, qu'il

faudra bien résoudre sérieusement si l'Eglise anglicane daigne un jour condescendre à une union avec les autres Eglises chrétiennes. Peut-être sera-t-elle assez heureuse pour obtenir la permission de M. le recteur Baddeley.

Ajoutons que M. le recteur s'est attiré l'excellente réplique suivante, publiée dans le *Guardian* du 17 février: Sir—Surely Mr. Baddeley's letter is neither necessary nor courteous. I fail to see anything whatsoever patronising in Bishop Mathew's letter and request. Most certainly it is all to the advantage of the truth and of Christian unity that the matter of Anglican Orders should be carefully examined by any part or Province of the Catholic Church which is not yet fully convinced of their validity; and, *pace* Mr. Baddeley, the Church of Holland is not, as a whole, yet fully convinced. It is not for our sakes that the Commission will sit, but for the good of the whole of Christendom, as well as for the better information of the Dutch Church. I hope your readers will send books, &c., to Bishop van Thiel, and so assist the future Commission.

English Chaplain.

* *Un article de M. Leighton Pullan sur l'union avec les Orientaux.* — Cet article a paru dans le « Guardian » du 3 février, sous ce titre: *Problems of reunion with the East.* Il y est dit qu'une entente cordiale est d'abord nécessaire; que cette entente cordiale a déjà eu lieu entre l'archevêque Benson et le métropolitain Platon en 1888; et qu'ainsi il y a « agreement *in doctrine* between the Anglican and Eastern Churches ».

Cette dernière assertion nous semble très prématurée et inexacte. M. Pullan reconnaît qu'il est « honnête » de chercher les conditions d'une union et que toute la Communion anglicane doit « préparer une honnête réponse ». Il ajoute: « The first thing that the Oriental wants to know is not the cut of our copes, *but if our belief is orthodox.* We must not try to use ritual to cloak differences. *The same principle applies to our Orders.* »

Si les Anglicans veulent que les Orientaux croient à leurs ordres, il faut d'abord que les anglicans y croient eux-mêmes. C'est élémentaire et de bon sens. Or la *Low Church* et la *Broad Church* y croient-elles? M. Pullan ne le demande pas, mais tout le monde le demandera. M. Pullan ajoute: « We

must therefore endeavour to create the desire for union far beyond the limits of England . . . I believe that the language employed in the formularies drawn up in the time of Henry VIII. affords a practical basis for discussion and, if it please God, for reunion.» Disons à M. Pullan que les formulaires en question sont impossibles à admettre, et que discuter sur ce terrain serait aller à une rupture. Nous n'en sommes plus à la théologie du XVIe siècle. M. Pullan est plus sage lorsqu'il dit: « It is of no use to say to the Oriental that the Romish doctrine is wrong. The Oriental wants to know *what doctrine we consider to be right.* » Très bien. Lorsque « High Church » condamnera la doctrine romaine, et lorsque les trois fractions anglicanes seront d'accord pour dire ce qu'elles considèrent comme vrai, alors on pourra s'entendre. C'est parler d'or.

* *Un discours du Rev. J. Wakeford sur l'Eglise romaine.* — Ce discours serait excellent s'il ne renfermait des attaques, pour le moins intempestives, contre d'autres Eglises. Il a provoqué, bien maladroitement, des répliques et des hostilités, qu'une réfutation calme et scientifique aurait évitées. Quand remplacera-t-on enfin l'agression par le clair exposé des arguments? En attendant ce grand progrès, citons quelques passages de ce discours substantiel:

Il dit qu'on a raison d'appeler *romanistes* et *papistes* les catholiques-romains, attendu que Rome est leur base et leur centre, et que la papauté est leur marque distinctive. Cette remarque est juste et capitale.

Ensuite: « Christ was the Revealer. He had given the whole truth for salvation . . . There was not other revelation subsequently . . . There was no new truth taught in the Apostles, but all referred back to the teaching of Christ. The society which Christ formed was a church, a society that existed to promote holiness by propagating the real truths. The Church had clearly two duties—to preserve with great jealousy the truth and at the same time to instruct mankind and to gather all men into the school of God. Some people said that unity must be insisted upon. Yes, but unity must be God-given unity. It could not be obtained by compulsion or compromise or statecraft. (Applause.) . . .

» He must say, not in the spirit of denunciation, but in the calm spirit of history, that the Roman Church was the great offender against Christian unity. It was chiefly responsible for the unhappy divisions between East and West. The Papacy had driven off the nations, had quarrelled with the Teutonic races, and had substituted for real unity mere external show of uniformity. There was no reason for them to think, from the Scriptures or from the first days of the Church, that God ever willed to have one autocratic throne as the centre of Christendom. If God had so willed it, surely he would have shown it in those directions given to the Apostles; in those guidances to the early Church, when it was forming its liturgies and its creeds. There was nothing in the first three centuries of the Church to suggest a Papacy like that of Rome to-day. It grew, and it grew out of evil and not out of good. The title of universal bishop was not given to the Bishop of Rome unti the year 605, and it was given by the Emperor Phocas, who had seized the throne through the murder of his brother . . .

» The title was first given in 605, and they found presently other introductions, aggrandising the position of the Papacy, and the greatest influence in this was that of the forged Decretals of the pseudo Isidore of 850. It was customary in the early ages to make collections of the Decretals of Bishops in answer to questions addressed them from the provinces, and so came this great collection in the year 850. Were these false? There was no historian nor scholar of any repute that now maintained for a moment there was any truth in them whatever. The marvel was that they deceived the world for 700 years. They were not only false; they were foolish. »

Suivent des griefs irréfutables contre le concile de Trente, contre ses procédés et contre ses innovations.

Ensuite: « Among the modern dogmas was the dogma of Papal infallibility, a doctrine that was denied by all history . . . Dr. Pusey declared that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope was not Christianity, but Llamism. There was now also the doctrine of the immaculate conception. Newman declared that the Arian put Christ on to a lower throne than God, that they made him demi-God, and that it was a mistake, because there was only one God. The Roman Church destroyed that doctrine of Arianism, but on the vacant throne it had placed

the Virgin Mother. One would think that her place was sufficiently honourable as the mother of the world Redeemer, and to make her the queen of heaven and a mistress of purgatory detracted from the true honour that God had bestowed on her...

The Church of England appealed to primitive antiquity. She went back to that. She declared that God had not forsaken his Church. She made an appeal to Scripture, interpreted by sound learning. The Church in England confidently threw herself on the understanding of the people, gave the Bible freely to them, translated her prayers into the vernacular, and trusted in the guidance of God for the future. (Applause.)... »

* *Une étude de M. le chancelier Lias contre l'ultramontanisme.* — A paper written by Chancellor Lias before the Victoria Philosophical Institute in London has been mentioned in a former number of the Review. It contains a full history of the origin and progress of the Old Catholic movement, and of the recent rebellions against the authority of the Pope in almost every country in the world. It is entitled "The Decay of Ultramontanism, from an historical point of view."

* *Un aveu et un vœu.* — On lit dans le « Church Times » du 29 janvier dernier, sous ce titre: *Rubric and Canon:* « The current number of the *Church Quarterly* has an article on the legal and historical study of the Ornaments Rubric. The writer confesses a feeling of impatience. "It is lamentable," he says, "that so much ability and learning, as well as heat and passion, should have been expended during the last fifty years in controversy, often ludicrously venomous, as to what was ordered two or three hundred years ago upon a matter which the Church ought to regulate by clear enactment, according to the necessities or conventions of the time." We agree: it is lamentable; it is also rather absurd. But would there have been less heat and passion if the discussion had abandoned history, and had turned only upon the convenience of the present usage? Would controversy have been less venomous, if present necessities alone were in debate? It may fairly be answered that something has even been gained for charity and temper by the concentration of interest upon antiquarian research. It is natural, and perhaps laudable, to be impatient

of such discussion; if the debate is to be turned to present conveniences and necessities, nothing can be much worse than impatience.

The writer of the article from which we quote wishes to give this turn to the discussion. He would end all the interminable debate about the existing rubric and past Canons or Advertisements by a new direction which the Church shall give "through its own Constitutional assemblies."... « He considers this an undesirable state of things, and therefore desires a change of the law . . . »

* *Comment les catholiques anglais sont traités à Paris par les catholiques romains.* — Le Rev. Cardew (Presbytère St-Georges, Paris) écrit dans le *Ch. T.* du 22 janvier dernier: qu'à Paris le clergé romaniste recommande aux catholiques anglais de « ne pas entrer dans l'Eglise anglicane. Anglican Churches are *schismatic* in France; you must attend the Church of the country ». Le catholique anglais, in the eyes of all is a Protestant, a schismatic and *a heretic;* his life in Paris becomes increasingly difficult, and he needs help . . . The responsibility for our presence in France rests, not with us, but with the Roman Church, *who denies our Orders and Sacraments, and refuses us Communion.* Our chaplaincies are simply missions. We are here to minister to the needs of our own "faithful" alone, not to interfere with the Church of the country. The Orthodox Churches of the East similarly provide for their own people.

The reply, no doubt, to my letter will be that all English people who live in France should joint the Church of Rome. There is certainly something to be said for this in the case of those of our countrymen who marry into French families, become French, and reside permanently in the country, but with the vast majority this is not the case. Most English residents hope to go home one day. If they are received into the Roman Church, they must renounce the Church of their land, and when they return to England the Roman Church will not permit them to re-enter the English Church. They will do so under pain of eternal damnation. Once in England the priests who advised them to go to Rome will tell them it is now their duty to return to the Catholic Church of their

country, whose Catholicity they have denied and whose sacraments they have treated as invalid . . . »

Dans le numéro du 29 janvier du même journal, un Anglican, qui a le courage de signer « *Lector* », s'exprime ainsi: « . . . The Catholic Church is one Kingdom, and there can no more be a Catholic priest in Paris without jurisdiction from the Archbishop of that See, than there can be a judge in Yorkshire without jurisdiction from King Edward. Mr. Cardew appears to regard the "Church of England" and the "Church of Rome" as two separate entities, a position manifestly inconsistent whit his Creed. In some strange fashion the local Church of France seems, in this view, to be part of the "Church of Rome." The "Eastern Orthodox Church" provides temples and clergy in Paris because, in the view of that Church, it alone is the whole Catholic Church—the Western Patriarchate having apostatized. On a similar principle, the "Archbishop of Westminster" founds his claim. But it is not open to Anglicans to say that they are the whole Church, and we do not in fact so say—any of us. *We admit the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Paris. That being so, it is contrary to the fundamental constitution of the Church to say Mass without his licence in his diocese. Absolution given by priests in his diocese, not in communion with him, is null and void.* To administer, or purport to administer, the Sacraments in his diocese without his authority *is mortal sin*, alike in the minister and the recipient. When an Anglican goes to St. George's, he is not going to "his" Church, or to "his" clergy. "His" Church, the Church of his baptism, *is not the Church of England, but the Catholic Church.* As for his not understanding French sermons, are sermons a necessary means of Grace?

True it is, that the Archbishop of Paris does not accept, or even understand, our position, that he unjustly (as we hold) refuses us the Sacraments unless we accept the Petrine Claims. That does not justify us in doing evil that good may come. It is, surely, of faith that God will not permit them to suffer from whom the Sacraments are unjustly withheld, if only they be conscientious and fully persuaded in their own minds. God is not tied to Sacraments. Mr. Cardew's young men should make an act of spiritual communion at their

parochial Mass. They may even make their confession to Mr. Cardew, without seeking absolution, which he cannot validly give. Surely such as these will not suffer less because of the injustice of their diocesan. With young men or women who make the laws of Holy Church, which they do not really hold and grasp, a mere excuse for lapse from Catholic practice, it is, of course, far otherwise. They have no right to look for God's special protection. Possibly Mr. Cardew's penitents may really belong to this last category. »

Enfin, dans le numéro du 5 février, M. Cardew réplique ainsi: « *I do not regard* (as *Lector* thinks) the Church of England and the Church of Rome *as two separate entities,* but we are forced to distinguish between them for administrative purposes, and for this reason we must give them distinctive labels. I am not quite clear in my mind about *œcumenical law* . . . I ask for information . . . »

Ainsi donc, il est des anglicans qui considèrent l'Eglise d'Angleterre et l'Eglise de Rome *comme une seule entité*, et qui ne savent pas ce qu'est une loi œcuménique! — N'est-ce pas un comble? Ces anglicans ne doivent pas parler d'union avec Rome, mais de *soumission à Rome.*

* *The Islington clerical Meeting.* — D'après une correspondance publiée dans le « Guardian » du 20 janvier, la fraction évangélique de l'Eglise établie serait en train de se modifier *(Evangelicals in Transition)*. Malheureusement on n'indique pas sur quoi portent ces modifications. On lit, au contraire, dans cette correspondance: « Some of the ultra-Protestants were dismayed at the nature of the programme which had been prepared, and consequently sent to the Chairman *their condamnation of it.* » Et encore: « The Chairman hoped the Conference would continue on the same lines as Dean Barlow had followed... together *with strong attachment to Evangelical principles.* » La partie la plus remarquable de cette correspondance est dans le conseil donné par le Doyen de Westminster, à savoir: faire disparaître les difficultés et les divisions *en étudiant sérieusement les questions et en suivant l'idéal contenu dans le N. T.* Là, en effet, est la clef de la vraie solution, parce que là seulement peut être l'unité. « Study your differences » he thought was a better maxim for the Churches

than « Minimise your differences ». Ignorance was the enemy of unity—*our ignorance of others, and the ignorance which prevented others from understandig us.* »— Bornons-nous à ajouter que les « autres », si appliqués soient-ils à comprendre les trois fractions de l'Eglise anglicane, ne pourront les comprendre que lorsqu'elles auront réussi à *se comprendre entre elles.* Lorsqu'on veut donner un concert, la première chose à faire c'est de mettre ses instruments d'accord; et comme l'a dit M. le Doyen, ce qui peut les mettre d'accord, c'est le vrai sens des textes du N. T. et surtout des paroles du Christ, et non le rabâchage des ritournelles périmées.

* *Le recrutement du clergé anglican.* — On lit dans « Le Chrétien » (journal protestant) du 1er janvier 1909: « D'après l'Eglise nationale, le recrutement du clergé anglican se fait difficilement. En 1886 le clergé de cette Eglise avait 814 recrues, aujourd'hui on en compte 587. Et pourtant, vu l'augmentation de la population (celle-ci s'accroît de 300,000 personnes annuellement), il faudrait 1000 clergymen chaque année. Aussi pour remédier à la situation, qui devient inquiétante, est-il question de créer un fonds de secours pour les jeunes gens qualifiés, mais trop pauvres pour faire des études. »

* *Papismus in Nuce (Matth. XXIII. 1, 8, 9, 10).* — Jesus locutus est ad turbas et ad discipulos suos, Patrem nolite vocare vobis super terram.

Qualem vero?

Non genitorem; dixerat enim, Honora patrem et matrem.

Non qualis Paulus eis erat quos per evangelium genuerat.

Non qualis Johannes filiolis eis quibus summa senectute non decreta imposuit, sed testimonia dedit.

Neque fideles indicavit Dominus pastores qui vigilant pro fratrum animabus.

Hujusmodi autem, Rabbi, Magistrum, *Καθηγητήν*, fratrem qui patris locum inter fratres usurparet, ut Dominus in cleris (I Pet. V. 3), Papam scilicet Romanum.

Si non Romanum, aut superiorem quendam, aut inferiorem.

Si inferiorem, multo magis Romanum. Neque ullus superior vocari isto potest qui supremum se vindicat et infallibilem, quippe qui definitiones suas ex ipsis, non autem ex consensu

ecclesiæ, irreformabiles esse docet, et auctoritate suâ majorem esse negat (Conc. Vat. 1870).

Idem ergo est Papæ obsequi quod Christo repugnare; nisi forte Christus evangelium ineptiis miscuit, quod si fecisset, neque Papæ, neque Ipsi credendum esset.

Spes manet æternæ sine Papa nulla salutis,
Dicunt qui Romæ nos domuisse volunt.
Fratres vos omnes; sit Papa sub æthere nullus,
Dicit Qui servis regna superna parat.

Anglice—

Without the Pope ye have no hope,
Say they who lead to Rome.
Ye all are Brethren; none is Pope,
Saith He who leads us home.

J. Foxley, M. A.

[5 Norton Way N., Letchworth, Hitchin, England.]

* *Prayer-Book Revision.* — Espérons qu'il ne s'agira pas seulement des rubriques, des ornements, de l'encens, du Symbole *Quicumque,* mais aussi des 39 Articles et de la Déclaration qui proclame le chef de l'Etat « Chef suprême de l'Eglise », etc.

* *Disestablishment?* — On lit dans le « Guardian » du 17 février: « The King's Speech contains no surprises. The farce of promising a Bill for the Disestablishmend and Disendowment of the Church in Wales has been duly performed, and it will at least be entertaining to dissect proposals which are notoriously made not because there is the smallest possibility of passing them, but to keep a troublesome section of the Government's supporters in fairly manageable humour . . . »

A quand le *Disestablishment* général? A quand un épiscopat qui soit nommé par l'Eglise (prêtres et fidèles), et non par un ministre d'Etat peut-être antichrétien; qui soit institué par l'Eglise, et non par l'Etat; qui fonctionne au nom du Christ et de l'Eglise, et non au nom du roi chef suprême de l'Eglise d'Angleterre? Etc. Il est des catholiques qui trouvent cette situation ecclésiastiquement et religieusement *incorrecte.* ***