

**Zeitschrift:** Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review  
**Band:** 10 (1902)  
**Heft:** 38  
  
**Artikel:** Anglicana  
**Autor:** [s.n.]  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403535>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. 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. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

### **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. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

### **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. [See Legal notice.](#)

**Download PDF:** 15.03.2025

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

## ANGLICANA.

---

“What is there just now remarkable in the theological movement in England?” I cannot answer this question completely: because it would be impossible for me to analyse all the valuable works and to abbreviate all the questions which are discussed here. But I will answer objectively. The fumes of the question of incense are no more thought of; our Prayer-Book and the Creed of Athanasius are undisturbed. The Gore question is no more disputed. In order to explain to you as exactly as possible, I prefer to send you, instead of my personal appreciations, some extracts from the best of our well known newspapers on the recent doings or documents.

### I.

I shall commence by some actualities.

At the last convocation of Canterbury, the Bishop of Salisbury presented a petition from the Rev. G. B. Howard, of Bromley, Kent, and others, asking the House to take steps to remove the *Filioque* from the Nicene Creed. The petition, he said, called attention to a very difficult subject in very temperate language, and he merely asked that it be allowed to lie on the table. The same Bishop, in another meeting, presented an *interim* report of the Joint Committee on the Position of the Laity in the Early Church, and promised a complete report for the next session, which he said would consist of an introduction and five chapters dealing with long periods of history. He has published under the signature John Sarum, in the “Guardian” of Feb. 26<sup>th</sup> an interesting article on the Dissertation of Friderich: *Are the Canons of Sardica Genuine?* The question does not seem to be resolved. We take notice of two pamphlets written by the same author: *Cathedrals a Manifestation of the Fulness of God* (1901), and *The Te Deum* (1902).

— The following letter from the Rev. G. Washington of Paris of the Jan. 31 on “the Orthodox Churches of the East” will interest you certainly:

“The usual annual meeting of the E. C. U. Branch (France) was held in the vestry of St. George’s Church, Paris. — It had been notified that a paper would be read by the chaplain on the ‘Relation of the Orthodox and Anglican Communions’; and both Greek and Russian clergy resident in Paris were invited. They not only came, but the Greek Archimandrite, Very Rev. P. Logothètes—a monk of the St. Catherine’s Monastery, Sinai, a chaplain of the Orthodox Greek Church, Paris, read a statement and proposal concisely as follows:—‘(a) That the faithful of the Anglican Communion, desiring reunion, should fix their attention more definitely on the historical aspect of Christianity. (b) That Anglican theological students should be sent to such centres of study as Constantinople and Athens and Jerusalem in order to become possessed of some practical knowledge of Orthodox theology and clerical life.’

“This last proposal has grit in it. We do not want the ideas of full-fledged priests and Bishops who (though with the utmost zeal and *bonne volonté*) take up the subject as a hobby (dare I say so?) perhaps late in life; who cannot in consequence help in their utterances, sitting in judgment, or making comparisons; but we do want young theologians whose hearts, souls, and brains have not been too hardened by Western preconceived notions, obfuscated by a little admixture of insular fog. Could no scholarships or exhibitions at our Universities meet this want in a larger sense than has yet been contemplated? Or could not our second Alma Mater, Cuddesdon, initiate the steps necessary to be taken?”

Since then, the “Church Times” of Febr. the 28<sup>th</sup> has published a description on the Conference of Anglican chaplains at St. Petersburg, but I did not find anything important or anything new which has advanced the question.

— The Rev. Chancellor J. J. Lias has rectified the 13<sup>th</sup> Feb. an error committed by Dr Sanday on the Ancient Catholics: “The Old Catholics did not secede; they were excommunicated. Not until they were deprived of the Christian sacraments for themselves and their families, of Christian marriage and Christian burial, and of all other blessings of Church communion a

Christian has a right to claim, and this for refusing to accept a dogma which, in their view, was a novel one, did they supply themselves with the privileges of which they had been unjustly deprived. If ever there was a position in which men might fairly claim the sympathy of Christian men of other communions, it was surely that in which the Vatican had placed them.”

— We read in the “Church Family Newspaper” (Jan. 31<sup>th</sup>) those interesting “Continental Church Notes” of MM. John Lomas and J. J. Lias:

“I have read with great interest the communication upon ‘Church matters in France’ which the Rev. Chancellor Lias has contributed to ‘The Church Family Newspaper’ of Jan. 17, and with all the more interest because he and I have worked together very pleasantly, for some years past, in an endeavour to coax English Churchmen out of their insular habits, and into sympathy with those who are fighting upon the Continent for religious freedom and Catholic reform.

“I must, however, say something to dash the hopes of those who are fondly imagining that Rome can be reformed, or mortally wounded, by movements such as those inaugurated by M. Bourrier, or by the Protestants who direct the Los von Rom secession in Austria. One Church error is not driven out by another; and episcopal Rome, almost invulnerable—humanly speaking—in her splendid heritage and discipline, can as well afford to laugh at ‘Bourrierism’, or any other form of Presbyterianism, as the Eastern Orthodox Church at the score of forms of dissent which imagine that they are honeycombing her in Russia. So far from having their existence endangered, or the future seriously troubled by reforms projected and carried out on non-Catholic lines, these two sister Churches may rather hail such unequal contests, which are bound to come to naught, presently, through want of direction and coherence, and through their dependence upon an individual rather than upon a system, inasmuch as the position, *prestige*, and discipline of the established faith are thereby extolled and enhanced. If, indeed, it be true that M. Bourrier has left off wandering in the wilds of a bald Protestantism, that he has sheltered himself under the wing of ‘six bishops’ and ‘over 2,000 [Roman?] clergy’, all keen for reform, and has inscribed upon his banner

the restoration of that old Gallican Church concerning which I discoursed in my Notes of August 30 last, he will have, at any rate, a definite aim, and that in a Catholic direction. The forerunner of Napoleon's Church of the Concordat was a church truly Catholic and national, free from foreign domination, and revered by her children to quite a remarkable degree. It brooked no question of papal interference in domestic politics, nor of organized defiance of legitimate episcopal authority by bands of regular clergy; it had no militant bishops, representing and upholding Vaticanism rather than Church order and discipline. But we have no proofs of M. Bourrier's new departure, and it would be marvellous indeed if such a Church could be restored by alien builders. Moreover, I am bound to say that, at the present moment, in view of the peaceable and profitable establishment of the *Loi des Associations*, and of the extreme affability with which the Vatican colours its relations with France, I can discover no 'crisis' whatsoever immediately before the French Church.

"If M. Bourrier and his fellow-combatants belonging to the *Los von Rom* movement be in earnest, and be free from individual ambition, let them join the quiet, splendidly Catholic and orthodox Old Catholic Church, whether in France or Austria, and thus add force to a reform which, as Chancellor Lias acutely says, maintains that there can be a Catholicism without Pope or the Church of Rome.

"A curious series of events, in which, as I may show later, the Anglican Church is directly interested, is being developed in that most conservative of countries Spain, wherefrom some startling results may be looked during the early summer. Although the country is Conservative in its policy to the last degree, the Liberal leader, Sagasta, is always the man of the hour—has been the only man for the last quarter of a century who has been able to keep a Government together, or ride over the storms which continually threaten a Spanish Premier. He has pledged himself, however, not only to enforce a law against the congregations which runs upon precisely the same lines as the French *Loi des Associations*, but to carry out a revision of the Concordat which settles the relations of the Vatican with Spain. To both these propositions the Vatican, the Court, and the Conservative party are strongly opposed,

and it is to be seen if Sagasta, with perhaps a preponderating majority in the country behind him, can carry a couple of strong measures in the teeth of a tremendously powerful opposition. The Prime Minister has already given way thus far—that the decree relative to the congregations shall be held in suspense, and that the proposed revision of the Concordat shall take place only upon the accession of the young King, Alphonso XIII., in May; but as the feeling in the country runs strongly against the religious bodies, and Sagasta is not a man easily turned aside from his purpose, the month of June should give us some stirring scenes in ecclesiastical history.”

JOHN LOMAS.

We sent the Rev. Chancellor Lias a copy of the first of the above Notes, and, in response, he writes: —

“I am afraid Mr. Lomas can hardly have read my letter. For I distinctly stated that Mr. Bourrier had now ceased to be a Protestant pastor, and that he was working at present for just such a reform in the French Church as, from what Mr. Lomas says, would meet with that gentleman’s approval. He also fails to note the fact that, as the *Katholik* for this week tells us, 8,000 of the 25,000 who have left the Church of Rome through the *Los von Rom* movement in Austria have joined the Old Catholic body. Moreover, I have not expressed any decided approval of the movement to the existence of which I have pointed. I think it even more likely to fall into extravagances than the movement in a Liberal direction which exists in our own Church. Our own extravagances in that direction I deeply deplore, though I am not in the least surprised when extremes in one direction lead to extremes in another. My only object in what I wrote was to protest against the common practice among us of ignoring facts which do not please us. The two facts to which I called attention were (1) that the movement of which I spoke has commenced, and is of serious import, and (2) that it is a sign that Rome is losing ground. Whether she is losing ground permanently, or whether, as has often occurred before, the violence of the reaction will bring about another reaction in her favour, I do not presume to say.”

— You will certainly read with interest the following passage from a letter of the Rev. E. I. Treble, chaplain (Wiesbaden) Feb. 8<sup>th</sup> on the late Professor Kraus:

“... In our conversations he would put out, for example, the view that the Vatican Council of 1870, not being formally ended, may at any time resume its sessions, and proceed to further definitions of the Infallibility Dogma.

“His was an entirely academic position. He would throw off an idea, as a kind of sighting shot, partly for the love of discussion, partly for the sake of hearing what one had to say.

“Thus he would say Infallibility might be defined in two ways, either of them acceptable to Catholics at large: — (a) The Pope is infallible by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. That inspiration is not one of a plenary character, but the ordinary inspiration of *assistance*. Hence the Pope must first inform himself on the point upon which he must pronounce. Hence he must at least use the Post Office, and write to Bishops. Hence, he is not infallible *sine episcopis*. In other words, he does but voice the episcopate! Or (b), the Pope is infallible as Head of the Church. No Head can live apart from a body. Hence the Pope is only so far infallible as the Body of Christ, the Church, is herself infallible, &c., &c.

“Obviously, the words ‘*ex sese*’ in the decree did not convey any absolutism to his mind.

“On Transubstantiation I used to argue that the English doctrine depended very much upon the current philosophical view of what *substance* is. In my younger days, ‘substance’ was regarded as a noumenon, whereas recently philosophy had begun again to regard it as a phenomenon. He replied more than once: ‘I fully believe that with most of us, including you and me, the *thing* is there; sooner or later definition must become more accurate.’

“On the subject of Anglican Orders, when the question was being considered at Rome, he would never commit himself to me. But, in my little missionary journeys in Baden and Alsace, I used to hear from his old pupils that his views were quite that Anglican Orders were valid. No doubt, he had to keep a still tongue on a then thorny subject in debate; but one could see where his convictions lay.

“As to the subject of our (supposed) Anglican intrusion on the Continent, he was very short and sarcastic. He regarded the mutual establishment of chaplaincies in each other’s ground as a bounden duty of the Catholic Church. He laughed to

scorn the mere close theory of jurisdiction in these divided days. He quoted the valuable intercourse he had had with the clergy of St. Alban's, Holborn."

— *Rome and England*. The "Church Bells and Illustrated Church News" of Feb. 7<sup>th</sup> have published the following article: "... No doubt the Penal Laws frightened Rome from the attempt, but, making all allowance for this, Rome did not do very much for the few English who remained true to her in this land; and what she did in 1850 was to set up an opposition Church in England to the Church in England.

"It was not an effort to provide more spirituals helps and privileges to her English adherents; it was much more than that. It was not only, as from the Anglican point of view, a setting up of a schismatic opposition Church, it was more. The Roman intention and purpose was to treat the Church of England as no church at all. She was to be treated as 'The Establishment,' a body created by, and subservient to, the State, without sacraments, without priesthood, an imposture and a sham; that is what Rome did in 1850, and what she does now. She violates all Catholic tradition and order by ordering Anglicans whom she persuades to join her, to be at least conditionally baptized. This is done again and again, and she has two provincial decrees insisting upon this sacrilegious proceeding.

"Wherever there is a reasonable doubt, conditional baptism should always be sought or administered, but the Westminster Decree treats all Anglicans as probably unbaptized. The Church which God is daily 'cleansing,' Rome persists in calling 'common,' and contemptuously denies it to be part of God's Church at all; in short, 'Down with it, down with it, even to the ground,' is the war cry of Rome in England.

"What, then, is an Anglican doing when worshipping in a Roman chapel in England?

"If Rome is in material schism, he is encouraging it. If Rome is in wilful formal schism, he is encouraging it. He is encouraging the idea that Rome is in a Catholic position here. He is causing suspicion to arise, and retarding the reunion of Christendom. He is puzzling people as to what principle an English Catholic holds. He is encouraging those whose life and



work is to attack, injure, and destroy that portion of the Church to which he owes his own allegiance.

“He is patronising those who deny the presence of the Holy Ghost working in the Church of England as in a church. A member of the Church of England, be it remembered, is not in schism, but if he worships in the chapels of those who have separated from his communion, and oppose it, then he must be countenancing and abetting of schism.

“The Church of England never separated from the Catholic Church, nor from that large portion of it called the Roman Church. She threw off the uncatholic yoke of Papal supremacy, and the Pope then ordered all who would obey him to leave the Church of England. The Pope made the position of his followers schismatic; he it was that ordered the intrusion into existing dioceses and the setting up of altar against altar, opposition to English priests, and denial of the validity of Sacraments in the Church of England.

“Cardinal Vaughan has told us that the Roman Church ‘has never spared the knife when necessary to cut off rebels against her faith or authority, whether Easterns or Greeks, or Anglicans under the Tudor rebellion.’ Here is the plain acknowledgment of Rome’s schismatic action; it is then undoubtedly wrong for Anglicans to attend Roman chapels in England.

“At the same time, when we know what coldness, irreverence, and spiritual starvation there still abounds, and also the infinite harm done to the cause of the Church, to truth and charity by the fanatics of the Church Association type, we may readily understand Papists thinking they are doing good and lawful work here.

“All should yearn and pray for the reunion of Christendom, but it must be brought about in God’s own time, and in His own way, and corporate reunion with Rome or any other portion of Christendom will be only hindered by the actions of individuals which tend to mislead and confuse their brethren.”

A. B.

The same Newspaper in its number of Feb. 28<sup>th</sup> has taken notice of a book by the Rev. Spencer Jones, who pleads first and before all in favour of the Reunion of the Church of England and the Church of Rome. Mere illusion: firstly Rome does not want the union, but its own authority; and such a

union would drive away for ever the Oriental Churches and the Old Catholics.

— On the same subject we read that letter in the “Church Times” of Jan. 31<sup>th</sup>: “In common, I am sure, with many other Anglicans and constant readers of the ‘Church Times’, I have been deeply pained by certain passages in the article, ‘Always Reunion’, in your current issue. You seem to intimate that one of the steps to be taken by members of the Church of England in promoting reunion, is the adoption of a habit of mind by which our views on the Roman doctrines of Transubstantiation ‘may become not utterly irreconcilable’ with those of Rome itself, and the ‘Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff be understood in a sense not altogether intolerable’. Now, with regard to reunion with the Church of Rome, it must always be borne in mind that the authorities at Rome itself, and the members of the Italian mission in this country, will tolerate nothing but absolute submission. We do not blame them. It is their logical position. They cannot escape from it. They have ever taken, and always will take, their stand on ‘non-possumus’. They will never budge one inch whatever overtures we may make. To do so, or to admit that their position is open to discussion, would be to give themselves away. They are too astute to do this. They scoff at our so-called ‘Church’, and deny the validity of our Orders. We have no *locus standi*. We are children who have lapsed from virtue and truth, and our only course is to throw ourselves at her feet and crave her forgiveness. I challenge Dr. Vaughan, or any other Romanist in this country, to say in unambiguous language, that I am wrong. I will be delighted to find that I am.

“But the passages to which I am drawing attention are not only amazing as the opinion of an Anglican, they are curiously suggestive. After immense efforts at reunion the only result attained is that two dogmas, most vital and important—regarded by Churchmen of every school with the deepest aversion—are to be looked upon ‘as not utterly irreconcilable’ and ‘not altogether intolerable’. Two beliefs which should be held, if held at all, with ardour and enthusiasm, are to receive not even a tepid assent, but are to be merely coldly and negatively regarded as not ‘irreconcilable’ and not ‘intolerable’. Depend upon it, so far from the attitude of the English

Churchman towards these dogmas being modified, it will only stiffen as the years roll on. While these dogmas remain, reunion is nothing but a dream, and even were we to swallow them with other Roman heresies, reunion, as we understand it, would be as far off as ever. No! talk about it as we will, 'reunion' in the Papal vocabulary spells 'submission', 'absorption'—nothing less. While it is our duty neither to hate nor fear our Roman brothers (after the fashion of some of our 'Protestant' friends), we must never forget the teachings of history, and while always ready to unite on terms of acknowledged independence and equality, to stand on the defensive, lest we be haply called upon to fight over again our battles of civil religious liberty." J. J. H. C.

And the Editor adds naïvely the following remark: "Our correspondent's contention is based on the popular delusion that Rome is *semper eadem*. The truth is that Rome changes, slowly indeed, and imperceptibly, but just as much as any other part of humanity. No one at Rome now teaches Transubstantiation in the exact sense in which it was understood by those who condemned Ridley, and Infallibility is now taught and accepted in a sense which, only thirty years ago, would have been angrily denounced. Our correspondent may safely appeal to Cardinal Vaughan for support, because he is repeating that Prelate's favourite argument, but the slow-working logic of facts is against him."

— I wish to put this book under your notice: *Reasons why I am a Catholic, and not a Roman Catholic*. By the late Charlotte M. Yonge. (Wells Gardner, Darton, and Co. 1 s. 3 d.)—This book is composed of thirteen papers which were published early in 1901. Miss Yonge's reasons are given with characteristic thoughtfulness, vigour, and thoroughness, and we fancy many will receive benefit from them.

— We read in the "Church Times" of the 28<sup>th</sup> of Feb. the following note, which I beg you to draw nearer to the article of the same number, titled *Mass and Communion*: and you could easily state the progress that the Romanism (I do not say the Catholicism) made amongst the Ritualists: "Lady Wimborne's Ladies' League appears to have held a solemn function in Grosvenor Chapel this week. A service was recited, in 'which, according to the 'Westminster Gazette', 'neither psalms, lessons,

collect, nor creed for the day (*sic*) were used, and in a prayer for the Ladies' League 'the Reformed and Protestant branch of the Holy Catholic Church' was prayed for.' This curious phrase may help to account for the fact that the 'creed for the day' was not recited, no creed that we ever heard of taking any notice of any such institution as 'the Reformed and Protestant branch of the Holy Catholic Church'. Most loyal Church-people are satisfied with the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of the Creeds to which they are accustomed, and make no profession of a belief in any branch of the same, whether Reformed and Protestant or not. But the Lady Leaguers, we suppose, are of the emancipated woman order, with whom just at present it is fashionable to break away as much as possible from the established order of things. It is a grievous pity that the worthy folks connected with this ridiculous league are devoid of the saving sense of humour. The trace of the hoof of that strange quadruped unearthed by its foundress is everywhere visible. This is all that it has been vouchsafed to us to see of it, but it is more than enough to content us. *Ex pede asinum.*"

— *Bishop-making.* The "Church Bells" of Jan. 31<sup>th</sup> have published that following Article: "The recent proceedings in regard to the elevation of Canon Gore to the episcopal bench, while displaying certain unpleasant features, will not be without their use if they are the means of leading the public to study and to grasp the exact procedure in the matter of 'bishop-making' in this country.

"In the sub-apostolic age, when cities and districts were converted to Christianity, the bishops were invariably elected by the clergy and people, so that we have very early authority for the participation of the laity in the details of Church government. When the number of Christians increased with such rapidity, it was found that these popular elections led to tumults and disorders (sometimes even accompanied by murder), whereupon the emperors, being then for the most part Christians, reserved the election of bishops to themselves. In England, from early Saxon times, all ecclesiastical dignities were conferred by the King in Parliament (the Parliament, at that period, consisting of the barons, knights, and mitred abbots). For several centuries the struggle between the ecclesiastical

and the feudal system, complicated by the claim to interference put forward by the Pope of Rome, led to much difficulty and confusion, until the question was definitely settled, with the concurrence of the Convocation, by a statute of Henry VIII.

“The legal aspect of the appointment of a diocesan Bishop in England and Wales is as follows. On the vacancy of the See, the Dean and Chapter approach the Sovereign for leave to proceed to election. The royal consent is given by a licence called the *congé d'élire*, which is accompanied by a letter, suggesting the name of a certain person to be chosen. The putting forth of the name is the responsibility of the Sovereign, but long constitutional usage prescribes that the Prime Minister shall submit the name to the Sovereign, who can adopt it or reject it. In the latter case, a second name is submitted, and so on, until the royal selection has been made.

“The Dean and Chapter must then, within a given number of days, proceed to the election of the Bishop-designate, who then becomes Bishop-elect. The royal mandate for the consecration is then issued to the Archbishop of the Province, the consecration to be preceded by the confirmation. The origin of this procedure is interesting, and is traditionally believed to have come about in the following manner. In the early middle ages, a bishop was elected to a vacant see. On his journey from his parish in the north, to seek consecration at the hands of the Archbishop, he was attacked and murdered by highwaymen, one of whom donned his clerical garments, and presented himself for consecration in his stead. The imposture was detected at the last moment, and then the form of ‘confirmation’ was inaugurated. When objectors are cited to come forward, as is the practice in the Vicar-General’s court—which has, until the present reign, been held in Bow Church—the only ground of objection is that the person claiming to be Bishop-elect is not the ecclesiastic chosen under the royal *congé d'élire* by the Dean and Chapter.

“Within the last fifty years, however, the occasion has been taken advantage of, in several instances, by persons who imagined that they could convict the Bishop-elect of heresy, to protest against consecration on this ground. The Vicar-General has, however, invariably overruled the objections, and, beyond a certain amount of sacrilegious brawling by irrespon-

sible busy-bodies, no harm has been done. At the proceedings, however, in the Church House last week, at the confirmation of the election of Canon Gore to the See of Worcester, a more determined and orderly form of opposition was set on foot, culminating in an application to the Court of King's Bench for a mandamus to compel the Vicar-General to hear the objectors. As the matter is still *sub judice*, it would obviously be impossible for us to discuss the possible decision at which the Lord Chief Justice and his colleagues may arrive.

“But there is no doubt that the subsequent action of Canon Gore in the matter has given great pain to a large body of Churchmen. Dr. Gore's consecration was fixed for last Saturday, the Festival of the Conversion of St. Paul, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, who knows something of these matters—his appointment to the See of Exeter, more than thirty years ago, having been bitterly (but, we rejoice to say, unsuccessfully) opposed—was perfectly ready to consecrate him. The Bishop-elect, however, decided not to present himself for consecration, on the ground, it is stated, of the ‘consequences that might follow his occupancy of the See, should the Courts ultimately rule that his confirmation was irregular and invalid.’ It would be difficult to conceive a more Erastian view of the situation. No decision of the Courts could affect the validity of his consecration; and, in the opinion of the vast majority of Church people, the priceless gift of episcopal orders, canonically conferred, ought to outweigh in the balance the remote possibility of some delay and inconvenience in the ultimate taking over of the rights and privileges of his bishopric. No action which the Bishop-elect could have taken could have given greater justification to the noisy brawlers who brought discredit on the proceedings at the confirmation, but from whom those who have, in a dignified manner (whether wisely or unwisely, is not for us to say), invoked the decision of the Courts, have been careful to dissociate themselves.”

## II.

After those ecclesiastical Actualities, there are some more important theological documents to be mentioned:

— The Rev. B. I. Kidd had read at the Church Congress, Brighton, Oct. 1901, a paper on “the Appeal to Antiquity

as a principle of the English Reformation.” That Appeal ends as follows: “But whatever there is to expect or fear from the appeal to antiquity, of its obligation there can be little doubt. The English Reformers may or may not have rightly interpreted the voice of antiquity, but they all appealed to it. By their own confession their private opinions are nothing to us, especially where they depart from their standard; and the same holds good of our relation to the formularies, except so far as we have bound ourselves in conscience by declarations of assent. With the Reformers, then, we are to go behind the Reformation back to the Fathers. We are to ascribe to it no finality, but to prosecute its own appeal, the more so as that appeal can now be prosecuted with greater accuracy and fuller materials. We are to hold fast to antiquity, not because it is a standard entirely above criticism, but because the past is the best guide to the present, and *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* the best corrective of *Quod nunc, quod hic, quod a paucis* (Gladstone, Gleanings, iii, p. 214).

— Dr Rainy has published a work on: *The Ancient Catholic Church*. (Edimburg: T. and F. Clark, 12 s.) — The style of this work has been criticised. But Dr Rainy has given a very impartial survey of the history of the three and a half centuries assigned him, and, though his own convictions are perfectly obvious, they are never obtruded, and are never stated in such a way as to imply that every one must be a fool who does not subscribe to them. We do not know whether this volume supplies any felt want. It is, at any rate, a creditable piece of work, and not unworthy of its author’s reputation.

— We have a volume on *the Earliest Gospel* by Dr Allan Menzies (Macmillan and Co. 8 s. 6 d. net). The “Church Times” of Jan. 31<sup>st</sup> has appreciated it in this way: “For Dr Menzies the ‘Earliest Gospel’ is without question the book which we know as the Gospel according to St. Mark. But he means only the earliest of those which are come down to us. He begins his commentary with the sensible remark that—in the Apostolic Age the word ‘Gospel’ does not denote a book, but a spoken proclamation.

“It follows that the opening words, ‘The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ’, mean that beginning of such procla-

mation about Jesus Christ which was made in His own earthly ministry. The Gospel was a continuous proclamation, taking divers forms in various mouths, as St. Paul speaks of 'my Gospel' and 'another Gospel'. The record of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ is only a part of that which is proclaimed. Even more important, in the mind of St. Paul, is the preaching of His present power and glory. This being the case, why does Dr Menzies say:—We should have supposed that the Christians would at once provide themselves with an account of Christ's life and sayings.

“Why should we suppose anything of the kind? Having said this, he goes on to show laboriously that such a supposition contradicts the facts of the first age. But the supposition seems to inhere obstinately in his own mind; and his treatment of the Synoptic problem is coloured by the necessity of combating it. That is not the way to approach the problem, which calls for the study of facts in the driest possible light.

“The growth, the retention, and the final redaction of that tradition which is contained in the Synoptic Gospels, Dr Menzies accounts for with considerable care and skill. He gives due weight to the 'apologetic motive', the need of putting the life and character of Jesus Christ, as Man, in the clearest possible light, as an answer to the slanders of Judaism, and the contempt of Gentiles. He makes a valuable remark about the silence of the Epistles concerning the Galilean Ministry; a remark bearing, with no little force, on the Johannine question—with which, however, he is not directly concerned. He notes, also, the important fact that the tradition retained only—isolated glimpses of the Life of Jesus; the connexions were for the most part lost. There was hardly any geography preserved, hardly any chronology. One had the incidents without dates of place or time.

“When the recorded sayings and doings of the Lord were digested into the continuous narratives that we now read, time-dates of a kind were supplied by the writers; but these are vague, uncertain, and with some obvious exceptions are introduced for the purpose of composition only. This observation, again, searchingly illuminates some dark places which Dr Menzies does not professedly explore. It accounts for some discrepancies in the Gospels, and it shows the impossibility of the task which



some have unsuccessfully essayed, in trying to construct a formal Life of Christ.

“Our readers will see that we have before us a book of considerable interest. We wish we could give it greater praise, but we cannot. It is scrappy in treatment. A discursive Introduction, touching on various points of interest, deals thoroughly with none. The title would indicate the intention of treating expressly and fully the relations of the three Synoptics. Instead of doing this, Dr Menzies contents himself with stating perfunctorily the questions that are raised and the terms of the various answers attempted, with a reference to recent works in which they are to be found. He then quietly assumes that Mark is the earliest of the three, and even more than this, for he says:—The Gospel of Mark is the earliest of the attempts of which Luke speaks ‘to draw up a continuous narrative’ out of the materials delivered by ‘eye-witnesses and servants of the Word’.

“For this assumption we may safely say there is no shred of evidence. He attempts to fix the date of writing by the terms used in the apocalypse of chapter thirteen. The method is legitimate, but needs using with caution. It may be true to say that ‘The destruction of the Temple is predicted in terms which would scarcely have been used after it had happened’, and we have certainly no quarrel with the conclusion which is drawn from this fact. But the argument denotes a mental attitude towards prophecy and prediction which hinders all satisfactory dealing with the subject. There can be no doubt that a prediction remembered and recorded after fulfilment will be verbally coloured by the writer’s knowledge of the events. But, on the other hand, prophecy is not a normal operation of the human mind; and to measure the utterances of prophecy by the same foot-rule which we apply to ordinary speech, is to ignore a chief factor of the problem attacked. Dr Menzies betrays himself when he seeks a downward limit of date from the words of the Lord about those who should not die without seeing the Advent of the Kingdom. These words point, he says, to a period of forty or fifty years after the Crucifixion, when some of the hearers would be still living as old men, and they ‘would scarcely be used much after this’. Here he assumes (1) that the words had one particular and

literal meaning, and (2) that when this meaning was proved to be false the Christian tradition would carefully drop the memory of them. The Gospel cannot be understood by a reader who makes such assumptions. But the assumptions of Dr Menzies do not stop here. He supposes the prediction itself to be inaccurately recorded, and that for a startling reason. Jesus, who expected it to come, if not before his death, at least very shortly after, could scarcely have deferred the Coming, as he does here, to a time when most of his disciples should have died, as was evidently the case when this was written.

“The extraordinary charm, the holding force of the Gospel, is well illustrated by the fact that men who think in this fashion about our Lord consider it worth their while to devote laborious days to minute study of the Evangelic records. Our admiration for these men’s labour does not, however, induce us to regard them as effective guides over the ground which they have investigated.”

— Harnack is read and even translated by us. We have *An Examination of Harnack’s “What is Christianity?”* by W. Sanday (Longmans). The “Guardian” of Feb. 22<sup>nd</sup> says: “Dr Sanday puts first the points in which he agrees with Harnack. These fall mainly in the section which deals with the doctrine of the Kingdom and the relation of Christ to problems of external life and politics. But there is a timely and valuable protest against ‘the sweeping and, I must think, unjust language that is used in reference to the Fourth Gospel’. Dr Sanday then passes on to the more negative side of his criticism. He treats first the attenuated Christology which Harnack puts forward; and this is a very valuable section of his paper, for he points out that the appeal to the ‘Gospel’— ‘Is by no means the same thing as the ‘Gospels’, even if we confine that term to the Synoptics. It is something much narrower. It is Harnack’s version of the leading points in Christ’s teaching.’

“And Dr Sanday rightly claims that the limitation of this would be obvious if we had only the Gospels, but is made infinitely more certain when we take in the evidence of the Epistles. This discussion of the New Testament books occupies the main part of the paper, and it is really the heart of the question. In the concluding sections Dr Sanday touches upon

Harnack's view of history and his antagonism to all external forms in religion, and he ends with a characteristic comment on the whole position:—"I know," he says, "that he [Harnack] is not a bigoted writer, and that his countrymen are clear-sighted and more ready than most men to acknowledge an error. And I wish they could be persuaded to cross-examine rather severely the assumptions they so frequently make on these three subjects of Church, Doctrine, and Worship."

"Here Dr Sanday makes a very important point. In spite of all the points which Protestant Churches hold in common, there is a really deep line of cleavage on these three questions. And though the existence of this cleavage displays itself in conclusions, it is often in the region of assumptions that it really lies. It is this that makes so much controversy futile, and is the secret of the failure of so many well-meant attempts to patch up 'reunions' between various Churches. We may safely say that reunion will remain a beautiful dream till the various bodies have faced the question of the significance of their assumptions and criticised them adequately."

Two other Lectures by Professor Harnack have been translated into English by Kellett and Marseille (Williams and Norgate, 4 s.): *Monasticism: its Ideals and History*, and the *Confessions of Saint Augustine*. — The "Guardian" of Feb. 19<sup>th</sup> says: "The sketch of monasticism is, of course, rather slight; the subject is too extensive to be dealt with thoroughly in so narrow a compass. But there is more completeness in the study of St Augustine. Dr Harnack gives full weight to the intellectual and moral greatness of Augustine; indeed, it is hardly too much to say that he speaks of him with enthusiasm. He understands, to a large extent, the leading motives of St Augustine's changes, and gives a good account of the history of his life. But the point of view from which he judges is made plain beyond mistake by the astonishment with which he finds Augustine attaining the satisfaction of all his yearnings in the Church. He chronicles it accurately, and explains it as an inevitable result of the influences of the period. But it is clear that at this point his sympathy passes into wonder. Now, it is conceivable that the peculiarities of Greek monasticism may be partly explained in relation to their environment, the extravagances and the false ideals of some of the Monks in the

West may be similarly treated without necessarily suggesting doubts as to the universal validity of D<sup>r</sup> Harnack's main principle; but it is a little remarkable that D<sup>r</sup> Harnack, considering all that he says of S<sup>t</sup> Augustine, should retain unimpaired a criterion of Christian truth which so entirely fails to account for the history of such a man. And it does fail to account for him. S<sup>t</sup> Augustine had seen through so many plausible systems that it is not likely that he would have failed at this point, if the idea of a great visible Church was so entirely a departure from the point of view of Christ's religion as D<sup>r</sup> Harnack thinks it is."

— D<sup>r</sup> James Orr has published a volume on the *Progress of Dogma*, which is appreciated in the "Church Family Newspaper", Feb. 21<sup>th</sup>: "These extremely able lectures, in which sobriety of judgment and a firm grasp of the subject are combined with a singular clearness of expression, ought to be in the hands of every student of theology. We occasionally disagree with D<sup>r</sup> Orr, but never without sincere respect for his fairness in stating the case, and one thing we particularly admire in his book is its absolute freedom from all kinds of cant and affectation. It presents a refreshing contrast in this respect, when compared with the sophistical productions of more than one popular writer of the day... D<sup>r</sup> Orr is of opinion that eschatology, which has 'never yet had an epoch of its own', is likely to receive much attention in the immediate future. He rightly observes that what the Church suffers from to-day is not, as some think, too much theology, but too little theology of an earnest kind. The lectures contain numerous references to Harnack's great work on Christian dogma, and were partly designed as a reply to some of Harnack's positions. Our readers are strongly urged to make acquaintance with this volume. We consider it one of the most thoroughly solid and wholesome books that we have seen for some time."

— Rev. Chancellor Lias has read a paper before the Rural Deanery of Frome on the Sacrifice in the Jewish and Christian Churches. That interesting paper is printed in the "Church Family Newspaper" of February last. On the question of Sacrifice and of the Eucharist I can indicate the following works, besides the work of Bishop Gore: *The Body of Christ* which you have appreciated in the last number of the "Inter-

national theological Review":—*The Eucharistic Sacrifice: an Historical and Theological Investigation* of the Sacrificial Conception of the Holy Eucharist in the Christian Church. With an Introduction by the late Rev. T. T. Carter. *Atonement and the Eucharist*, by the Rev. Kerr Smith.—*The Christian Sacrifice*, by the Rev. Harry Wilson.

— Some works about Eschatology are also to be noticed. That deep subject seems to excite more and more the attention of our generation:—*The Immortality of the Soul*, by J. Agar Beet (Hodder and Stoughton);—*The Soul in the unseen World*, an Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Intermediate State, by R. E. Hutton;—*Purgatory, the State of the Faithful Departed, Invocation of Saints*, by A. Mason (Longmans);—*Immortality, and other Sermons*, by Rev. Momeril (Blackwood);—*Life: its Mysteries Now and After Death*, by Rev. A. Wright (Oliphant).

— One will also read with interest the following essays:

In the "Church Family Newspaper" (Jan. and Febr.): Old Testament Criticism (Rust, Urban, McKenny, Field, Tremlett, etc.);—the Relation of modern Criticism of the Old Testament to the Authority of the New;—the Church's Outlook Theology Old and New (Cobb);—the New Testament in Greece, opposition to a new translation;—What Religion is (Canon Armitage Robinson);—A Common-sense View of the Bible;—Our Attitude towards English Roman Catholics and the Papal Court, by A. Galton.

In the "Church Times" (Jan. and Febr.): Critics on the following works: Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the N. T., by Fr. Kenyon;—History of the Church of England, by Dixon.

In the "Guardian" (Jan. and Febr.): Critics on the following works: A Historic View of the N. T., by Percy Gardner;—Justification by Faith, by Holden;—Historical Christianity the Religion of Human Life, by Strong;—The Old Testament and the New Scholarship, by J. Peters;—the Apologetic of A. Vinet;—the New Biblical Commission;—Lord Halifax on the Reunion;—etc.

If one wants to have an idea of the arbitrary and of the fault of criterium with which many of our Theologians interpret the Bible, one must read the work of Rev. S. Chainey: *The Unsealed Bible*.

I close with a remark of the "Church Bells" of Febr. 28<sup>th</sup>, for which I decline any responsibility, about the book of Wendt on the Gospel of S<sup>t</sup> John: "One significant point about the book reminds me of a story told by a friend who had been staying with a Professor of Theology in Switzerland. Looking round his well-stocked library, he remarked on the rich array of French, German, and Dutch works, and on the absence of English. 'English theology,' replied the Professor, 'I was not aware that there was any.' So Professor Wendt quotes one English theologian only, D<sup>r</sup> E. A. Abbott, 'The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.' Even D<sup>r</sup> Sanday's now rare treatise on the same subject is ignored. What is the reason for this contempt of English theology? The answer is probably that our workers are, as Germans think, too timid, too conventional, and too much trammelled by their preconceptions. Especially are they weak in Quellenforschung—study of the primary sources. This is no doubt why our cousins treat Westcott on S<sup>t</sup> John's Gospel just as if it were non-existent."

ANGLICANUS.

---