

**Zeitschrift:** Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review  
**Band:** 16 (1908)  
**Heft:** 64  
  
**Artikel:** Anglicana  
**Autor:** [s.n.]  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403718>

### **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:** 17.11.2024

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

## ANGLICANA.

---

\* *Encore le Symbole dit de St. Athanase.* — Tout le monde sait que ce symbole n'est pas de St. Athanase; qu'il ne date que du V<sup>e</sup> siècle; qu'il n'est qu'un document théologique, et non dogmatique; qu'il n'a jamais été en usage parmi les fidèles; qu'il manque d'une sanction œcuménique; que ses exagérations sur plusieurs points de doctrine sont manifestement erronées. — Néanmoins des théologiens anglicans reviennent à la charge, les uns pour son maintien, les autres contre. Les discussions recommencent, quoique tout, ou à peu près, ait été dit en ces matières. Pur verbiage, qui n'éclaircit pas ce qui reste obscur, et qui obscurcit plutôt ce qui est clair. Absence de critère pour distinguer ce qui est dogme et ce qui n'est qu'opinion théologique. Mouvement de l'écureuil qui fait tourner sa roue sans avancer lui-même.

\* *Encore le modernisme dans l'Eglise anglicane.* — On lit dans une lettre de M. Gordon Milburn, publiée dans le « Guardian » du 15 juillet dernier: "That there will be a Modernist movement in the English Church during the next ten years is, I suppose, quite certain... Now the allimportant question is as to the attitude which the Church is to take up towards the movement. Two things are possible. On the one hand, it is possible for the champions of strict orthodoxy to move the Episcopate to attempt repressive measures—declarations of the necessity of strict orthodoxy to membership in the Anglican Communion, anathemas, hard words, refusal of licences, and the like. This will in all likelihood provoke critical attacks upon the orthodox faith by Modernist writers, more hard words, regular unbelief under veils of complete orthodoxy, the world of modern thought put out of all sympathy with the Church,

multitudes outside our churches who ought to be inside, a clergy with such hide-bound and officially regulated souls that they will be quite incapable of interpreting the things of the Spirit in any other way than by repeating mechanically what they have learnt in authorised books, and the whole religious world permeated by strife, animosity, and un-Christian bitterness . . .

On the other hand, a corresponding duty devolves upon all those who are conscious of Modernist leanings. If we are treated with consideration we ought ourselves to be considerate. Traditionalism will not be an enemy to be conquered, but an elder sister from whom we have very much to learn. And, above all, we shall remember that the aim of a religious movement is always religion—not intellectual satisfaction. There are thousands to day to whom the old faith appears worn out. To the question, “Ist Gott tot?” the secret answer is often a sad affirmative. To such people Modernism is called to bring a new message of hope and faith. It must show them that it is not Christianity that is worn out, but at most its old scholastic dress. Therefore, in order to keep a genuinely religious, rather than a critical, bias on the movement from the first, may I suggest that all of us who are inclined to Modernist points of view should make it a personal rule to pray daily for the peace and spiritual well-being of the Church of Christ, and to abstain from all harsh or contemptuous expressions with reference to schools of thought (and denominations) to which we do not ourselves belong, even if ourselves attacked? And in general the aim of both parties, Modernist and Scholasticist alike, must be to keep open the possibility of that future consummation and reconciliation which, in the words of *The Guardian* leader already referred to, “shall surprise and delight us all.”

Autre lettre. M. A. Bulley écrit dans le « Guardian » du 22 juillet : “Mr. Milburn’s timely letter is encouraging to those who see in the new conditions which affect the Church the need for greater activity. “The new conditions,” as Mr. Lilley says in the Introduction to his translation of the *Programme of Modernism*, “have raised new problems.” And these problems are not to be solved by enclosing the great truths of revelation in an inflexible system. The present conditions of

our social life are not favourable to the religious necessities of the people, which are imperilled by ecclesiastical controversies on the one hand and the deadening influence of materialism on the other. The sanctity of the Lord's Day is palpably losing its hold on the nation, and amusements are rife which public opinion would not have tolerated in past generations. This reckless introduction of the Continental Sunday has done much to thin the attendance at our churches. The Nonconformists also complain bitterly of a marked falling-off, and a eminent Baptist minister at a recent Conference of the Free Churches attributed it to the "iconoclastic materialism" which is deadening the soul of the world. The masses are indifferent, owing to the many incitements to pleasure, but nevertheless the soil is capable of cultivation, and a Mission preacher of power will often make a marked change in a district. Would it not then be a fatal error to curb the activities of any section which could bring the rising generation under religious influences?

And the term "Modernism," which has been applied to Liberal theology in the Church of Rome, is no new thing amongst ourselves. Not to mention the names of living preachers, F. W. Robertson, Jowett, Stanley, Haweis, and the writers of *Essays and Reviews* were certainly of this school; and Maurice and Farrar were sympathetic. Their teaching is by no means homogeneous, but its direction may be summed up in the phrase that "Truth is light." Liberty of interpretation is widely tolerated in the Established Church of Scotland, although the General Assembly exacts subscription to the Confession of Faith. The time was when its rigid Calvinism was in entire harmony with the thought of the day. It is so no longer. The substance of its Calvinism remains, but it is held more often in the scientific rather than in the theological sense. To alter the Creeds is to open the flood-gates of anarchy. The Catholic faith has no need to stifle inquiry. Revelation is larger than theology, and dogma is thought crystallised, and thought may convey an imperfect rendering of revelation. I think I may appropriately quote one of the inspiring sermons of Robertson of Brighton—"There is boundless danger in all inquiry which is merely curious;" and he adds—"Lastly, I assign as a cause of scepticism that priestly bigotry which forbids inquiry and makes doubt a crime."



Bref, on est loin de s'entendre, et nul ne songe ni à définir le modernisme, ni à l'analyser. C'est la théologie du bloc et des coups dans les ténèbres.

\* *Encore le « Woman Suffrage »*. — Nombre de dames anglaises sont intrépides à réclamer leurs droits politiques et sociaux. On connaît leurs récentes manifestations. En religion, elles sont plus calmes. Il y a cependant discussion sur leur droit de parler dans l'église. Il est certain que *plus d'une* parlerait mieux que *plus d'un*. Attendons la fin, s'il doit y avoir une fin.

\* *Encore l'« Educational problem »*. — On lit dans le « Church Times » du 17 juillet : “ The efforts of the little group of “ Liberal Churchmen ” to establish an educational *modus vivendi* in concert with Dissenters appear to have come to nothing. This is not to be wondered at, for they have not taken for the basis of the attempted agreement the broad principle of religious equality. This principle, once a prime doctrine of Liberalism, has long since been thrown over by the people who call themselves Liberal, and even when they qualify their Liberalism with Churchmanship they cannot get back to this root principle. Until they do so, they may just as well stand aside from the present controversy. They certainly will never settle it . . . ”

\* *Encore le Congrès Pan-Anglican de Londres (15—24 juin 1908)*. — Recueillons ce que plusieurs Revues en ont publié : — Ce congrès n'avait pas pour but de formuler des décisions, et, de fait, il n'en a formulé aucune; on discutera donc après comme avant. Il voulait seulement donner des renseignements, et il en a donné. Son programme était beaucoup trop vaste; il a touché à peu près à tout; de là une superficialité inévitable. Il eût mieux fait de se concentrer sur les points les plus importants. D'après la « Revue catholique des Eglises », « les *exaltés* et les *bavards* ont été à peu près exclus » <sup>1)</sup>; donc tolérance et courtoisie. De plus, on a avoué les « insuffisances » de l'Eglise anglicane; donc sincérité. — Le « Church Times »

<sup>1)</sup> Juillet 1908, p. 430.

du 3 juillet 1908 a remarqué : « Presque tous les membres du clergé qui, au congrès, ont parlé sur les questions sociales, ont exprimé des vues en harmonie avec les principes socialistes. Que nous sommes loin d'il y a 20 ans, ou même d'il y a 10 ans ! Et c'est le signe d'un développement de la vie spirituelle dans l'Eglise et d'un progrès dans l'enseignement et dans la pratique des idées catholiques. » Avis à qui de droit. Beaucoup d'orateurs se sont étendus sur les questions sociales sans beaucoup les éclaircir. M. John Malcolm a fait remarquer que le remède à la bureaucratie n'est pas dans l'aristocratie, mais dans la démocratie. Est-ce bien sûr ? Ne serait-il pas ailleurs ? — Sur la critique biblique, mémoires très « avancés » du professeur Kennet et du D<sup>r</sup> Burney. Réplique du doyen de Cantorbéry. Selon le D<sup>r</sup> Burkitt, « le christianisme n'est pas porté et transmis par un livre, la Bible, mais par une société, la société chrétienne. Que cette société vienne à disparaître, elle ne pourrait, à son avis, renaître de la Bible seule. Si le christianisme était contenu dans la Bible, l'étude critique de ce livre serait plutôt un danger qu'un secours. Mais la foi n'est pas actuellement fondée sur l'autorité de la Bible. Les croyants peuvent se servir du livre sacré pour leur profit spirituel, mais son autorité ne s'impose pas d'elle-même à ceux qui n'ont pas la foi. C'est parce que nous croyons au Christ et que nous appartenons à son Eglise que la Bible a pour nous un si grand prix. » Le D<sup>r</sup> Burkitt a parfaitement raison. C'est dommage qu'il n'ait pas développé la thèse complémentaire de la sienne, à savoir que l'Eglise ou la société chrétienne n'est pas la hiérarchie, et que par conséquent les actes de la hiérarchie doivent être contrôlés et complétés par les simples fidèles. — La « Revue catholique des Eglises » (très papiste) applaudit au papisme de certains anglicans ; rien de plus naturel. « Les Anglicans, dit-elle, comprennent très bien l'attitude prise par Rome contre le modernisme, et c'est le lieu de rappeler la conférence du D<sup>r</sup> Gore, évêque de Birmingham, sur ce sujet : l'intervention de l'autorité était nécessaire, et il le proclama bien haut. » Reste à savoir si tous les Anglicans sont dans cette fatale direction. — Le rapporteur de cette Revue remarque encore que « le point de vue protestant exposé par un des délégués qui parla d'une mission anglicane cherchant à introduire les idées de la Réformation et à provoquer des conversions en Espagne et en

*Portugal* ne paraît pas avoir rencontré les sympathies de l'«auditoire». — Lord Halifax a parlé des possibilités de communion avec Rome, avec la Rome de Pie X, bien entendu; M. W. J. Birkbeck, avec l'Eglise orientale, spécialement en Russie. Le chanoine Newbolt a prouvé que la tendance actuelle est plutôt portée vers la création d'Eglises nationales que vers la formation de groupes d'Eglises. Il ne croit pas qu'une autorité centrale soit la meilleure forme de gouvernement pour toute l'Eglise ou une large portion de l'Eglise. D'autres, au contraire, préconisent une autorité centrale. On le voit, le congrès a montré les divisions, mais il n'y a pas remédié.

\* *Lettre encyclique de la Conférence de Lambeth.* Voir le texte dans le «Guardian» du 12 août. Les appréciations sont diverses. Voici celle du «Church Times» du 14 :

“ Our first feeling, we confess, is one of *disappointment*. We should have expected that the 243 prelates would offer the clergy and the laity advice less timid and indecisive to guide them in dealing with some burning questions of the day. The obvious explanation of the halting opinions they have delivered is that *they are seriously divided among themselves*. We looked, of course, for some deliverance concerning the duty of the clergy in regard to marriage with a sister-in-law, but the Conference had no advice to offer. The question of divorce, which called for courageous and decisive treatment, was discussed, it is true, but left practically where it was left by the Conference of 1888. The Bishops then approved of the distinction between the guilty and the innocent party, refusing to withhold the Sacraments from the latter if they remarry under civil sanction. All that they now do is to add the statement that it is “undesirable” that the marriage of an innocent party should be solemnized by the Church. This distinction, so persistently maintained, entirely disables the Bishops from dealing effectively with the appalling evil of Divorce and its moral and social consequences. It has sentiment in its favour, but not logic; for, if a marriage can be dissolved at all, both parties are free to marry again; they are as though they had never been married at all, and the question of their guilt or their innocence is *non ad rem*. There are but two logical positions, either that a marriage can be dissolved,

or that it cannot. There is no *tertium quid*, and those who act as though there were have no answer to give to those who advocate the wholesale relaxation of the marriage bond. The Church's rule, which is in accord with the Divine appointment "from the beginning," is the only firm ground on which we can stand.

Another subject of which the Encyclical treats is the question of reunion. And here again we are *disappointed*. Mention is made, in this connexion, of approach towards the Russian and the Eastern Churches, the Church of Sweden, the Presbyterians and the Moravians; but the Roman Church is entirely ignored. We do not wish to disparage any effort to reunite professing Christians, but the only reunion for which we could work would have a Catholic basis, and we should deprecate the granting of concessions on the one side which would make it more than ever difficult to heal the breach in the great Church of the West. It was, perhaps, impossible for the Conference to do otherwise than leave it within the discretion of the various Churches of the Anglican Communion to order, or not to order, the liturgical use of the *Quicumque Vult*. In view of the diversity of practice among them, the Bishops could scarcely venture to pronounce upon the question as it locally affects ourselves. All that they could do was to recommend the production of a new version, "based upon the best Latin text." Almost better would have been the recommendation to study this great exposition of the Christian Creed, for we are convinced that many of the objections urged against it arise from an unreasoned dislike of it, and an unwillingness to ascertain its true purport. We are thankful to find that the members of the Conference realise to what an extent our secondary schools have neglected religious education in its proper sense. On many occasions we have tried to show that the Church has been responsible for this neglect, which is *all the more deplorable* because it had a free hand, when teaching was almost entirely a clerical profession, to inculcate the faith in all its fulness. Now, the work has to be begun from the beginning, under all the *disadvantages* of an established *bad* tradition."

Ajoutons que, dans une Lettre spéciale à son clergé, M. l'archevêque de Cantorbéry a fait remarquer que la Conférence

n'avait aucune autorité législative, et que par conséquent elle ne liait personne. Ce n'est donc qu'une simple démonstration.

\* *Doyen et évêques.* — Le doyen de Westminster a osé exprimer des désirs et même donner des conseils dans une assemblée où se trouvaient des évêques. Scandale! « The Dean of Westminster is unquestionably a great prelate », dit un journal. Cependant ce même journal écrit :

“ This English Christianity is not only divided from the rest of Christendom; it is profoundly divided within itself. Its internal divisions, again, can be traced to historic origins, have had an historic development, and are facts which it is idle to ignore. Only from the narrowest outlook can anyone disregard Methodism and Congregationalism and Presbyterianism as factors in English Christianity, and therefore in the Christianity of the world. Can these divisions be healed? Some derivative rents are actually being patched; an effectual closing must be the work of the historically continuous organization from which the various parts have broken away. The historic English Church, with its tentacles extending to all parts of the world where English influence is felt, is the parent of this English Christianity; family union can be effected only in the paternal home.

A hurried union would be disastrous. An underlying unity there is; the unity of the name of Christ, the unity of baptismal grace, the familiar unity created by use of the same English text of Holy Scripture. But union means common action, though it does not mean uniformity of fashion; and common action is hindered by fissures both wide and deep. Some of these may safely be bridged, others may be really closed by the movements of the mass. The preliminary shaking that heralds such movement may be in evidence. The business of the Bishops now assembled is to examine the evidence, to indicate the possible points of juncture, to plan the action that may be needed.

It is evident to all concerned that the question of ordination causes one of the deepest and widest rifts. If presbyteral ordination be regarded as possibly or probably valid, it is none the less so doubtful that no part of the Church, however large, can safely accept as sharers of the official priesthood

those who have been so ordained. It might be right—and there is the weighty precedent of Bramhall's action—to offer in these cases ordination administered under the most carefully-guarded conditions. All American Methodists, and perhaps all Presbyterians, have a continuous tradition of the imposition of hands, but careful inquiry is still needed as to the character of the rite employed. This consideration, however, covers only part of the field. English Protestantism is founded in great and growing degree on the basis of Congregationalism, and the principle of Congregationalism is that all the authority of the Church and the whole power of the Keys are vested in each group of believers who meet for common worship and common action. The minister is then but the delegate of the congregation. How can he be received? How can he be reconciled?

The Dean of Westminster thinks that “when there is an ordered ministry, guarded by the solemn imposition of hands, then our differences are not so much matters of faith as matters of discipline, and ought, with humility and patience, to be capable of adjustment.” But if the solemn imposition of hands be a mere formality, a recognition of a ministry already existing on another basis, it is not what is understood by ordination. And the meaning of ordination is rather a matter of faith than of discipline. The Dean proposed a possibly more fruitful thought when he spoke of “a charismatic ministry, which God has owned and blessed.” He probably did not mean that such a ministry ought to be formally recognized as valid in the Church. The refusal of the Church, probably determined in the early years of the second century, any longer to recognize such a ministry, was undoubtedly wise, and must be considered final...

Yet we have said that the Dean of Westminster may have lighted upon a fruitful thought. May not a man who believes himself so-called be willing none the less to receive the imposition of hands as adding to his inward call the outward commission of the Church? That relation is implied, indeed, in the ceremony of ordination. May not men by the grace of humility so far submit themselves in the cause of peace? It is what remains to be seen.”



\* *Les collèges papistes en Angleterre.* — D'après « L'Enseignement chrétien » (1<sup>er</sup> juin), on en compte une *quarantaine* de moyenne importance épars dans les plus grandes villes : Londres et Liverpool sont les plus favorisées. De ce nombre, les Bénédictins en possèdent 5 ; les Oratoriens, 2 ; les Jésuites, 9 ; la congrégation enseignante de St. Joseph, 1 ; les Frères, 3 ; les autres sont tenus par les membres du clergé séculier. Puis, 16 collèges dirigés par des laïques, et qui sont surtout des écoles préparatoires à l'entrée aux collèges. Surveillance par un comité général. Tous ces établissements ont un congrès général au mois de mai.

\* *Les espoirs de la Revue catholique des Eglises.* — Cette Revue ultramontaine espère que l'Eglise anglicane fera bientôt partie de l'Eglise catholique-romaine. On lit dans son numéro de juin (p. 380) : « Le mouvement catholique a aujourd'hui conquis droit de cité dans l'Eglise d'Angleterre ; la seule pensée d'expulser de l'Eglise les Anglo-catholiques aurait, pour tout le monde, quelque chose de ridicule. La *Low-Church* apparaît comme une ignorance, qui passera. La puissance du mouvement catholique vient non de tel accident, ou de telle mode, mais du fait qu'il est imposé *par toutes les tendances, par toutes les forces* qui travaillent le pays. Il suffira à présent de quelque petit incident imprévu pour montrer le chemin *sourde-ment fait*, et pour achever *d'un coup* ce que les hommes préparent, sans connaître le temps. » — Si les Anglicans ne sont pas avertis, c'est qu'ils voudront ne l'être pas.

\* *Réponse à MM. les Rapporteurs de la Société anglo-continentele.* — Dans le *Rapport de la Société anglo-continentele 1907*, on lit (p. 22), à propos de la consécration de l'évêque Kozlowski (Chicago) : "No doubt there is much to be said for sending a fellow-countryman to be Bishop to the members of a foreign community resident in the United States ; but it would certainly have been *more brotherly* if the Old Catholics Bishops had consulted with the Bishops of a Church with which they were in Communion before taking such a step."

Les anciens-catholiques ont déjà déclaré qu'ils ne se sont aucunement immiscés dans les affaires de l'Eglise épiscopale des Etats-Unis ; que les catholiques polonais établis dans la

contrée de Chicago avaient et ont encore le droit de ne pas vouloir faire partie de l'Eglise anglicane (épiscopale), car on peut rompre avec Rome sans être obligé logiquement de se faire Anglican; que dès lors les catholiques polonais en question avaient le droit de faire appel aux anciens-catholiques, et de leur demander le service de charité de consacrer l'évêque élu par eux régulièrement; que les anciens-catholiques, en leur rendant ce service, n'ont fait que leur devoir de confraternité catholique; que, pour le remplir dignement et convenablement, ils n'avaient nullement à consulter l'Eglise anglicane des Etats-Unis, et qu'ils n'y ont même pas songé, tant la conduite tenue par eux leur a paru correcte et simple.

Et maintenant, ce qui les étonne, à leur tour, c'est cette obstination des Anglicans qui, sous les yeux des anciens-catholiques de Hollande, d'Allemagne, de Suisse, etc., établissent journellement des évêques anglicans pour les Anglais vivant en Hollande, en Allemagne, en Suisse, etc., sans avoir non plus la moindre idée de consulter les évêques anciens-catholiques de ces contrées. Ce que les Anglicans trouvent bon pour eux, devient mauvais pour les anciens-catholiques!

Ces mêmes Anglicans se déclarent « également surpris et désappointés » que les évêques anciens-catholiques aient consacré évêque M. Mathew pour les catholiques anglais qui veulent rompre avec Rome et ne pas entrer dans l'Eglise anglicane. C'est toujours la même inintelligence de la situation. Ces Anglicans semblent persuadés que, par cela même que des catholiques anglais veulent rejeter la juridiction et la dogmatique romaines, ils sont tenus de se soumettre à la juridiction et à la dogmatique de *l'Eglise des 39 articles*. Cette prétention est si illogique qu'il suffit de la signaler pour qu'elle éclate aux yeux du public. Le public sait en effet qu'il y a, même pour des Anglais, un milieu entre la Rome papiste actuelle et *l'Eglise des 39 articles*.

Même réponse à faire à l'*Anglican Church Magazine* de juillet (p. 102), qui attaque comme schismatique la consécration de M. l'évêque Mathew: "*It is difficult to see any analogy between the English Church's care for her own children upon the Continent and the Old Catholic Church's care for other people's children in England. Moreover it does not touch the*



vital question of the necessity which alone justifies an act which, in its form at any rate, is one of schism.”

*Il est difficile*, en effet, de faire voir à quelqu'un une vérité ou un fait qu'il ne veut pas voir. Mais cette vérité ou ce fait n'en sont pas moins réels et visibles. Les *catholiques* anglais qui ont fait appel à la charité des anciens-*catholiques* sont, il faut bien en convenir, meilleurs juges de leurs « nécessités » religieuses que les membres de l'Eglise des 39 articles. Si ces *catholiques* anglais jugent qu'en conscience ils ne peuvent pas s'unir à une Eglise qui ne leur paraît pas professer un vrai catholicisme, c'est leur affaire et leur droit. Les anciens-catholiques se sont bornés à leur rendre le service de charité et de confraternité catholique qui leur a été demandé; c'était leur devoir. Ce que l'*Anglican Church Magazine* appelle « schisme », nous l'appelons, nous, « union de foi, de sentiment et de sacrements ».

Certes, nous rendons très sincèrement hommage aux parfaites intentions de la Conférence de Lambeth; mais, très sincèrement aussi, nous professons, sur la manière de réaliser l'union des Eglises, des vues autres que celles de la Conférence et de la Société anglo-continentale. Nous nous croyons assez bien informés pour penser que le procédé de cette dernière restera inefficace. Ce ne sont pas les détails sans importance et jusqu'ici purement décoratifs, relatés dans l'*Eirenè* (the official organ of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Church Union), qui pourraient modifier notre opinion. Au contraire. Nous avons beau également consulter les Actes de l'A. P. U. C. (Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom), nous n'y trouvons que des menus faits sans valeur<sup>1)</sup>. Sans aucun doute, l'Eglise anglicane pourrait jouer un très beau rôle dans cette grande question. Mais, quoique flattée à cette pensée, elle ne semble pas comprendre en quoi il devrait consister. D'une part, en effet, elle est trop divisée, même de son propre aveu, pour exercer l'autorité morale nécessaire; et, d'autre part, certains de ses évêques ne prennent la question que par ses petits côtés. Les Eglises anciennes-catholiques, tout en ayant conscience de leur faiblesse numérique, ont aussi conscience de la force de leurs principes et de leur unité; et elles pensent qu'en matière de religion la doctrine l'emportera sur le nombre.

---

<sup>1)</sup> Voir, par exemple, le *Church Times* du 4 septembre dernier.

\* *Comment l'« Anglican Church Magazine » juge l'Eglise de Russie.* — On lit dans le numéro de sept.-oct., p. 128: « One step forward, however, was taken by the Conference: not a far-reaching effort in its consequences, but still useful and timely. It was resolved that a deputation should be sent to the forthcoming General Council of the Russian Church, bearing a letter of greeting; the matter possessing all the greater importance inasmuch as this unwonted spectacle of a *bonâ fide* General Assembly marks the stirring of new life in a *somewhat fossilised* if venerable Church.

It is to be hoped that we shall have some fairly complete record of the debates and proceedings of this Council. There is a question, *e. g.*, upon which we have long wanted enlightenment: To what extent do the modern books of devotion which are placed in the hands of the more earnest Russian Church folk *inculcate Roman teaching and practice*, more particularly with respect to Transsubstantiation, auricular confession and Mariolatry? We are under the impression that a good deal has been done by this silent, unostentatious means, to destroy the *not very broad line of demarcation between Roman and Russian Orthodox formulae*; and the matter is important, in the interests of reunion. Some of our readers in Russian cities should surely be able to offer valuable evidence on this point—the spread of what we may term ‘ritualism’ in the foremost of the Eastern Orthodox Churches. Books of devotion are to be welcomed as signs of a quickened spiritual life, and they may be useful in direction; but they naturally wield a *dangerous power* in moulding the religious life of a people, and so of a Church. We note that an important clerical gathering in Kieff, at the beginning of August, took into alarmed consideration *the rapid growth of Romanism*, pure and simple, throughout the empire, and adopted a series of resolutions calling upon the Government to take means for counteracting, indeed suppressing the work of foreign missionaries. This, however, is not at all the same thing.»

\* *Les anciens-catholiques et M. l'évêque Mathew.* — Le P. Angus, après avoir cherché de son mieux à discréditer M. l'évêque Mathew, a cependant écrit dans le *Guardian* du 29 juillet: “ Sir—I have, in common with other people, been

inclined to doubt the existence of Old Catholics in this country. I was wrong—and say so. Information received from Holland corrects me. There are, I find, eight or nine Old Catholic congregations, with priests, in England.” Ce bon Père trouve ensuite qu’un évêché ancien-catholique n’a pas de raison d’être en Angleterre, où il y a déjà l’évêché romain et l’évêché anglican. Il peut lire, dans le paragraphe précédent, notre réponse sur ce point.

Autre lettre, d’un chapelain anglais, parue dans le même journal: “Sir—As I have mentioned before, Anglicans are too often inclined to pass over the Old Catholics as a small or even diminishing body. Your readers may care to know that, on the contrary, they are an increasing body. Recent investigations of mine have led me to note a very distinct progress in every way—in vigour, spiritual life, and numbers—in Holland, where the Old Catholics are indeed the ancient Catholic Church of the country. Increase is to be noted too in Austria, and there are many signs there of further growth and vigour, and the probability of the Consecration, hitherto so long deferred, of an Austrian Old Catholic Bishop. Both in Switzerland and in Germany new congregations have been formed. It is quite contrary to facts to suppose that the Old Catholics are diminishing in numbers.

I am glad also to be able to say that the correspondence in *The Guardian* is having a good effect both in England and on the Continent. At the same time I desire to add that I have been myself treated with the utmost courtesy, kindness, and friendliness by the various Old Catholic Bishops on the Continent.

*English Chaplain.”*

Nous ne saurions entrer ici dans le chassé-croisé de lettres et de contre-lettres publiées sur cette question dans le *Guardian* des 5, 12, 19, 26 août, 5 septembre, etc. Espérons qu’à la fin on finira par s’entendre.

\* A lire: “*Anglican Liberalism*” by twelve Churchmen: 1. Religious Liberalism, Rev. Hubert Handley; 2. Theological Liberalism, F. C. Burkitt; 3. Biblical Liberalism, Rev. J. R. Wilkinson; 4. Devotional Liberalism, Rev. Shaw Stewart; 5. Clerical Liberalism, Rev. Hastings Rashdall; 6. Lay Liberalism, Percy Gardner; 7. Political Liberalism, Sir Th. Dyke Acland;

8. Social Liberalism, Rev. A. J. Carlyle; 9. Past Liberalism, Rev. Woods; 10. Nonconformist Liberalism, Rev. A. Caldecott; 11. German Evangelic Liberalism, Rev. W. Morrison; 12. Roman Catholic Liberalism, Rev. Lilley.

— Dans "The Church Quaterly Review" (July): The Lambeth Conference and the Union of the Churches.

\* *Authority: Ecclesiastical and Biblical*. By Rev. Fr. Hall, Prof. (Chicago). — Professor Hall's standpoint is Catholic as opposed to Roman. He maintains that an infallible Authority exists as an endowment of the Universal Church, but not of the assembled Episcopate, still less of an individual See. Utterances, whether Conciliar or Papal, must be tested by universal acceptance. A theory of infallibility, if real, must be consistent with the facts of history, and *a priori* constructions must be proved this way. The Universal Church has never conceded absolute judicial authority to any machinery whatever. — Vaticanism, or the absorption of the endowment of the Church Universal by the local See has been the chief formal cause of existing schisms. "All questions as to the righteousness of our break with Rome in the sixteenth century are now purely academic. The Vatican Council has created a new situation." Nevertheless, the author is possessed by an optimistic confidence that the Roman Church must ultimately outgrow Vaticanism. Meanwhile the urgent duty of the Anglican is to recover to the full the œcumenical spirit. The entire book is marked by caution, balance, and restraint, and deserves to be carefully read. A noticeable feature of the work is the immense number of modern writers referred to or discussed. (*Guardian*, July 29.)

Voir l'article publié dans le « Church Times » du 14 août.

\* *The Church in Modern England*. By F. Claude Kempson. — On lit dans le « Guardian » du 19 août : "It is not often that one takes up a book so bracing as this. By its freshness, its unconventionality of utterance, its sincerity and clear-headedness, and by the wide learning which is its background, this little volume should appeal to every fairminded Churchman; and if it but catch his ear, it will teach him something. We have

most of us recognised for some years that the old party nomenclature of "High Church," "Low Church," "Broad Church" is out of date. But the party-spirit, alas! is still with us, though crystallised in a different way. Mr Kempson would adopt a new classification, answering as he believes to the present lines of cleavage. Catholic, Nationalist, and Evangelical are his three categories. By Evangelicals he means those whose interest—deep and sincere though it be—is practically confined to their own personal sphere of work; Nationalist is the name he would give to those (of very various views in other matters) whose horizon is bounded by the limits of Anglo-Saxon Christianity. It includes not merely out-and-out Erastians, but also those who lay stress on everything "distinctively Anglican," whether they be of those who would elevate the "blessed Reformation" into a second Pentecost or of those mediævalists who love to play off Sarum against Rome. By Catholics he means those for whom membership in the Church is a matter of status—those who, taking the sacramental doctrine of the Catechism, and of the Prayer-book generally, in its plain and obvious sense, can hold out a hand to Dissenters on the one hand, and invite them to qualify themselves for active membership in a Church which is already theirs by virtue of their baptism, while it calls the Papist priest to purge his schism and disobedience by attending the Synodical assembly of the (Anglican) Diocese in which he is residing. That the Anglican Communion should be "comprehensive" is good, and is a mark of her mission in the world; that it should be split up into parties is evil, and handicaps its great missionary work, all the more because wherever it travels it is flanked by the Romanist and the Nonconformist. Mr Kempson regards this party system as the most serious drawback with which we have to deal; and he is bold enough to specify a remedy. What that remedy exactly is can best be gathered from his own breezy and epigrammatic pages. Suffice it here to say that he takes as his basis the Diocesan unit, and builds his hopes on a vigorous revival of Diocesan life and organisation, fostered by Bishops who can demand and inspire "loyalty," not so much "to the Church of England" as to that "Church of God" which "is explicitly the Church of" our priests' Ordination."

\* *Mort de M. l'évêque Potter, de New York.* — M. l'évêque Potter n'est point inconnu à nos lecteurs. Nous le considérons comme un ami de notre Eglise. La dernière fois que nous avons eu l'honneur et le plaisir de le voir, c'est au Congrès ancien-catholique de Bonn, où il était venu présenter les salutations fraternelles de l'Eglise épiscopale d'Amérique. Malheureusement il était déjà souffrant. La mort vient de l'enlever à son Eglise; c'est pour celle-ci une très grande perte, et nous lui exprimons dans cette triste circonstance notre plus vive condoléance.

Tous les journaux ecclésiastiques anglais mentionnent ce douloureux événement. On lit dans l'un d'eux, à la date du 24 juillet :

*"Bishop Potter died at Coopertown, New York, on Tuesday last, after a long illness.*

The Right Rev. Henry Codman Potter, Bishop of New York, came of a distinguished clerical and episcopal stock, his father, the Right Rev. Alonzo Potter, having been Bishop of Pennsylvania, and his uncle having been Bishop of New York before him. Born at Union College, New York, on May 25, 1834, Bishop Potter was educated at Union College, at the Episcopal Academy, Philadelphia, and at the Theological Seminary of Alexandria, Virginia. His first rectorship was in Greensburgh, Pennsylvania, whence he migrated to St. John's Church, Troy, New York, and subsequently to Trinity Church, Boston. In 1868 he became rector of Grace Church, New York, where he remained until 1883, when he was consecrated Assistant-Bishop to his uncle, with the right of succession. In January, 1887, he became Bishop on his uncle's death. Bishop Potter, who was well known in English clerical society, had received honorary degrees from Oxford, Cambridge, and Harvard.

A number of interesting publications stand to the Bishop's name. He wrote on "Sisterhoods and Deaconesses" in 1872, "The Gates of the East" was published in 1875, "Sermons of the City" appeared in 1878, "Waymarks" in 1887, and "The Scholar and the State" in 1897. It was as secretary to the American House of Bishops that Bishop Potter grew to know his episcopal brethren so intimately as to be able to tell



the pleasant stories about them which appeared as "Reminiscences of Bishops and Archbishops" in 1906.

No man was more popular or more highly respected throughout America than Bishop Potter, and our own Bishops and Archbishops who have visited the States have also learned to appreciate his worth. There was no great function, public or private, to which he was not one of the first to be invited."

\*\*\*

---