country for the moment—but the world is inside the barriers. Were we a few inside fixed barriers, able to trust each other and to fight together for common ideals, we would face the unbelief and error around us with equanimity and steadfast resolve. But we are not. Every heretic, infidel, and evil liver is able to call himself a member of the Church if only he has been baptized, although his baptism was accomplished without obedience to the discipline laid down in the Prayer-Book, and does so call himself in many cases, arrogating to himself at the same time the right to speak and to legislate for the Church.

But to go back a little. Even as one speaks of the compilers of our Prayer-Book one wonders if they were really so blind as they have been painted, or whether, even as they legislated for an entire nation, they did not retain at the back of their minds the consideration of the possibility of the position being altered. For surely, as one reads and considers violated and forgotten rubrics and canons, one is more and more struck by the potential fighting efficiency of the Church in her present difficulty. It is all there, all the Catholic discipline that would enable us to shake ourselves free again from the contamination of formalism and unbelief; that would enable us to set up again our barriers, exclude the faithless and disobedient, and restore again our primitive unity and consolidation. The essentials are all unspoilt. Details may need readjustment. To take an example from the ludicrous extreme: no disciplinarian, however bigoted, would care to devote his energies to the restoration of the canon that forbids the use of an embroidered nightcap to the weary priest. Some of the canons have been superseded by Act of Parliament. A wise discretion would be needed to differentiate between essentials and non-essentials, the possible and the impossible.

If, then, we resolve in the end on the bold course of re-establishing our ancient discipline—and it is our right to do so—what would it mean? The attempt will be made in succeeding papers to enter into details, and to explain what it would mean if we took the essentials and strictly obeyed them in the light of modern difficulties. It is not possible at this stage to suggest modifications; all we can do is to gather together the main principles as enunciated in rubric and canon, leaving possible alterations and elaborate details to be evolved later. We do not wish to pick and choose, taking up those points which are attractive to us personally, and ignoring such as are not. We wish, rather, to take up, as far as we can see them, the broad outlines of essential discipline, regardless of their effect from the point of view of policy or party, and equally regardless of their conformity with early Catholic discipline, where such conformity can be called into question. We are endeavouring, rather, to take the Prayer-Book just as it is, and to reconstruct the effects of its own stated discipline, outlining the possible methods of re-establishing it, and attempting to indicate the primary consequences of such re-establishment on the Church as she is to-day.

DISCUSSION

ANGLO-CATHOLICS AND EPISCOPAL AUTHORITY: ANOTHER VIEW.

MR. W. L. KNOX's article on this subject contains much for which we should be grateful to him, and much with which all Anglo-Catholics will agree. In particular, the appeal in his last paragraph for the revision of the present method of appointing Bishops in

England will be widely received with sympathy. One of the principal reasons for the present distrust of the episcopate is that we dare not allow too much power to any Bishop, however excellent, as long as we have no share in the appointment of his successor, who may be the nominee of a Prime Minister personally hostile to the Church. But in some respects Mr. Knox's view of authority appears to me to be open to very serious objections. Though I cannot claim either the learning or the influence of Mr. Knox, I am sure there must be many among the younger generation of Anglo-Catholics, to which I myself belong, as well as among older men, who take my view rather than his; and I maintain that it is at least as Catholic, and as much in accordance with our best traditions, as that which he has so ably put forward.

In the first place, he has not mentioned the place which is to be taken by Holy Scripture. It was the teaching of the undisputed Œcumenical Councils that all doctrinal definitions must be based on Holy Scripture, as the inspired record of Divine Revelation. When we were ordained to the priesthood, we solemnly affirmed that "we were persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation," and that "we were determined to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which we were persuaded might be concluded and proved by the Scriptures." We are bound to accept the Scriptures according to the interpretation of the Church, and to the definitions of the Seven Œcumenical Councils (which does not mean that every belief held or practice permitted in the undivided Church is permissible now); but we are not bound—indeed, we are forbidden—to accept anything as of faith, even if it has been defined by the whole Church, unless it can be proved by Holy Scripture. The dogmatic definitions of the Seven Councils will all pass this test. But the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of our Lady, mentioned by Mr. Knox, which is defined as of faith by the Roman Communion, but condemned by the Orthodox Communion, cannot by any sound exegesis be extracted from Holy Scripture (some would say that it is excluded by Rom. iii. 16): it cannot even claim the authority of the undivided Church; and even if it had been defined by the Orthodox as well as by the Roman Communion, we could not allow it to be taught as necessary to salvation, either now or at any future time.

In the second place, Mr. Knox's theory of the living voice of the Church is, if I understand it rightly, that it is not the voice of the Orthodox Communion, nor the voice of the Roman Communion, but the voices of both, when they agree, or at any rate when they do not formally contradict one another; in other words, it is the highest common factor of the teaching of Rome and Constantinople.

This highest common factor view seems to me very unsatisfactory, for three reasons:

1. Our final authority in matters of faith is apparently, in Mr. Knox's opinion, those parts of Roman teaching and Orthodox teaching which are not mutually contradictory. But this is not submitting to the living voice of authority; it is choosing for yourself what you will believe and what you will refuse to believe. This authority is not external to Mr. Knox and his friends; it owes its existence, as an authority, to them. It is as if a man were to say, "I will obey the laws of England when they are not contradicted by American law, and the laws of the United States when they are not contradicted by English law," being himself all the time a citizen of a third State which was not subject to the jurisdiction of either Westminster or Washington.

2. Mr. Knox assumes that the Roman and Orthodox Communions are equally Catholic, and that the difference between them is not of fundamental importance. The really important part of this difference is the Papacy; and here Mr. Knox has against him the Roman Communion, the Orthodox Communion, and historic Anglo-Catholicism—in fact, the whole Catholic Church. For Rome says that the acceptance of the Papal Supremacy, with the other claims which rest upon it, is essential to salvation; the Orthodox Communion, that it is formal heresy, differing from Protestantism only in degree; the traditional Anglo-Catholic school of theologians that it is, if not formal heresy, at any rate sufficiently serious error to justify us in remaining in separation rather than accept it. Surely Mr. Knox's view is only our old friend Undenominationalism in another form. The Protestant undenominationalist says: "It doesn't matter whether you are an Episcopalian, a Presbyterian, or a Congregationalist, provided you accept the fundamental Evangelical principles which are common to them all." The Anglo-Catholic undenominationalist says: "It doesn't matter whether you are Roman or Orthodox, Papalist or anti-Papalist, provided you accept the fundamental Catholic principles which are common to them both." I hold, on the contrary, that the difference does matter; that on the question of the Papacy the Orthodox Communion (and the Anglican Communion with it) is right and Catholic, because it has maintained the principles of the undivided Church; and that the Roman Communion is in this matter wrong and un-Catholic, because it has rejected them.

3. The appeal to the highest common factor is not only unsound in theory, but also useless in practice. What do we want a living voice for? Surely to guide us in dealing with modern problems. If we want to know what to believe about the Incarnation, we can fall back on the definition of Chalcedon; but if we want guidance in such matters as the application of historical criticism to the Bible,

the lawfulness of psychical research for Christians, the best way of reconciling the great Protestant Evangelical societies to the Church, and a host of other questions for which the undivided Church provides no exact parallel, we shall not get what we want by appealing to the highest common factor. As Mr. Knox rightly points out, the Orthodox Communion has hardly yet been affected by the problems which arise from the Reformation and the Industrial Revolution. An appeal to the highest common factor means, in many instances, an appeal to Roman practice only. But we cannot appeal to Rome as the final authority in some things, and reject her authority in others; if Rome is to be our final authority, we may as well give up the Anglican position altogether. Besides, the "consensus" of the Roman Communion is deceptive. An appeal to a large Council in the undivided Church meant the comparison of independent traditions. But the modern Roman Communion is a highly centralized despotism; all its parts teach a single tradition, and that the Roman; the Popes have long acted on the principle "*La tradition, c'est moi.*" Roman practice, and Orthodox practice too, is often very valuable to us, but it can never be our final authority.

Where, then, it will be asked, is the living voice of the Church to be found? I will throw my answer into the form of a parable. I believe that during the Great Rebellion there were at one time two English Parliaments: one at Westminster and one at Oxford. Let us suppose that this has happened again. There is one Parliament at Westminster for the South of England, and another at York for the North. Each claims to be the true and only English Parliament. The Westminster Parliament has repealed the Act of Succession, and has summoned to the throne Prince Rupprecht of Bavaria, as the lineal representative of the House of Stuart; it has transferred all the functions of government to him, and he rules the South of England as an autocrat, in the spirit of his German paternal ancestors. This autocratic system is the main reason which keeps the two halves of the nation apart. The counties of Devonshire and Cornwall, weary of the methods and spirit of the German King, rebel, and after a severe struggle obtain their independence. What are they to do? They cannot place themselves under the York Parliament, partly for geographical reasons, partly because York legislation, intended for an industrial community, does not suit their conditions, and partly because large portions of the territory of the Northern Parliament, including the capital, are in the hands of foreigners, who have taken advantage of the long civil war to invade the country. So the men of Devonshire and Cornwall carry on with their own county councils, taking care to enact no by-laws contrary to undisputed Acts of Parliament passed before the war began, and working for the day when the German dynasty shall be overthrown, or at

least so much weakened that it will be possible to summon a Parliament which shall really represent the whole nation. I think this is as near a parallel to the present condition of the Church as analogies between secular and ecclesiastical institutions can ever be. Westminster represents Rome, York Constantinople; the German King stands for the Pope, who is quite as much the heir of Augustus, Trajan, and Diocletian as of the early Bishops of Rome. Devonshire and Cornwall stand for the Anglican churches; the county councils represent our provincial and national synods, which are to us, in the absence of an Œcumenical Council, the living voice of the Church. Even in the undivided Church Pelagianism was suppressed by the Latins, Macedonianism and other heresies by the Greeks, without help from outside. We have got to settle our own problems by ourselves; it is useless to appeal to any living authority beyond the Anglican Communion until the Church is reunited.

"What!" it will be said, "would you have us regard the Anglican Bishops as our final authority?—the men who have all along been the foes of the Catholic Movement, who drove Newman out of the Church, and hunted Mackonochie to death, and who are still far more tolerant to Modernists than to Anglo-Catholics?" I don't deny that our Bishops have often been wrong. But the living voice of the Church is not necessarily infallible. It must be remembered that the Victorian Bishops frequently acted, not on their authority as Catholic Bishops, but on their authority as officials of the Establishment, and that most of the cases of Anglo-Catholic resistance to Bishops have been cases in which the Bishops were exceeding the limits of their constitutional rights. Restore the diocesan synods; let the principle be generally accepted that no Bishop acts by himself, but either with his diocesan synod of priests or with his com-provincial Bishops; let the Bishops be appointed by the Church, and not by the Prime Minister; and we need have no cause for alarm. In any case, the Anglican Episcopate has never gone so far wrong as the whole body of Bishops of the undivided Church did, when they accepted an Arian creed at Seleucia and Ariminum. There are times when it is necessary to resist authority, though you always do so at your own risk. St. Athanasius and St. Hilary did, and time has shown that they were right. Our fathers the Tractarians and their successors did (though never willingly or without necessity), and time has justified them too.

"But our Bishops are tainted with Protestantism." Only some of them, and the Roman Bishops to whom Mr. Knox would have us appeal from them are all of them, not merely tainted, but formally committed to Ultramontanism. Besides, our Bishops are getting rid of their taint. Compare the report of the last Lambeth Conference with some of the utterances of its predecessors!

I agree with Mr. Knox that we have much to learn from Roman methods. At the same time, some of us are not satisfied that the despotic and obscurantist spirit of the Counter-Reformation is not being introduced with them. Where the Roman Church differs from us in doctrine (as she undoubtedly does differ from the best Anglo-Catholic theology, if not formally, at any rate in emphasis, on the doctrine of the Eucharist, and others that I might mention), we ought to be very careful how we introduce practices based on her doctrine. What one would like to know is, supposing a provincial synod, composed of Bishops appointed as we should like them to be appointed, were to pass a formal prohibition of, let us say, public extra-liturgical devotions to the Blessed Sacrament, resting this prohibition explicitly, not on any Protestant denial of the Real Presence, but on the grounds on which Dr. Gore and the late Dr. Scott Holland disapproved of such devotions, would all Anglo-Catholics obey?

If we are to be relieved from the reproach of disloyalty to the English Church, as Mr. Knox and all of us so heartily desire, it appears to me that we shall have to make it much clearer than it has ever been made yet that, while we are anxious to make use of all that is good and sound in Roman methods, we do definitely and formally reject the whole Papal system, from the application of the "Petrine texts" to the Bishops of Rome up to the latest developments of Ultramontaniam, and likewise the theory that the Anglican churches are still in some way under Roman patriarchal jurisdiction, which would be as absurd an anachronism in the twentieth century as for Russia to be still under the patriarchal jurisdiction of Constantinople; that though we long for communion with the Latin churches, as with those of the East and every other part of Christendom, we have no desire to assimilate the English Church to the churches of the Counter-Reformation; and that we are anxious to obey our Bishops and to abide by their decision, without any wistful glances across the Channel, provided only that they treat us fairly, and observe in their dealings with all parties the doctrinal and constitutional limits laid down by Holy Scripture and the undivided Church.

C. BEAUFORT MOSS.