

stringent and tyrannous than was ever claimed by the Universal Church. *In other words, nationalism must result in the meanest form of bigotry, and, as being essentially demoralizing, must be a fearful heresy in theology.* Meanwhile it should not be forgotten that much is to be said, very much indeed, for the pertinacity of St. Colman, and his retirement from his see. A controversy and a separation where both parties were holy men, and both at this day venerated by the Church—this is a fact which nothing but the Catholic Church can display, a noble phenomenon not rare in her miraculous history.

These being the writer's opinions, what clue does this volume afford as to the reasons which keep him from acting upon them? We can find no clue except that which is contained in the following passage:—

In short, he made it a condition of his acceptance of the bishopric of Lindisfarne, that he should be sent into France to receive an undeniably canonical consecration.

To many persons in our days these scruples will seem so unreal as to be unintelligible; while to others, and those not a few, they will have a distressing reality. Of course those who do not believe in the divine institution of the Visible Church and the mysteriousness of her privileges, will perceive in St. Wilfrid's hesitation, nothing but a superstitious and judaizing spirit; more especially when, through long disesteem of apostolical order, they have learned to look on jealousy for Catholic doctrines, and the high-minded anathemas of Holy Church as bigotry, ignorance, or at best, great uncharitableness. It is quite impossible for any one to sustain for long an affectionate jealousy about the doctrines which concern the Divine Person and Two Natures of our Lord, who is not likewise exceedingly jealous for the divine forms, unity, ritual, and succession of the visible church. The preservation of true saving doctrine is tied to the true formal constitution of the visible Church just as much, and with as infrequent exceptions, as the gift of regeneration is tied to the form of Baptism, or the Justifying Presence of Christ consigned to the Sacrifice of the Altar. The word *assumes* the divine forms of the Church to be mere externals, and arguing from its own unwarrantable premiss, condemns the Saints as verbal

disputants and sticklers for empty ceremonial. No wonder, then, that in these days, St. Wilfrid's scruples should be matter of derision. But there are others who find the present state of things only too fruitful in similar perplexities, and the danger is not slight of their putting themselves into a false position in consequence of their distress. Under any circumstances the office of ecclesiastical rulers, teachers, and priests, is full of difficulty from its double nature. They who bear it have not only the government and discipline of themselves to look to, their growth, mutations, lapses, as lay Christians have, but to this they superadd another entire second life, through their solemn and sacramental relations to others. Is it not then, a very fearful thing for them to have a doubt cast on the efficacy of their priesthood, the reality of those tremendous acts which they have performed in the name of priests, and the truthfulness of their absolutions and consecrations; and if we further assume the possible cases of ailing health and broken spirits, what a burden must it be for reason to bear and not give way? Indeed, it is hardly right to go on dwelling upon it. Enough has been said to suggest more: there is *some* support in seeing that so great a saint as Wilfrid keenly felt a somewhat similar position, and did not hesitate to act at much cost upon these feelings. *But farther than this, is there not almost incalculable comfort in reflecting on the actual history?* Wilfrid stood, as all men stand in their generation, amidst the blinding battle which the present always is: he was oppressed with doubts about the system of his church, because of the relation in which it stood to the chief bishop: he was able at once, though with some pains, to clear up his position. This latter mercy may be denied to us; but we, looking at Wilfrid's days as part of the past, are permitted to see the Church whose system he doubted of recognised as an integral part of the Body Catholic, the prelates whose consecration he distrusted canonised as saints, his own rival, whose ordination was indisputably uncanonical, now revered as one of our holiest English bishops. When we naturally couple together, almost without thought, St. Wilfrid and St. Chad, we read ourselves a lesson, which, if we would only receive it, is full of deepest consolation, and most effectual incentives to strictness and holiness of life, and a quiet occupying of ourselves with present duties.