

matter of opinion, and thus to seek on the basis of the revelation made to the Apostles and interpreted and explained by the primitive and undivided Church, the very basis, indeed claimed by the Encyclical "Satis Cognitum," for a common point of agreement—that is what we wished, that is what we attempted to bring about. "On behalf of the Anglican Communion," wrote the Archbishop of York, "I may confidently say that our supreme desire is to maintain the 'faith once delivered to the saints,' *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*," and to "hold the truth in the unity of the spirit and in the bond of peace." In regard to our relations with the Church of Rome, while it is absolutely vain to expect that England would ever accept the idea of the Papacy as we have been accustomed to have it presented to us, we could never hesitate to admit whatever can be shown to be in accordance with the will of our Blessed Lord and the teaching of the Primitive Church. It is in this spirit we should welcome any opportunities of friendly conference which might tend to bring about a better understanding between us on the basis of St. Augustine's rule, *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas*. Is there anything to regret in such wishes or in such words? Nay, are they not the wishes, are they not the objects which any man who calls himself a Christian is bound ever to have at heart? And what have we done to give effect to such desires? When an opportunity, which is none of our making, seemed to be opening out, for showing those from whom we had long been estranged, and who for the most part were strangely ignorant of our affairs, all that God had done for the Church of England in the past—all, more especially, that He had been doing for our own souls by the revival of spiritual life and earnestness vouchsafed to us during the last sixty years—how, I say, was this effort to break down the mountain of misunderstanding which kept us apart, met by those of our own countrymen to help forward the good cause? Can it be said with truth, at least of those who spoke on their behalf, that they showed any desire to meet us half way? Was there any evidence of that spirit of love which endeavours to put the most favourable construction on the past where a choice is possible between two alternatives? Nay, is not the very opposite the case? Have we not been met by a determination to make the very worst instead of the best of the Church of England, by a total inability to look at alleged facts except in the narrowest and most party spirit? The inspirations of love and sympathy—those keys by which all who will can learn so much—have been conspicuous by their absence, and, looking back over that wonderful revival with which it has pleased God to bless the Church of England during the last 50 years, they could find nothing better to say of it than that it was the work of Satan, who by an imitation of the true Church was endeavouring to keep souls from the truth. Our Lord has been amongst us, healing the sick, giving sight to the blind, and letting the captives go free, and they said it was the work of the enemy of souls. It is an awful responsibility to attribute to Beelzebub what may be the work of the Holy Ghost; but the servant is not above his Master, and to that Master we are content to leave ourselves. It does not increase our anxieties, as Cardinal Vaughan seems to imagine will be the case, that ultra-Protestants and the press should agree with him in his view of the English Church. We have been told quite recently by members of the Roman

Communion that belief in the continuity of the English Church is the great obstacle to Roman Catholicism in England, and it does not the least surprise us that those who in other matters are as opposed to one another as were the Pharisees and Sadducees of old, should unite with the world to discredit, if they can, a truth they both dread and deny. That Cardinal Vaughan should find himself in agreement with and quoting as authorities those who look upon the Roman Church as Antichrist, and are at this moment the most determined opponents of definite religious education, is a fact which ought to suggest misgivings to him, not to us. Nor will his appeal to the East serve him any better. For upon what he tells us is the critical point of the whole controversy, the necessity of unreserved submission to the Pope, the Eastern Church denies the claim as emphatically as we do. But, in truth, such an argument sounds strange to Christian ears. Was it by following the opinions of majorities or by deferring to articles in the Press that we have been able, by God's help, to vindicate the ancient rights of the Church of England? Was it by listening to such pleas that the martyrs won their crown? When we are told that all men combine in the assertion that our Sacraments are shams and our absolutions worthless, we reply with St. Paul, "that we know in whom we have believed," and that we are content to trust our souls to Him in life, in death, and on to that great day when before all the world the truth will be vindicated. We have used the Sacraments intrusted to and administered by the Church of England as effectual signs of grace, and as conveying to our souls and bodies the grace which they represent. They have produced in us the effect which God's Word has told us to expect from them. They have been the spring, the support, the centre of our whole spiritual life, and to ask us to believe that all the time such Sacraments were fictitious, empty signs of man's invention, is to induce us to disbelieve, not merely in the Sacraments we have received, but in the reality of sacramental grace altogether. To assert such things is to make Him who is the truth itself the accomplice of a lie. It is to prepare an arm which the unbelieving world will not be slow to use against the Roman Church herself. No, I say it advisedly, I would willingly die, if God gave me the grace, rather than seem to impute such treachery to God, or imply by any act of mine that all I have known of my Lord's love and goodness to me, was a snare and a sham. It would have been a great happiness if Rome had done the Church of England justice. It would not only have removed a great obstacle to reunion but it would have inclined the minds of all to listen favourably to explanations which might have prepared the way for peace. Not for a long time will Rome have such an opportunity again. It was said by Urban VIII. of the Popes, his predecessors, Paul IV., Pius V., and Paul V., that they were responsible for the loss of England. It will perhaps be said of Leo XIII. that he threw away the opportunity he had himself created for the healing the schism. "Having begun to build he was not able to finish." Having encouraged the blessed work of those who sought corporate reunion, he ended by yielding to the traditions of the Holy Office and to the representation of those who look upon "corporate reunion as a snare of the Evil One." For ourselves our position is clear. We have shown our readiness for peace, that we at least deplore the divisions of Christendom, that we would do all in our power to heal

them, but, as before in the history of such attempts, when we spoke to men of peace, they made themselves ready for battle. The motives which lie behind the Bull are apparent. The memorandum submitted by Don Gasquet and Canon Moyes to the Pope, published in the *Guardian* and *The Church Times*, the speeches of Cardinal Vaughan, and the preparations made for the expected harvest of converts in consequence of the Bull, speak for themselves. As for the Bull itself, I may be permitted to make two remarks. A careful study of its words suggests, I might almost say necessitates, the conclusion that the invalidity of English orders being held to have been already decided by the Holy Office in 1704, in the case of Gordon, the members of the Commission recently appointed found themselves precluded from reopening that case, and, in consequence, the point at issue has been not so much the validity of English orders in presence of a free discussion of all the facts of the case, as between reopening the matter already decided by the Holy Office, and the general policy of reunion which the Pope at one time had encouraged. The traditions of the Holy Office, backed by the representation of Cardinal Vaughan and the English Roman Catholic bishops, and of those who urged the danger of reopening the question, prevailed. The policy of reunion was abandoned and the conclusion already arrived at in 1704 was reasserted. In the second place, I will point out—for it is a fact within the cognizance of all who have followed the controversy—that the alleged defects in the form and intention which the Pope's letter finds in the English Ordinal have, by anticipation, already been answered by Roman theologians and dismissed as worthless. At the proper time and in the proper place the English Episcopate will, I have no doubt, reply to the letter "Apostolicæ Curæ," and when they do the Encyclical "Satis Cognitum" will supply both their answer and its justification. If that Encyclical claims for the Pope all the rights conferred on St. Peter, it claims no less for the Episcopate all the rights conferred on the Apostles. St. Paul, in a matter which he considered vital, withstood St. Peter, and the bishops in communion with Canterbury may cite his example and reply to Peter's successor that, in a matter in which "he walks not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel," they, too, will withstand him to the face and will know how to defend the rights of the churches committed to their keeping by the Great Head of the Church.—*Church Times*.

#### BORROWING TROUBLE.

It has sometimes been said that a business house which does not borrow money cannot be prosperous. In other words, a growing business necessitates a certain amount of borrowing, and in such a business borrowing is not only safe but commendable. On the right basis borrowing means progress, advancement, enlargement of enterprise, and possibilities of greater profit. But there is one thing which ought never to be borrowed under any circumstances, and that is trouble. Every man and woman under the conditions of life has a sufficient capital of trouble without adding to it by the process of borrowing. The chief business of the successful man or woman is to diminish trouble by meeting it courageously and dealing with it strongly. There is neither wisdom nor wit in adding to one's stock by borrowing it, and yet this lack of wisdom is so widely diffused that the people who refuse to borrow in the market of trouble are notable excep-