

is one of great learning, candour, and lucidity, lies in the fact that when it was written the author was tutor of Keble College, Oxford. I must not stop to give even the briefest analysis of this essay, but simply read you one or two quotations, which I hope and believe are not violently torn out of their context. Mr. Rawlinson writes as a High Churchman, but one who is looking for a new kind of foundation upon which to base his High Churchmanship. [I may add that there is almost nothing in his essay that I personally cannot accept though I might not agree to all the deductions which he draws from his conclusions.]

"In its strictest and most traditional form the theory of an original Apostolic succession has perhaps broken down ; but the liberalized restatement of it, which is to be found in the writings of Duchesne and Batiffel abroad and the present Bishop of Oxford at home, is at least a tenable interpretation of the evidence as viewed in the light of certain antecedent presuppositions. It is not, however, likely, in the nature of the case, to carry conviction to those who do not approach the evidence with the presuppositions in question, for though a view with which the facts are compatible, it is not one which they necessitate."

So again, "with regard however to the form and manner of ministerial appointment and the sense, if any, in which what is called Apostolical Succession may legitimately be asserted as a literal fact of history, the evidence is almost, if not quite, non-existent."

(418)

Mr. Rawlinson concludes that "the attempt to reach precise agreement upon grounds of history alone is a fundamentally mistaken one, and that the problem must really be decided. . . in a quite different sphere."
(383, 384.)