

THE FICTION OF CORPORATE REUNION.

IT is perfectly natural that Anglican fallacies about "Reunion" should be best apprehended by English Catholics. They only who have lived in England all their lives, who have followed the vicissitudes of Anglicanism, and who know the mental habits of English Protestants, can accurately value the shifting attitudes of a conscience which has been trammelled from childhood by Protestant prejudice. For this reason it seems a pity that French Catholics, who know little or nothing of the Anglican mind, should come forward as teachers or dictators on the deeply vexed question of "Reunion." The Abbé Portal has no doubt meant amiably in his conciliating attitude towards the Ritualists, but he does not know the scope of their misapprehension. In the same way the writers in the "*Revue Anglo-Romaine*"—a review which is now in its thirty-sixth number—do not see that by obscuring the duty of submission they are indefinitely postponing Reunion. The "case" for Reunion stands thus: The Abbé Portal is aware, though he keeps the fact in the background, that Reunion demands, primarily, the recognition of the Papacy as a divinely appointed institution; whereas Lord Halifax, and most of his brother Ritualists, insist on the recognition of the validity of Anglicanism, ecclesiastically, authoritatively, doctrinally. The two claims are not only irreconcilable, they are hopelessly opposed and antagonistic. To put the case differently, the Catholic Church says: If you would come inside the Church, you must anathematize your schism and all your heresies, and must submit with all your heart to the Holy See in doctrine, devotion and practice; whereas the Ritualists say we will participate in Catholic Sacraments, and consent to a fraternal intercommunion, on condition that we retain our present formularies and beliefs and whatever habits we esteem to be orthodox. "Corporate Reunion" on such terms as the Ritualists' would be as much a mockery of truth as of sincerity. It would be indeed a much worse form of error than the insisting on being faithful to private convictions; for to be "in good faith," even in error, is a much better state of mind than to assert that truth and error are convertible.

The advocates of Corporate Reunion are fond of appealing to a memorable precedent, which they conceive to be in some respects parallel. In the time of Queen Mary there was Corporate Reconciliation; why should there not be in these days? It was in the year 1554 that, at Westminster Palace, there was a public,

a national reconciliation of all England to the Catholic Faith; and it is urged that the reconciliation, while corporate in modern sense, was nevertheless grounded on the principle of "give and take," many concessions of vast import being made to "Anglicans," even to the extent of the recognition of schismatical bishops and of new dioceses created by schismatics. Now here we have a grave misapprehension. In every case where the Papal Legate made concessions, there was a previous grant of absolution to penitent clergy who had confessed to the crime of their past schism, so that in no single instance was installation or promotion permitted by the Catholic authority without full recantation or disavowal and without sacramental absolution. At this point, however, we have to allude to a difficulty which is obscured by not a few controversialists. In the early days of Queen Mary there was an insuperable impediment to the harmonizing of the spiritual and the temporal, parliament not being summoned and the queen not being crowned, and the statute-law remaining consequently in full force. Thus Mary had to be called "the Supreme Head of the Church," a title of which she said to Cardinal Pole's envoy: "I will not have it, even though by accepting it I could gain three other kingdoms equal to those I possess"; but she could not prevent those who drew up her writs from obeying a law which was not repealed. In regard to the six bishops-elect, who were consecrated before the reconciliation, we know that they were absolved *in foro externo*, their proxy going humbly upon his knees, confessing heartfelt sorrow and repentance, and utterly abjuring their acts of schism and other errors, in which spirit they were required to go to confession to a Catholic confessor and fulfil the salutary penance which should be given. And so, too, the members of both Houses of Parliament went on their knees, and did "declare themselves very sorry and repentant for the schism and disobedience committed in this matter against the Apostolic See." Contrast such a spirit as this with the spirit of most modern Ritualists. And that we may say one word more as to the "concessions made by Rome," be it remembered that no concession as to doctrine was ever either granted or asked for. The ratification of newly created dioceses, and of judicial sentences schismatically pronounced, was so far from being a "concession" as to their validity that the Legate decreed that "all such things attempted in any way that was null during the aforesaid schism should receive the vigor of the apostolic sanction, so that they should be considered by all to have been made, *not* by the preceding temerity, but by that authority which he then gave unto them." The concessions, therefore, were not admissions of validity; on the contrary, they were assertions of invalidity.

While on this point of the Marian Reconciliation, it is almost a platitude to remark that, the whole nation being traditionally Catholic, there could be little need of individual conversions. We may say confidently that five-sixths of the adult population were still profoundly Catholic at heart. Excepting only those who had benefited by Henry VIII.'s spoliation of church property, the nation abhorred the innovations, so that, as Mr. Froude tells us, in the last year of Edward VI. there was what might be called a reign of terror, "the prisons being full to overflowing with Catholic recusants who would not relinquish the Mass." One of the Protestant missionaries to Ireland thus describes the enthusiasm with which the return to the old faith was welcomed in the Cathedral of Killarney: "They rang all the bells in that cathedral; they (the clergy) flung up their caps to the battlements of the great temple, with smilings and laughings most dissolutely; they brought forth their copes, candlesticks, censers and crosses; they mustered forth most gorgeously all the town over, with *Sancta Maria ora pro nobis* and the rest of the Latin Litany." Now, it is obvious that a Reconciliation in those days and a Reconciliation in a three-centuried Protestant England must be very different processes indeed. If we put together what we may call the party of Lord Halifax and the more advanced of the members of the Church Union, and even wish to believe in the ardent aspirations of the majority of the Ritualist laity, we still count only a small minority of English Protestants who could be expected to rejoice in "Reunion." Under Edward VI. it was by the sheer strength of the executive that royal injunctions were enforced against Catholics; in these days royal injunctions against Protestants would meet even with more strenuous opposition. What the nation now wants is conversion—a very different thing from Reconciliation. And if we are to accept the leading organs of the various parties as indicating the bent of the national will, there seems to be a restless desire for compromise, but very little repentance for schism.

II.

It is in regard to the disposition of the English people, as demonstrated by their proposed terms of reconciliation, that the Abbé Portal has been seriously misled, trusting rather to his charity than to his knowledge. We should say, first, that the popular use of the word Reunion shows how completely the whole subject is misapprehended. There cannot be Reunion where there never was Union; and it is certain that between the new Protestant religion—first invented by Henry VIII., and subsequently developed by Elizabeth—and the religion of the Catholic Roman

Church, there never was, never could be, real union. The two religions were opposed on first principles, as to authority, worship, and devotion; nor was it ever possible to speak of them as being united, any more than of a negative as being identical with a positive, or of *nego* and *credo* as being sympathetic. Let us, then, discard the word Reunion, and use a much truer word, Reconciliation. Now the Abbé Portal, and the "Revue Anglo-Romaine," in their earnest longing to bring about Reconciliation, do not like to insist on the hard, stubborn fact that what is called the Church of England is a sect. It is not a Church nor an integral part of the Church, but a purely political organization. It follows, therefore, that each individual Anglican is necessarily in schism and in heresy. And this being so, it is idle to talk of a "corporate" reconciliation, as if the fact of a multitude of dissidents agreeing to "shake hands" with the Catholic Church could in the slightest degree undo their schism and their heresy. They would all remain precisely what they were before, Protestants so far as they chose to be Protestants, and Catholic in their own sense of Catholicity. Reconciliation would mean, I will not obey you. Submission would mean, I do not believe in you. The only practical outcome of such a fictitious fraternization would be that truth and error would have "shaken hands" as good friends on the very ground that no one could know what was the truth.

"Conversion" to the Church is, in reality, the exact opposite of this fiction of "corporate reunion." It means the accepting whatever the Church teaches, and the abhorring whatever she condemns. And the grace of God alone can give to each individual soul the full light which is necessary for conversion. "The gift of faith" is not given in its fulness until after the receiving of the divine sacraments—a gift which so purifies the intellect that it apprehends the necessary truth of Catholic teaching; but the grace to apprehend the primary duty of submitting to the divine authority of the Church will be given to every soul who asks for it; so that it must be always a man's own fault if he goes on worshipping his own opinions, instead of asking God to enlighten him. Now who does not see that a "corporate conversion" is a sort of contradiction in terms? Certainly, God could, if He willed, give the grace of conversion at the same moment to a whole nation, or to a whole Protestant sect; but this is not His ordinary way. Ordinarily, He acts separately on each soul, in His own time, by special calling; and each soul is responsible for himself. "Corporate" conversion would shirk personal responsibility; would shift the burden on to the shoulders of a whole community; whereas, personal conversion is in the order of Divine Providence, and consistent with all we know of the Divine ways. The

Abbé Portal, in his desire to smooth over the thorny and troublous path of conversion, seems to shrink from the *suffering* which it involves, as though the sufferings were not the price to be paid. As in the early pagan times, the ordinary price of conversion was martyrdom, imprisonment, or at least ostracism, so, in our own day, there is no buying the pearl of great price without being willing to sell all that we possess. Imagine that the same counsel which has been approved by the Abbé Portal, in recommending a "corporate" conversion, had been given to the first converts to Christianity: "Do not suffer martyrdom, but wait till imperial prejudice shall have given way to more kindly amenity, and then you can all become Christians together, without risking the torture or the lion's mouth." This was not the counsel of the Apostles or their disciples, who insisted on individual sacrifice, and left "corporateness" to take care of itself. As Cardinal Vaughan has happily expressed it, with that straightness and ingenuousness which may be said to be characteristic of his teaching: "Every day is making it clearer that the Providential way of bringing about Reunion, at least in England, is by the powerful grace of God acting on the intelligence, the independence, and the goodwill of individual units, as in the past; and that no hope or confidence is to be placed in the idea of corporate reunion."

But this thoroughly Catholic meaning of "conversion" is either obscured or minimized into unmeaningness by the French writers and orators we have referred to. The reason, as we have said, is that they do not know the Anglican temperament, and do not realize the havoc made by false traditions. That a defined article of faith cannot be denied without heresy, and that the authority of the Holy See cannot be rejected without schism, are known to *them* to be axioms of Catholicity; but living always among Catholics, they utterly fail to apprehend how Anglicans can habitually think the contrary. And so they try the courtly experiment of soothing and caressing, with which many sanguine Ritualists are much pleased. A much wiser method would have been to inquire of Cardinal Vaughan what was really the present attitude of the Ritualistic mind, and so to have avoided making mistakes which, though doubtless quite natural, may put back many conversions for many years.

III.

There is another curious delusion, at least implied by the Abbé Portal, to which it is desirable to refer. This delusion is that the Catholic Church would gain so much by "corporate union" with all the contending communities which make up Anglicanism, that she should strive for it on purely interested grounds. And it is

even urged that the Catholic Church is suffering from her loss of "the Nations of the North," suffering "from the lack of the Teutonic element, while the Anglican Church is increasing in strength." We have here a misstatement both of principle and of fact which we must venture to call hardly excusable. As to principle, the suggestion that the Catholic Church, which now numbers two hundred and twenty millions of souls, would gain strength by the corporate adhesion of twenty-five millions of Anglicans, none of whom are quite sure as to their own belief, it may be dismissed as, to say the least of it, uncatholic. The Anglican communion, as a matter of fact, scarcely includes one-half of the people of England; while in the British dependencies it is in a painful minority. And we all know that when a man says he is an Anglican or a Protestant we are no nearer to concluding what he thinks he believes than if he had made no profession of faith. What advantage then to the Catholic Church could accrue from the fraternization of such a host of conflicting opinionists? If such a "corporate reunion" were possible, it would be an injury at which every Catholic would shudder. Happily it is utterly impossible.

But, as a matter of fact, the growth of Catholicity far exceeds the growth of so-called Anglicanism. As to the "Teutonic element," the number of Teutonic Catholics within the fold exceeds by many millions the whole number of Anglicans throughout the world. But let us go a little more deeply into this question of statistics, since it is urged as being of weighty importance.

There may be a difficulty in obtaining the exact truth in regard to numbers, but we may fairly trust authorities which are known not to be addicted to exaggerating Catholic claims. Thus the "Economiste Français" assures us that, from the year 1800 to 1890—a period almost embracing the present century—the number of Catholics in Germany has gone up from six to sixteen millions. This does not look as if the "Teutonic element" can be spoken of as being lost to Catholicity. And now, as to the "Nations of the North," the number of Catholics in England and Scotland, in the first year of this nineteenth century, was only 120,000. In the year 1890 it had gone up to 1,690,921. (We believe this to be far below the mark, but it is better to keep on the safe side.) Russia is a good country for comparisons, for we all know how Catholics have been persecuted. The advance of Catholicity in the ninety years was (Poland being left out of the calculation) from 20,000 to 2,935,519. As to the United States the increase in the same period has been given as from 61,000 to 7,977,270. And what do we learn about Africa? 47,000 have grown to 3,000,000. As to China the increase is given as from 187,000 to 576,000; while in

Indo-China it is from 310,000 to 690,772. Turkey in Asia and Europe would not be a promising empire, yet the number of Catholics has gone up from 631,000 to 1,298,475. Switzerland has increased her number threefold. Canada has changed 120,000 into 2,000,000. Oceanica has advanced from the very small beginning of 2800 to 2,000,000. Holland also has converted 350,000 into 1,448,852. And so in proportion in most other countries. And it must be remembered that within the last five years—from 1890 to 1896—the progress of Catholicity throughout the world has been swifter than it ever was before. So that viewing this progress as a whole, we may say that, in non-Catholic countries, the increase of Catholics has been fivefold. And in the old Catholic countries there has been this improvement, that there are now very few "indifferent" Catholics; the great bulk of Catholic peoples being solidly Catholic, and the minority being noisily infidel. There is scarcely any Protestantism in Catholic countries. *That* is a weed which is an accident of British fervor; but it is too shallow a compromise to capture intellects. As a rule, the French, Italian and Spanish peoples are logical, keen-witted, and also humorous; and they know the difference between being taught by divine authority and being taught by individual opinion.

Now it is obvious that a growth in Catholicity is not like a growth in Church of Englandism, or indeed in any kind of Protestantism. Every Catholic believes the same thing, so that the Catholic Church is a compact and perfectly united army; not united only in rejecting what is false, but in affirming what is infallibly true. So that the Catholic one-third part of Germany is a much stronger power than the two-thirds of German Rationalist speculators; and the same must be said of all other countries. What the Abbé Portal calls the "Teutonic element" and the "Nations of the North" are steadily returning to the Catholic faith; not by "corporate reunion"—such a fiction is untenable—but by the individual apprehension of the duty of obedience, aided by the spectacle of divided Protestantism.

We have to enquire, in the face of this steady advance of Catholicity, whether the prospects of a "corporate" reconciliation appear to be lessened or increased; and whether the new phases of Protestantism are better adapted than the old ones for "corporate" submission and conciliation?

IV.

It must be accepted as axiomatic that the only possible reconciliation must be preceded by individual submission. And individual submission in the case of Protestants—and as much in the case of Anglicans as of Nonconformists—would mean, *not* the

surrender of the same errors in all Protestants, but of different errors in each separate Protestant. No two Protestants, whether Anglican or Nonconformist, believe or disbelieve in the same way; and while one and all misapprehend the Catholic faith, each one of them misapprehends it quite differently. A "corporate" submission would therefore involve the surrender of ten thousand different "objections" of various minds, these "objections" being entertained in varying spirits, and impossible to be formulated or defined. If then the submission of even one Protestant must involve his complete surrender of many heresies, what would be involved in the submission of a mighty host of deeply differing conflicting opinionists? But "surrender" is just that very difficulty which the corporate reconciliationists will not face. They wish to retain all their private ideas, while "submitting," only to an external fraternity. And this is the not submitting at all. For example, the Rev. Piers L. Claughton, who is the Rector of Hutton, and an advocate of corporate reunion, says that "on the Anglican side there must be the acceptance of the infallibility of the Pope, who ruled over the English Church all through the Middle Ages, and was only renounced for the political exigencies of Henry VIII. . . . There must also be the acceptance of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception." Now this seems to come very near to "submission," and we scarcely expect any difficulty. But presently we read that there are "conditions;" and the first is that "on the Roman side the validity of our orders and sacraments must be recognized as we recognize theirs, and (2) it must be conceded that the secular clergy may marry." So that here we have an Anglican who actually acknowledges the infallible authority of the Pope, and yet at the same time insists that that infallibility must be instructed as to the essentials of the validity of Holy Orders. Probably there are not many of the High Church party who would combine such contradictory attitudes; but the example serves to show how diversified are the units which are now advocating a "corporate" reunion.

To take another extreme case—extreme in a very painful sense. Father Ignatius, the Anglican monk, writes of a publication by Dean Fremantle as "the very greatest scandal that has ever occurred in our venerable and orthodox Church of England." He says: "For myself I can truly say that the very fact of this awful man being a dean in our beloved Church causes me sleepless nights of mental agony. . . . We need from the Church of England a plain and explicit expression of her mind, such as shall make clear her determination to hold at all cost to the truth of Revelation, which is her only ground of existence. But the Church of England is silent; our archbishops, bishops and convocations are, as

Canon Gore says, 'accomplices' of Dean Fremantle." Now, seeing that the "heresies" which are so strongly assailed were professed and published eight years ago, and that since their publication the Hon. and Rev. W. H. Fremantle has been promoted to the Deanery of Ripon, we cannot conclude that "the archbishops, bishops and convocations" have taken them very seriously to heart. Father Ignatius says that the Bishop of Ripon "has thoroughly and without a word of protest welcomed as dean into his cathedral a man who is a publicly professed unbeliever in the Christian religion, and a notorious defamer of the Scriptures and the creeds." Whether this accusation is wholly just, we need not now stay to inquire. What we are considering at this moment is the practicability of a "corporate" reconciliation which should include the Rector of Hutton and the Dean of Ripon, and all the innumerable "shades of opinionists" which lie between them. Imagine such a coincidence as that Dean Fremantle and the Rector of Hutton should both together sue for "corporate" reconciliation. Join with these two suitors Father Ignatius, the well-known zealous Anglican monk. And that we may have a thoroughly representative deputation, let us add the Editor of the Ritualist "Church Times" and the President of the Protestant Alliance. Every one of these gentlemen, be it remembered, is equally a member of the Church of England, equally entitled to speak on her behalf, equally competent to dictate the terms of reconciliation, the conditions of the proposed "give and take." It is manifest that, in the ante-room, before their admission to the presence of the Papal Legate, Dean Fremantle, the Rector of Hutton, Father Ignatius, the Editor of the Ritualist newspaper, and the President of the Protestant Alliance would have preliminaries to settle which it might take a number of years to bring within a "corporate" agreement. And if it be answered, "yes, but it is the Ritualists alone who really desire reconciliation; the whole of the rest of the communion, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, and probably three-fourths of the clergy, being as indifferent to corporate as they are to individual submission," we must rejoin: then there is an end of all corporateness; for to say that, within one and the same Church of England, the Ritualistic section may be reconciled to the Catholic authority, while all the other sections remain in hostility equally with Catholicity and Ritualism, is to suppose a babel of different creeds in the same Church, even more embarrassing than that which now exists. It would only be adding a semi-Catholic Ritualist sect to the existing semi-Protestant Ritualist sect; and there would be no more corporateness than is possible between members of the same family and the strangers who knock at their gate for hospitality.

We have still, however, another grave difficulty. The Church of England never was corporate in any sense, historical or sound. It was from the first a political sect, held together solely by royal tyranny and compacted by iniquitous laws. It was "corporate" only in the sense in which prisoners are corporate, within a jail from which they cannot escape. Henry VIII. deprived the nation of their true corporate Church, which was theirs by inheritance and by choice; and because the Pope and the whole Church in England were faithful to their whole Catholic duty he created, not a church, but a schismatical sect, of which he made himself supreme head. The story of "how it was done" is as simple as it is desperately wicked. The nobles and the upper classes were bribed by rich gifts of church lands, church abbeys and money; the burgher class were the dependents of the nobles, and the poor were at the mercy of both. At one blow, as it were, Henry destroyed the monasteries, the homes, schools and hospitals of the poor; he punished the now friendless peasantry as vagrants, and thus created the two great evils from which the country has ever since suffered, a national vagrancy and pauperism. To call such a new religion a "corporate" church would indeed be a trifling with words. And when Elizabeth, driven wild with the Pope's rejection of her claims, abolished the Mass, repudiated five sacraments out of seven, and completely stripped Christianity of its doctrine and discipline, of its authority and divine jurisdiction, she did not make a new church; that was impossible; she established a new sect, which was only corporate in the sense that it was the treason of law against God.

Nor can it be assumed that the Church of England is corporate in the sense of its Common Prayer Book or its Formularies. As to the Prayer Book, it was drawn up by the boy-king Edward VI., was ratified by Elizabeth, and ratified once more by Scotch James. So that to regard the Prayer Book as in real sense representing the *ecclesiastical* totality of the nation would be as absurd as to speak of it as Roman Catholic. And as to the Thirty-Nine Articles—which declare that "General Councils may err," that Transubstantiation is "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture," and that "the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England"—they were so grotesquely at issue with the beliefs of the nation, with all the traditions of a thousand years, as well as with the dictates of common sense, that they could no more be said to "corporately" voice the nation in its doctrinal and supernatural *credo* than they could be said to reflect justly its intelligence or its educatedness, its truthfulness, sobriety, or morality. We must dismiss, then, the whole idea of a corporate reconciliation in its relation to the history of the State Church, and all its forms of worship and unbelief.

V.

Yet happily, the very impossibility of a corporate reconciliation renders the duty more imperative, and the task more easy, of individual submission to the Church. And has it not always been a habit of English Protestants to talk of "every man being answerable to God in his own conscience," and of his "*not* wanting the guidance of others?" It is exactly this condition which should lead each separate Protestant to pray to God to illumine his intelligence, so that, detaching himself from the crowd of contending teachers, who can teach him nothing but their own private opinions, he may obtain the grace of faith sufficient to make his submission, and so to enjoy the divine sacraments of the Church.

There is no intention of alluding in this present paper to the supernatural side of the subject; it belongs to theologians to speak of the supernatural; and an ordinary lay Catholic would be out of his groove were he to go outside ordinary lay reasonings. It is only in the region of common sense that a layman can talk about "submission"; and Englishmen rather pride themselves on their common sense; indeed, they sometimes seem to claim a monopoly.

Now common sense can establish these three positions: (1) That divine truth can be known only by divine authority; (2) that the Church of England has no divine authority whatever; and (3) that, therefore, each separate Anglican must search for divine authority before he can discover divine truth. This is the making individual responsibility not only the best rule but the only rule. It is an absolute folly for any Anglican to wait until half a dozen other Anglicans, or half a dozen thousand other Anglicans, have chatted over the "terms" on which they will consent to be admitted into membership with the one Church of God; it is the inversion of common sense, since the only motive of being admitted into the Catholic Church must be the conviction that she is the only true teacher. If outsiders can make conditions with the Pope, or, like the amiable Rector of Hutton, who would acknowledge his infallibility provided only his own Orders were acknowledged—it follows, logically, that the divine authority of outsiders must be equal to, if not greater than, that of the Pope. Imagine a man saying in his prayers, "I have no objection to obeying Almighty God, provided he will acquiesce in my views"; yet this is exactly what the Rector of Hutton must say when he affirms that he will accept infallibility provided he, the Rector of Hutton, may define its limits and the scope of the truths to be determined. Common sense is a quite sufficient theologian to apprehend that he who possesses infallibility must alone possess the knowledge of its limits; and that to dictate to the Infallible

what it shall allow or not allow, is the same thing with saying: "You are no more infallible than I am, since it is for me to point out to you what you should do." Undoubtedly, as to certain national customs, as to certain matters of discipline or of *modus vivendi*, it is perfectly lawful for Anglicans to beg for concessions, and a variety of such concessions might be made. But in all matters of faith—and the question of Anglican Orders, though not in itself a question of faith, involves questions which are closely allied with the faith—is just one of those enquiries on which the *magisterium* of the Holy See must make final judgment and pronouncement. Now to say to the Holy See, "I am rather attached to my Anglican Orders, and I really cannot allow your infallibility—or, as it would be in the present instance, your *magisterium*—to upset my fondly cherished convictions," is to acknowledge a principle while denying its operation; to admit a law while denying its obligation. It is an attitude which common sense must ridicule, and which Christian piety must condemn. The Holy See is either set in this world to give judgment on points, which are disputed, or it has no more prerogative or special gift than has any one of the fourteen hundred Catholic bishops. To admit the prerogative, the *magisterium*, and yet to affect a superiority over its exercise, is a good deal more like the want of the spirit of concession than like the earnestness which desires concessions.

Have we not seen then that the fallacies of corporate reunion are as obvious as is the paramount duty of individual submission to the Church? And this paramount duty, as has been said, is consistent with the exercise of private judgment—the most treasured of the privileges of Protestantism. There is no need to consult with High Churchmen or Low Churchmen; no need to wait for the harmonizing of a score of dissident "views as to reunion;" no need to take counsel with the Archbishop of Canterbury, with Father Ignatius, with the Rector of Hutton, or with the members of the Protestant Alliance; the only rule is to be sincere and in earnest, and to ask God every day for the gift of faith. This course will be common sense and true piety. If the Church of England—that heterogeneous muddle, which no intellect could ever define, and no soul could ever look to for infallible teaching—affirmed that she possessed divine authority, we might naturally say, ask *her* to tell you whence she derives her divine authority, and what does that divine authority teach. But the Church of England repudiates divine authority; she assures you that all churches, all councils "have erred;" she teaches that "erring" is the grand credential of orthodoxy, and that every one who does not err must be in error. We cannot avoid the paradox; it is not ours, it is Anglican. But every Anglican should rejoice in the

paradox, because it clears the way for individual submission. No Anglican has any one whom he can consult; he has no one to obey, no one who can teach him anything about anything; his "Church" is in the same position as himself, knowing just so much of truth as can be gathered from the private impression of what the Roman Catholic Church has always taught. This "private impression" is equally the privilege of all Anglicans; of Cranmer, of Laud, of John Wesley, of Lord Halifax, and of the Protestant Alliance. Away then with the too puerile fiction of obedience to a "Church" which does not exist! Every Anglican, when seeking the truth, must begin by turning his back on the impostor which affirms that "all churches may err."

In a few months what is called the Pan-Anglican Synod will meet at Lambeth for the discussion of—what? We are emphatically warned that the more than two hundred Anglican Bishops will *not* settle doctrinal disputes, will not affirm or condemn. We knew beforehand that they would not attempt to do so; and that if they made the attempt, there would be one universal exclamation, "*risum teneatis amici.*" Now this one curious anomaly, the Pan-Anglican Synod, should clear the way for "individual submission." We can imagine an Anglican, who is really anxious to be reconciled to the Catholic Church, sitting outside the Synod Hall at Lambeth, and waiting for the decisions of the Synod. "Will you tell me," he asks eagerly of the bishops, "whether I am in the Church or out of it? If I am in the Church, of course you can define for me what is the true doctrine of the 'communion service;' whether I ought to adore the Consecrated Host, or to believe only in a spiritual Real Presence?" No answer. "Will you tell me whether the Anglican clergy for the last three centuries have been priests; whose duty it was to hear confessions, and whose power it was to give absolutions; and have they therefore, for three centuries, incurred the anathema of the Church, for never doing what it was their duty to do, and for always preaching against the powers which they possessed?" No answer. "Will you tell me whether the Roman Catholic Church in this country is in schism, and if so, from what Church it is in schism, and by whose authority it is proved to be in schism?" No answer. "Will you tell me what is the Living Authority in the world, to decide for me on all matters of faith; so that, for example, between the teaching of the Tsar's Church, of the English Ritualists, and of the Protestant Alliance, I may be guided infallibly to choose the truth; and will you specially mention *why* the Roman Catholic Church, which is the only Church in the world which claims to teach, and the only Church in the world which does now teach, is to be the only communion to which I am to refuse

my obedience, under penalty of the Anglican anathema?" No answer.

Individual Submission is the clearest duty of free will within a "Church" which is neither *docens* nor *discens*. If we had to live a thousand years, instead of ten years or one year, we might wait a day or two longer before making quite sure whether we were inside or outside the Church of God. But to risk dying without confession and absolution, without Holy Communion, without Extreme Unction, and without the aid of the Communion of Saints, is what common sense must pronounce to be the wildest act of folly which is so much as even possible to the human mind.

A. F. MARSHALL.

A DAUGHTER OF THE DOGES.

THE Venetian family of the Cornaro had made its name illustrious by the several doges it had given to the state from the fourteenth century onward, and by one of its noble daughters, Caterina, queen of Cyprus. This young woman, daughter of a rich merchant, was given in marriage to James de Lusignan on his being made king of Cyprus, when that island was wrested from the Greeks. Proud though the Venetians were of the wealth brought by their enterprising merchants to the ancient city, it was deemed scarcely fitting that the new king should wed a wife without a title, although her family was one of the oldest in Venice, so the republic adopted the youthful Caterina; it pronounced her a daughter of St. Mark, and became her guardian. And nobly it fulfilled this self-imposed trust, for later, when her royal husband was killed in the defence of his kingdom, Venice watched over the welfare of the widow and her infant child. Finally, her position becoming most precarious, Caterina cast aside the unsafe burden of sovereignty and abdicated in favor of the republic; later she retired to Asolo, where she kept up a mimic court for many years. Pietro Bembo, afterwards cardinal, wrote about the innocent but rather unreal life led there, with its fantastic pastimes and revels.¹ The story of Caterina has fascinated more than one

¹ It is probable that this book was among those printed by the famous Aldus; for Cardinal Bembo, both before and after his elevation to the Sacred College, was a friend and patron of Aldus.