

of the Establishment in any way correspond to the Scripture idea of the Church founded by Christ? The Anglican Church has no continuity with any ecclesiastical system that preceded the Reformation days in England. Recent theorists make a claim of continuity; but they can never get away from the fact that the English Reformation did not profess to be a continuation, but, on the contrary, a subversion, of the old Catholic teaching—a new thing, a supposed improvement on what had been believed before. It brought about a change in Church government such as Christendom had never known or heard of before—the substitution of a lay for an ecclesiastical head. The Royal Supremacy is the very lifeblood of the Anglican communion. That and parliamentary control have made the Anglican Church, not a separately existing corporate body, but a Department of the State. Where, in all the writings of the Fathers, where, in the history of the General Councils, where, in all Christian antiquity is there a scrap of evidence to support the transfer of spiritual authority which took place in England by Act of Parliament in the sixteenth century? Here is how the late Dr. Brewer, the distinguished Anglican historian, puts the question in his 'English Studies' (p. 301):—

'Whose genius was it that upset the traditions of fifteen centuries and devised an organisation without parallel in ancient or modern times? Who first conceived the bold idea—not of a parity of power between the spiritual and temporal jurisdiction; not Warburton's figment of an imperium in imperio; not modern Anglicanism watching to steal a feather out of the tail of the imperial eagle—but a transfer of the whole authority of the Church from a spiritual to a temporal ruler? Who was it that, with one stroke of the pen (to use the phrase of Bishop Andrews) "transubstantiated Henry VIII. into the Pope," and converted the Church from an independent rival to a ready and submissive dependent on the State?'

Where is the Scripture authority for this mighty metamorphosis? The question has been asked in season and out of season for three and a half centuries. No answer has yet been vouchsafed to it. Till an attempt has been made to meet it, our Anglican friends would do well not to direct attention to their own lack of title-deeds by challenging those of the Catholic Church, which are ever on public view.

Notes

'Catholic Bishop of Dunedin'

In a communication with which he recently favored us for publication, the Right Rev. Dr. Nevill correctly described himself as 'Anglican Bishop of Dunedin.' At the close of a letter in last Saturday's 'Otago Daily Times' his Lordship took a different title and added to the gaiety of the newspaper-reading public by styling himself 'Catholic Bishop of Dunedin.' The claim is presumably based upon an extraordinary 'branch' theory which makes 'the Church' mean (in the language of an Anglican writer), not any one particular denomination, but a great corporate body of Christians 'spreading through East and West, and serving God in all languages. Some of our Anglican friends maintain that their Church is a 'branch' of this great speckled body that (they say) constitutes 'the Church Catholic.' There is only one thing the matter with this pretty theory: no such corporate body exists. No such corporate body has ever existed. Nor is there any trace of any such multitude of men, as described, that by any stretch of fancy can be called a 'body' or an association of any kind. Not a scrap of evidence of the existence of such an association has ever been offered. There is none to offer. This idea of the Church is a new one. It has no place in history. Who, for instance, are the members that compose this mythical corporate body? Catholics? But Catholics ridicule the idea that any such association has ever existed. Greeks? But the Greeks are equally energetic

in denying that any such body exists or that they have ever had any connection with it. Protestants? But Protestants generally repudiate such a new-fangled view of the Church. Nobody in the wide world at the present time believes in it except a small party in the Church of England. And they are hopelessly unable to determine who are the members of this imaginary association, what is the nature of its organisation, or any of the other points which it is essential to know about any corporate body existing amongst men. They try to force into an imaginary body a thousand hostile creeds that are diametrically opposed to each other on the most important subjects—creeds, too, nineteen-twentieths of which do not admit the existence of such an association, much less membership thereof.

As for the term 'Roman Catholic': it is none of our making. It is merely a legal designation forced upon us by an Act of a Protestant Parliament. In itself, and apart from legal convention, 'Roman Catholic' means a Catholic who is a native of, or resident in, the city of Rome. And this is the meaning which the combination carries in Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, German, and every modern language with which we are acquainted. 'Catholic' is our name, not 'Roman Catholic.' The word 'Roman,' in the sense of limiting the meaning of the title 'Catholic,' was repudiated by the Vatican Council. It is, in this signification, theologically wrong. With us, the word 'Roman,' when applied to the Church, is descriptive or explanatory, not restrictive. It indicates that Rome is the centre of our unity. It is, of course, not meant to convey a limitation of the circumference or sweep of the Church's catholicity or universality, for that would be a contradiction in terms. Ours is the only Church that claims and bears the simple title, 'the Catholic Church.' Apart from legal necessities created for us by Acts of Parliament, 'Catholic' is the only name we acknowledge. To say 'Roman Catholic' is, in its way, as bad a tautology as to say 'a round circle.' All circles are round, and all Catholics are 'Roman'—in the sense explained above. There are no other Catholics. And his Lordship the Anglican Bishop of Dunedin can learn as much from the first person—learned or simple, medico or lawyer, hodman, street-cleaner, or schoolboy—that he meets upon the street. If he inquires for the residence of the 'Catholic Bishop of Dunedin,' one and all will direct him, not to the Anglican See House, but to 'Rockmont,' opposite St. Joseph's Cathedral.

DIocese OF DUNEDIN

The opening of St. Dunstan's Church, Clyde, has been fixed for the third Sunday of October. The ceremony will be performed by his Lordship the Bishop.

Recent news from Ireland reports that the Right Rev. Mgr. Mackay paid a visit, whilst in Dublin, to the Dominican Priory, at Sion Hill, where he met the Rev. James Liston, of Dunedin, who was also on a visit to this well-known educational institution.

Mrs. P. Murtagh, who had been a member of the choir of the Catholic Church, Gore, during the past 13 years, was on Thursday night of last week, prior to her departure to North Otago, presented by the members of the choir with a handsome biscuit barrel.

The Rev. Father Buckley arrived in Auckland from Sydney on Monday last by the Mararoa. The Rev. Father will pay visits to relatives on his way to Dunedin, where he will arrive shortly. Rev. Father William Corcoran, a young priest recently ordained for the diocese in Thurles College, will be leaving for New Zealand in September, and is expected to reach Dunedin in November.

The health of the Rev. Father McGrath, of Port Chalmers, has been so unsatisfactory, especially since his recent severe attack of pneumonia, that he intends to take a rest from active parochial work. The Rev. Father has received his Lordship's permission for leave of absence, and will proceed to Ireland at an early date. Father McGrath's many clerical and lay friends throughout the diocese will wish him a complete restoration to health and vigor and a speedy return to the sphere of missionary work with which he has been so long, honorably, and usefully associated.