

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Anglicans, who are sometimes inclined to carry to an extreme the English instinct of expressing much less than is felt, were more than once swept off their feet, in spite of many a dignified tradition and convention. Who can forget how nearly ten thousand Church-people on a weekday evening in a concert-hall stood in earnest, silent prayer, at the bidding of the Archbishop of Canterbury, turning into immediate petition the searching personal appeal of the Bishop-Designate of Zanzibar, at the great meeting for the non-Christian world ?

Will it last ? Will it have any substantial result ? In answer, we should refer not to the debated point of a possible decennial Congress, not to any definite scheme for practical work that may be considered by a surviving Committee of the Congress, but rather to the duty laid on all that band of men whose hearts God has touched to permeate the whole Church with the spirit of the Congress. We have seen a vision of what the Church ought to be and to do ; we have also seen a vision of the Divine power that can enable it to carry out that Divine ideal. And if we can only go forward in the uplifting strength of that vision, the gain from the Pan-Anglican Congress of 1908 must be solid and permanent.



The Vatican and Reform.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR GALTON, M.A.

CERTAIN changes have been contemplated for several years in the administrative machinery of the Holy See. After mature consideration, a new scheme has been adopted. The details of it have now been published, though it will not come into operation until November. In some quarters these changes have been welcomed effusively as a reformation, which in one sense they are ; but, before we accept that definition unreservedly, it will be advisable to examine what we mean by it. If it be meant that the Court of Rome has moved towards

decentralization, then the term "reformation" is certainly misapplied to the present changes; or if it be meant that the administration of the Papal Church has become less autocratic and more liberalized or popular, then, again, those who desire or expect a reformation will be disappointed.

A reformation, however, there certainly is; but it is limited strictly to the internal working and the mutual relations of the present Congregations. The business of the several Congregations is more sharply and scientifically divided. Their various functions and jurisdictions will not clash or overlap, as they do at present. Their duties and powers are readjusted to existing circumstances. Judicial, disciplinary, and executive functions are clearly separated from one another; and, in judicial matters, the same judges will no longer sit in different and successive courts, often revising their own previous decisions, and going through the farce of hearing appeals against themselves. Moreover, in all judicial cases which come in future before the Pontifical courts, the reasons for the judgments given must be stated. Procedure is simplified. Litigation is made cheap and easy. The courts are accessible to the poorest suitors, and they are to be continuously in session. All these changes are a veritable and sweeping reformation, which certainly was required, which is most creditable to those who devised it, and to the supreme authority which approves it. Let us add that many of these changes, *mutatis mutandis*, might be imitated and adopted with advantage by other governments. They cheapen, they facilitate, and they expedite the whole course of ecclesiastical business, so far as it has to be carried on in Rome.

But there is another aspect of the question, and we must not overlook it if we would understand things as they really are. That justice should be just and business prompt is, of course, admirable; especially in that place where for so many ages it was a reproach that justice was uncertain or venal, and that business was most dilatory. And both these defects were profitable in those days to the Holy See. They were profitable, not only for the obvious reasons by which delays in justice can be

made to pay, but because delays in procedure, with the then slow methods of communication, multiplied precedents and built up the authority of the Roman courts. In these days, however, of incessant and instantaneous communication with the centre, the simplest procedure, the most effective machinery, and the quickest decisions, are the most advantageous to the central authority. These three advantages are certainly aimed at, and probably will be secured, by the new arrangement of the Papal Congregations.

The chief of these Congregations go back, in their present form, to the sixteenth century ; to an age of theological controversy and ecclesiastical warfare in Europe, when all the Churches were assailed and many were overthrown by the struggles of the Reformation. It was an age, also, of adventure, of discovery, of conquests, and of colonization, leading on to missionary enterprises, to new ecclesiastical problems and acquisitions. These great affairs brought into being the existing Papal Congregations, and have left their mark on them ever since.

To deal with the Protestant revolution, the great Congregation of the Roman Inquisition was organized, of which the Pope himself is President ; and subsidiary to it was the Congregation of the Index. These two committees dealt, and still deal, respectively with men and books. They give practical expression to the Papal claim of infallibility in faith and morals, of supreme authority in the spheres of intellect and knowledge. They represent the most serious aspect of these Papal claims. Now, the Inquisition, it is true, has been modified by the recent changes. It is no longer a judicial court in matters of ordinary civil or criminal disputation ; but it still deals with questions of dogma, and of faith and morals. And we do not find, so far as our present information goes, that this mysterious, autocratic, and sinister tribunal has been reformed, either in its procedure or in its composition. In these matters a drastic reform is absolutely necessary if its decisions are to be accepted with respect and confidence.

Next to the Inquisition in rank, and of even more importance practically, was the *Congregatio de Propagandâ Fide*, the Propaganda. Under it are all missionary countries, and all countries in which the old and regular Church order was destroyed by the Reformation. Its interests and its influence extended into all the world. Those who realize the extent of Roman Catholicism cannot think of Propaganda without a thrill of emotion at the variety and size of the Empire governed by its Cardinal Prefect, the Red Pope.

Under Propaganda was that colonial world which grew up in the sixteenth century, and which has passed so largely into the hands of the Anglo-Celtic or English-speaking communities. Churches ruled by Propaganda had not the advantages of a regular ecclesiastical administration. The decrees of Trent were not technically current in them. The Canon Law was not in force. Their bishops are more truly apostolic delegates than bishops in the older and fuller meaning of the term. The priests, who usually take the missionary oath, are chattels of their bishops; and we use this term in its medieval sense, and not with any opprobrious application. Such priests have no security of tenure, no certainty of maintenance or employment, no canonical position. This was the state of English Romanism under the old Vicars-Apostolic. It was not altered, as it should have been logically, when the hierarchy was established in 1850. The so-called hierarchy was more a name than a reality. It is not an advantage, as the *Times* imagines, but a very great disadvantage, for the clergy, except in a genuine missionary country, to be under Propaganda. Discontent with this insecure and unsatisfactory position has been growing among the English secular clergy for the last fifty years, and sometimes it has become clamorous.

Great Britain, Ireland, and the United States are now to be removed from the jurisdiction of Propaganda. As Canada is included in the change, we cannot but wonder why Australasia is not.

We are not informed, either, what the new system of govern-

ment is to be ; and, until we know, it is not possible to decide whether the change is a reformation. If we may judge by recent, by contemporary, and by maturing facts, our judgment may find some guidance. In France, under the Concordat, the old Church order was not restored ; and it is undeniable that Ultramontane principles increased there steadily throughout the nineteenth century, in spite of the connection between Church and State. It was hoped by many French Catholics that separation would increase the freedom and autonomy of their Church. They expected a national Church existing freely in a neutral State ; but these expectations have not been realized. The French Church has, indeed, been cut adrift from State control, except where the necessary regulations of police, of finance, and of association are concerned. But the French clergy and all their affairs are more closely supervised by Rome than ever. We say this in no controversial temper. We neither blame nor praise. We only register existing facts. And we find no reason for supposing that Roman Catholic affairs will be regulated differently in those Churches which are now removed from Propaganda, and which will probably be administered by the Consistorial Congregation in its revived and extended form. This body, we are told, is to appoint bishops, to supervise seminaries, and to deal with the higher administration of dioceses. In other words, the change from one Congregation to another is a change of names with very little change in reality or *status*. So far as there is any alteration, we venture to predict that it will take the course of an increased and more effective centralization. The natural tendency of Rome has always been to centralize. This tendency was favoured enormously by the opportunities created in the sixteenth century. The Church of Rome not only solidified and crystallized the fluid medieval dogmas at the Council of Trent, but it strengthened and centralized its organization. Under the influences which then became dominant throughout the Papal system, this process has been continued with a fearless logic and an ever-growing rapidity. The losses of the Reformation and

the apparent disaster of the Revolution were both utilized by Rome to extend the Papal autocracy over the weakened national Churches. Separation in France has now added farther possibilities of an advance in the same direction. Indeed, it has created a new position, for which the Papacy is reorganizing itself with its usual astuteness and foresight. France has so often been the leader of European progress that it is almost safe to prophesy that her example is likely to be followed in political, social, and intellectual affairs. If so, separation is within measurable distance, not only in the other Latin countries, but generally on the Continent. This, as we think, is the new position for which the Vatican is preparing; and, if we judge truly, it is what we might have expected logically as a result of separation in France. That this progress in centralization should be proclaimed to the world as a reform is also natural. It is also thoroughly in the Roman manner: *agnosco stilum Curie Romanæ*; especially as a proclamation of reform will help to disguise both the increase of Papal centralization and the persecuting rigour which was initiated last year by the encyclical *Pascendi*.

There are two problems connected with the future of the Papacy which are worth noticing, as a great deal may turn upon their development. The United States, we are told, come under the new arrangement. That is, instead of being administered by Propaganda, as at present, they will be governed by the revived and renovated Consistorial Congregation. There has already been friction between American Catholicism and Rome. This uneasy movement is known as Americanism; and it is not confined to the United States. The term has been utilized and extended so as to mean that incompatibility between Papal methods and the modern spirit, between progress and reaction or passivity, between liberty and absolutism, which is certain to increase. In the solution of this problem lies the whole future of the Papacy.

The question of Ireland is less important, but more curious. In the sixteenth century Ireland was not placed under Propa-

ganda. The old Canon Law was held to be still current there. It was not administered as a missionary country, but as a settled Church. The Stuart Kings nominated bishops. After the Revolution of 1688 and the Protestant Succession, the claims of the exiled Stuarts were still recognized at Rome. It was only when all hope of a restoration was abandoned, and Cardinal York was dead, and the French Revolution had happened, that this state of things was changed. Ireland was still, however, treated as having a canonical Church. It was only when Catholic Emancipation was passed, in 1829, that Irish affairs were transferred to Propaganda. In other words, it was just when Catholic affairs might be thought to have revived that the old Catholic organization was superseded. This is really what the Irish Catholics might not have expected. Certainly it is not what they deserved, after three centuries of heroism and suffering. We believe that this curious proceeding was the result of a deal between Leo XII. and the British Government, in which Irish interests were sacrificed to gain emancipation in Great Britain and the Colonies.

The "reform" in Canon Law, which was announced prematurely has not yet been accomplished. The present changes are only the prelude to a simplification and codification of the present ecclesiastical law. What is called Canon Law is an amalgam of Roman Civil Law and medieval precedents. It is not now recognized by any country, and is not applicable as it stands to modern conditions. But any changes in this mass of confused and obsolete legislation will, we feel confident, be all in the direction of perfecting, facilitating, and strengthening the Papal autocracy, of which we have so plain an object-lesson in the existing French Church.

Finally, we are astonished, not that these Papal changes should have been announced to the world as a radical reform, but that the *Times* should have succumbed so easily and completely to such an obvious manoeuvre. The Papacy may, indeed, be reformed gradually from below, by the local hierarchies or by the laity, though we think it more likely to end

by a slow and ignominious extinction. But to think that the Papacy will reform itself voluntarily, from above, shows very little intelligence in the present direction of the *Times*, and a singular incapacity in some of those who provide its news and articles.



"Lord of Hosts."

BY THE REV. ANDREW CRAIG ROBINSON, M.A.

IN the *CHURCHMAN* for September, 1900, an article appeared by the present writer on "The Divine Title 'Lord of Hosts' in its Bearing on the Theories of the Higher Criticism." Attention had never before been called to the point which was raised in that article—namely, that the total absence of this title from the Pentateuch would seem to be irreconcilable with the Graf-Wellhausen theory. Articles on the subject have since been contributed by the present writer to various periodicals, and to some of these articles replies have been made on the critical side. Such objections and criticisms have been met in a booklet, "A Problem for the Critics: the Divine Title 'Lord of Hosts'" (Marshall Brothers).

More recently, in the January number of the *Expository Times* of this year, there appeared a short contribution on the subject by the present writer, which in the issue for the following month was adversely criticized by an anonymous contributor signing himself "X." A rejoinder to this was sent to the *Expository Times* early in February, but was not admitted, although the editor's attention was more than once called to the matter. By not publishing that rejoinder, the editor left it open to his readers to conclude that there was no answer to "X's" criticism. The present article is written to set that matter right. The following is the original contribution :

As long ago as the year 1900, in an article contributed to the *CHURCHMAN* (September, 1900), I called attention to the significance of the fact that the Divine title "Lord of Hosts" never occurs in the Pentateuch, and I pointed