

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

THE MONTH.

THE most significant event of the month has been the issue, by the *Church Times*, of a manifesto by the President of the English Church Union (Lord Halifax), which is an ardent appeal for definite corporate reunion with Rome. Lord Halifax assumes (1) that the Roman claim for supremacy is in the main right; (2) that the Reformation was directed against a state of things which has long passed away, and that there is nothing in the decrees of the Council of Trent that is antagonistic to our formularies; (3) that Dr. Newman and Dr. Pusey were right in explaining all our documents in a Roman sense; (4) that the true historical Church of the Reformation is represented by the English Church Union; and (5) that the main differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome are now those of sentiment and *esprit de corps*. Henceforth we are all to labour night and day to explain everything away, and to undo the work of the Reformation by corporate reunion with the Pope. If the Pope will only recognise our orders, all will be plain sailing. We cannot expect the Pope to retract, but he and we will both submit to God.

What an unreal world it is in which many of us live! To an amiable dreamer, like the President of the English Church Union, in whose eyes the facts of history assume the shape in which they appear in this manifesto, any imagination is possible. But we have to remember that he is the head and mouthpiece of an earnest and enthusiastic body of 34,800 communicants, who have the most influential part of the religious press at their command, and who, far from disavowing his policy, will absorb it. The followers of Dr. Newman, who are now popularly known as Ritualists, have often repudiated with decorous indignation the charge of Romanizing. And now their own revered and beloved leader in the face of the whole world proclaims a policy of Romanizing beyond which it would be impossible for any Romanizer to go. His position will be indicated by the following verbatim extracts. We are almost ashamed to insert words which, to the ordinary English Churchman, appear nothing short of treasonable; but in Lord Halifax's case they are nothing of the kind; and they are simply the frank, honest, open transcript of the mental and religious atmosphere which he breathes, and which others have not an equal courage to avow:

THE RELATIONS OF CANTERBURY TO ROME.

"Canterbury was the daughter of Rome. At Canterbury the church outside its walls, which sheltered the remains of the Kings of Kent and the Archbishops, was dedicated to Saints Peter and Paul. It was another Pope, St. Vitalian, who sent St. Theodore to Canterbury, the Archbishop to whom is due the definite constitution of the English Church.

"It was to Rome that the eyes of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers turned, as the seat of the Bishop whose help and assistance, and the authority of whose see was acknowledged by all the Churches of the West; and if they thought of the ancient British Church which they succeeded, they would only remember that the members of that Church had formally refused to associate themselves with their conquerors, over and above the fact, which in this day is hardly doubtful, that the ancient British Church, like that of Gaul and of Spain, has nothing to prove—on the contrary, the evidence all goes the other way—that it was not itself the daughter of Rome. That there is a long way from all this to the centralization which later on developed itself in the Western Church, requires no insisting upon, any more than that the relations now described do not involve all that some modern writers belonging to the Roman Church have tried to see in them. On the other hand, when, for controversial purposes, it is attempted to discover an origin for the English Church other than that of

Rome, or to prove that England from the earliest times down to the sixteenth century was not united to Rome by the closest links of an external unity and a common faith, those who are acquainted with the facts are tempted to doubt either our honesty or, at least, the trustworthiness of our historical methods.

"Such, then, was the unity of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that unity lasted for 1,500 years. For 1,500 years men might talk of the Church of England, of the Church of France, of the Church of Italy, or the Church of Spain, but all knew that each was but a part of a greater whole; that as there was but one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one Eucharist, so there was but one Church; and in the West all looked to Rome as the great central see, grouped round which the different national Churches of the West were supported in the profession of a common faith, by the link of an external authority which, binding them to itself, bound them also to one another."

NO FURTHER NEED FOR THE SCHISM OF THE REFORMATION.

"In weighing its consequences, then, and in apportioning its guilt, which is essential if right is to be done in the present day, a just balance must be struck, and an even measure apportioned to both sides in the quarrel; and in this connection there are two things which it is very necessary to remember. One, that the protests made in the sixteenth century against the abuses of the Church, whether doctrinal or practical, were directed against a system which has long ceased to exist. That system disappeared after Trent, gradually and silently as it had arisen. Protestant protests were directed not against the system defined at Trent, but against a previous state of things which it is now difficult to reproduce."

RELATIONS WITH ROME.

"I proceed to the consideration of the relations between England and Rome. Surely there is no one, if he thinks what it would be to see the Western Church once more united, her schisms healed, and peace once more existing amongst her members, but must long for the day when the Church of England, our own branch of the Church which we love so well, should again be united in bonds of visible communion with the Apostolic see and all the Churches of the West. What would we not give to be able to make our confessions and our communions abroad as we do at home! Who can endure the sense of being separated from those with whom in all essentials of belief and sentiment we are one? And why should we not see the day of such a happy reconciliation? It was never the intention of the Church of England to depart from the rest of the Catholic Church. What is there which should make her desire to remain in her present isolation, which should make such a renewal of her ancient relations with Rome impossible? She accounts herself a portion of the Visible Church, estranged rather than divided from the rest of Catholic Christendom. Her articles expressly assert the authority of the universal Church in controversies of faith, and in the institution of rites and ceremonies."

POSSIBILITY OF EXPLAINING AWAY THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

"But at this point I am conscious that an objection will be made. You have mentioned many things, it will be said, but you have omitted one which, in connection with this view of a reunited Christendom, is perhaps the most important of all. You have said nothing of the effect of the Vatican Council upon the prospect of a reunion which shall embrace England and the East. It is not for me on the present occasion, nor am I the person to endeavour to show how doctrinal and theological difficulties are to be accommodated. There are many questions besides those involved in the decisions of the Vatican Council which will need, before

peace can be secured, to be considered and discussed. Explanations may do much to remove many misconceptions which prevail on both sides. Even in regard to the Vatican Council, it appears not impossible that mistakes and exaggerations as to its scope and consequences may have been made, and that as time goes on explanations will emerge which may make the difficulties it seems to involve less than they have sometimes appeared. It is certain that the explanations given by Bishop Fessler, the Secretary of the Council, with the approbation of the Pope, were by no means such as some who have pressed for the definition approved. If by Papal infallibility it is only meant that the Pope is infallible when acting as the head of the whole Church, and expressing the mind of the Church, and after taking all the legitimate and usual means for ascertaining that mind, in determining which the authority and witness of the Bishops, as representing their respective churches, must be paramount, and then only in regard to the substance of the deposit handed down from Christ and His Apostles, it would seem that the difficulty of a possible agreement is not so insuperable as it has been sometimes represented. Certainly, it is not such as to preclude all endeavours to find possible terms of peace on other matters. In any case, till it is proved to the contrary, let us nourish the hope that such explanations are possible."

THE MOVEMENT OF DR. NEWMAN THE TRUE EXPONENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AND TO BE RECOGNISED BY ROME AS SUCH.

"I say also that while it is a reason for prudence, for being careful lest we do anything which might endanger the cause we would seek to promote, for doing all we can, [in the first instance, to leaven public opinion, and for striving by all means in our power to dispel prejudice and to awaken greater desire for union, it is not a reason for abandoning the hope of reunion as one which can never be realized. Events go fast in these days; much that seemed impossible yesterday is accomplished to-morrow; and just as it is not fair to judge the Roman Church by the superstitions and abuses which at various times have been tolerated by her authorities and disfigured her communion, so neither is it fair to impute to the Church of England the blame of opinions, and a state of things which are diametrically opposed to her authoritative profession and formularies. Much has been amended already; much more will be amended in the future. Time is required to test the value of inferences which may be drawn from the condition of any religious body at a particular moment. It is not the Church of England of to-day, but the Church in all ages and in all countries, which requires indulgence in such matters. No one, I think, who knows anything of the history of the Church of England, especially during the last sixty years, can doubt that the difficulties alluded to are essentially temporary and accidental; that a generous view of the position of the Church of England is really the true one. After all, there is a logic in facts which cannot be ignored. It has not infrequently been said that nothing but the Catholic Church can produce a Sister of Charity. The revival of the religious life among women within the limits of the Church of England is a fact, and has to be accounted for. Again, it has been said by most distinguished and competent critics that the Oxford Movement, apparently successful in much, had failed in what was perhaps its most essential principle—the vindication of the spiritual claims of the Church of England as against the civil power. I reply again, in view of the relative position of the Church as a spiritual power, able to assert herself, and to vindicate her doctrine and ritual against the encroachments of the State, let the contrast between the condition of things at the time of the Gorham Judgment and at the present speak for itself."

DIVINE FUNCTION OF DR. NEWMAN'S MOVEMENT TO ACHIEVE
CORPORATE REUNION.

"For ourselves, we are convinced that the great religious revival in England, . . . which has now advanced another stage by the more recent restoration of the Catholic Ritual prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, . . . can be intended by Almighty God for no other issue than the restoration of the whole body of the Anglican faithful, whether at home, in America, or in our scattered missions throughout the whole world, to corporate reunion."

PRACTICAL IDENTITY OF ENGLAND AND ROME.

"Let me recapitulate our position again. It is essential there should be no mistake about it. In the words of a recent writer, which leave nothing to be desired, 'We wish for union with Rome; we wish for nothing so much, but such a desire on our part involves nothing inconsistent with a sincere and loyal allegiance to the Anglican Communion. We are convinced on the one hand that there is nothing whatever in the authoritative documents of the English Church which, apart from the traditional glosses of a practical Protestantism, contains anything essentially irreconcilable with the doctrines of the Church of Rome. We are, indeed, members of a body not in communion with the Holy See. We deplore the isolation, and desire to do our best to heal the breach between us. That breach is none of our making. It is not one for which even our spiritual forefathers three hundred years ago were solely, or even mainly, responsible. Political tyranny on the part of those at home, the undue assertion of ecclesiastical power on the part of those abroad, as well as the practical corruption of the Church at large, forced us into it. We regret it, indeed, but we could not help it. The fault was on the side of the authorities of the Roman Church as well as on ours. We are ready to admit our part of it. It remains for them to admit theirs. So far as the Church of England is concerned, there has been no schism in the strict and historical sense of the word. We have never renounced communion with Rome. There is nothing in the formal teaching of the Church of England which in the least degree implies the existence or the desirability of such a separation; on the contrary, it is distinctly repudiated. Priests in Roman Orders may minister, members of the Roman Communion may communicate, at our altars. We desire from the bottom of our hearts to be allowed to make our own confessions to, and to receive our communions from the hands of, the Roman clergy abroad. What we cannot do is to make any surrender inconsistent with truth and justice. If, then, we are asked to acknowledge, not formally, but in effect, that we have neither priests nor sacraments, the reply is clear—that our present Episcopate is in all respects the true and lineal descendant of the Apostolic mission in this land. If we are required to renounce communion with the Church of England on the ground that she is heretical, we reply again that there is nothing in her authorized teaching which is not taught in the pulpits and catechisms of the Roman Church itself. It is not by demands such as these, which are inconsistent with loyalty to our own communion and to our Episcopate, that the day when the two Communions will be made one, to the infinite joy of Christian hearts, and, as we trust, to the incalculable blessing of millions of our fellow men, will be brought about."

EXPLAIN TO THE UTTERMOST.

"'We must explain to the uttermost,' the Cardinal said; and on the Anglican side it is needless to mention the names of Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, of Bishop Hamilton, of Salisbury, who concluded his aspirations for unity contained in that charge which will ever make his name famous, with the words, when speaking of the Pope, 'Non ille nobis cedit sed

nos unâ cum illo cedemus Deo'; of Bishop Gray, of Capetown, who declared that every sacrifice short of truth should be made for the cause of union; and last, but not least, of Dr. Pusey, of whom Mr. Ambrose de Lisle, himself a Roman Catholic layman—who, to quote his friend and mine, the late Rev. H. N. Oxenham, concentrated the life-long devotion of his talents, his energies, and his prayers on the work of promoting the reunion of the separate Churches in one faith and fold—did not hesitate to say, 'That it was not possible for any Catholic to read what Dr. Pusey had written without being convinced that the Church of England holds, either implicitly or explicitly, the main great verities of Catholic doctrine, and that if ever, in the good providence of God, the divisions which now rend asunder the Christian Church are healed, that glorious result will be more due to the services and exertions of Dr. Pusey than to any other man living.'

THE POPE CAN DO MORE THAN ANYBODY ELSE TO DISPEL
THE DIFFERENCES OF THREE CENTURIES.

"It does seem to me that if the present Pope were, so far as England is concerned, to inaugurate such a policy by taking steps for a complete investigation into the subject of Anglican Orders, it might lead to a renewal of relations which might eventuate in nothing less than the reunion of Western Christendom. Certainly the recognition of the validity of the Orders conferred by the English Church would not of itself bring about reunion: many other grave and difficult questions would remain behind. At the best it would only put the Anglican Communion in the same position as regards the Roman Church as that occupied by the great Communions of the East; but no one can doubt that such a recognition, though it would not be everything, would be a step, and a great step, in the direction of unity. Nothing tends to keep up the irritation between Rome and England so much as the apparent denial of the validity of our Orders and Sacraments. That question out of the way, the whole relation between the two Communions would be put on quite a different footing—a footing which would facilitate other negotiations in their turn. I shall not believe such a step impossible. I say a step, for it is folly to suppose that we can hope to sign a concordat between Lambeth and the Vatican to-morrow. A new national attitude in regard to the relations of Christian bodies has to be taken up. The misunderstandings and prejudices of three centuries have to be dispelled. But I am convinced that no one can do so much as the Pope himself in this direction. I could even conceive an overture from Rome to England of such a character as might almost transform the whole national attitude in regard to the Roman Church and the question of reunion with the Holy See."

AN HONEST AND COURAGEOUS AVOWAL.

"Meanwhile, on our side the main point we have to insist upon at the present time is that reunion is to be worked for, prayed for, that the present is an opportunity which, once lost, may never occur again. Do not let us be afraid to speak plainly of the possibility, of the desirability, of a union with Rome. Let us say boldly we desire peace with Rome with all our hearts. Public opinion will never be influenced if we hold our tongues. It is influenced by those who, without any concealment, have the courage of their opinions. It is the interest of the whole Church of Christ, it is the interest of political order, it is the interest of the human race that these estrangements in the Christian family should cease. The cause is good, we have no need to be ashamed of it. Let us frankly avow it to be our own. One thing above all others let us do. Let us take the opportunity of the appeal made by the present Encyclical to assure Leo XIII. that we, at least, are grateful for his efforts—that he may rely upon a sympathetic answer to any appeal he may make to the Church of England."