

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

Conscience was to him the voice of God in his soul, and his ear was ever attuned to its music. Duty was the "stern daughter of the voice of God," and for him she wore "the Godhead's most benignant grace." It was his devout allegiance to Duty that constrained him at times to employ such strict measures in dealing with the abuses around him. Like a surgeon, he had to use knife and cautery.

A distinguished living Cambridge professor tells us that we ought to cherish the memory of the good and wise, for the implacable effect of research is to diminish their number. To us it seems clear that the name of Grossetête can never be removed from that honoured band—the good and the wise! He was endowed with great mental gifts, and he used them for the noblest purposes, and in his life illustrated the beauty of goodness and truth, showing an example to his whole diocese of "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report."

WILLIAM COWAN.



ART. III.—THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL.

ON St. Peter's Day the Bishop of Rome issued an encyclical letter on the subject of the unity of the Church. It is addressed to "our venerable brethren, the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and other ordinaries in peace and communion with the Apostolic See." Translations of it, or of large portions of it, appeared on the following day in our principal English papers.

For such documents to be issued from time to time by the ecclesiastical head of a Christian community for the guidance of its members is but a natural procedure, and for members of another body ordinarily to canvass and examine them might properly be considered uncalled for. But we venture to think that the avowed object of this particular manifesto renders some public notice of it by English Church-people perfectly justifiable. For, though formally addressed to the hierarchy of the Roman Church, it is intended specially for the perusal of non-Roman communities. Thus it opens: "It is sufficiently well known to you that no small share of our thoughts and of our care is devoted to our endeavour to bring back to the fold, placed under the guardianship of Jesus Christ, the chief Pastor of souls, sheep that have strayed. Bent upon this, we have

thought it most conducive to this end and purpose to describe the exemplar and, as it were, the lineaments of the Church. Amongst these the most worthy of our consideration is unity. Nor is it improbable that ignorance may be dispelled, as false ideas and prejudices are dissipated from the minds, chiefly of those who find themselves in error without fault of theirs. We earnestly pray that God will graciously grant us the power of bringing conviction home to the minds of men."

When a heretic is addressed, even he may claim the right to reply.

The task will doubtless be taken up by those who are accepted as representative members of our English Church. Meanwhile, it is surely but safe and wise that we of the rank and file of her teachers should in some far less adequate fashion approach the subject, and endeavour to the best of our poor ability to furnish our people with a few salutary thoughts upon it.

I. A few weeks ago Mr. Gladstone wrote a letter to the Archbishop of York on the validity of our ministerial orders. This letter excited much interest. It was elicited by consideration of the laborious inquiry on this question which is now being prosecuted by the central authorities of the Roman Catholic Church. In it the writer exalts the magnanimity of Leo XIII., revealed in authorizing the inquiry. "What courage," he writes, "must it require in a Pope, what an elevation above all the levels of stormy partisanship, what genuineness of love for the whole Christian flock, *whether separated or annexed*, to enable him to approach the huge mass of hostile and still burning recollections in the spirit and for the purposes of peace!" And with expressions of the same grateful appreciation of the motives of this investigation, the letter closes: "Be the issue (of these proceedings) what it may, there is, in my view, no room for doubt as to the attitude which has been taken by the actual head of the Roman Catholic Church in regard to them. It seems to me an attitude in the largest sense paternal; and while it will probably stand among the latest recollections of my lifetime, it will ever be cherished with cordial sentiments of reverence, of gratitude, and of high appreciation."

With the Papal letter open before us, we may fittingly ask, Must not the gratitude of our brilliant statesman now have parted with something of its warm glow? Of Mr. Gladstone's letter, the Pope is said to have remarked that it tended rather to render more delicate and difficult the solution of the question, and the Cardinals are stated to have concurred in this opinion. But if any in England were at the date of the Hawarden letter inclined to echo its hopeful prognostications, this latest en-

cyclical must have effectually dispelled the illusion.¹ An "attitude in the largest sense paternal" has to be reconciled with a reaffirmation of the old arrogant assumptions of universal supremacy, with which the Papal conception of unity is bound up. As the *Times* of June 30th describes it, the argument of the document is but an expansion of the misinterpreted text which runs round the dome of St. Peter's: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church." The leader on the subject in the same paper adds that the propositions based upon this text are "assumed, but not attempted to be proved." This is not quite accurate; and we venture to think that the few attempts that *are* made in the course of the letter leave it considerably weaker as an intellectual effort than had pure and unrelieved assumption marked it throughout.

We select specimens of these methods of substantiating the transcendent claims of the Roman Pontiff; and the reader is asked to remember that we are listening to as solemnly *ex cathedrâ* a communication as could ever demand for itself the unquestioning homage due to an infallible authority. What can we think, then, when we find in one place the pontifical sanction accorded to an amazing etymology of "Cephas" from "head," based on the jingling alliterative resemblance between this word and "caput" and "cephale"? What shall be said of the reference to St. Cyprian as teaching that heresy and schism arise and are begotten from the fact that due obedience is refused to "the supreme authority," it being left to the ignorance of the reader to gather that by the phrase "supreme authority" is meant the Roman See? A glance into Church history shows no Father so vigorously and even contemptuously repudiating the supremacy of Rome, barely willing to concede even its primacy, as that of Canterbury is understood amongst ourselves.

Milman's words are unequivocal: "Cyprian confronts Pope Stephen not only as an equal, but, strong in the concurrence of the East and of Alexandria, as the Pope's superior."² He circulates a letter of another Bishop, Firmilian, still more unmeasured in its censures. His correspondent exposes what he calls "the manifest folly of Stephen in boasting of the place of his episcopate, and contending that he holds the succession from Peter."³

Still more to our purpose is Cyprian's third Treatise "On the Unity of the Church." Take this sentence: "Assuredly

¹ In his prefatory letter communicated to the papers with extracts, Cardinal Vaughan mentions this probable effect of the Encyclical.

² "History of Latin Christianity," vol. i., pp. 66, 67 (edit. iv.).

³ Cyprian, "Epistles," No. LXXIV.

the rest of the Apostles were also the same as was Peter, endowed with a like partnership both of honour and of power." But now mark against this the following words to be met with in received copies of this Treatise: "Upon Peter, being one, He builds His Church, and (to him) commits His sheep to be fed." "And the primacy is given to Peter, that there might be shown one Church of Christ and one See." "Does he who deserts the chair of Peter, upon whom the Church is founded, trust that he is in the Church?" Does Leo, then, find something in this Father to serve his turn? Not at all. Before citing these passages, or referring to the substance of them, he has a formidable task before him of textual reconstruction, for below these three friendly sentences bristles an awkward triplet of editorial footnotes:¹ "This passage is beyond all question spurious." "This passage is spurious." "This passage is undoubtedly spurious." Infallibility supports its claims with passages in the text of a notoriously hostile authority, which are infallibly unauthentic. And this is to be accepted by the faithful as patristic evidence.

Nor are the references of the Encyclical to the relations between primitive Popes and Church Councils much happier. The following is the passage in which these allusions occur: "The Popes have ever unquestionably exercised the office of ratifying or rejecting the decrees of Councils. Leo the Great rescinded the acts of the Conciliabulum of Ephesus, Damascus rejected those of Rimini, and Adrian I. those of Constantinople. The 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, by the very fact that it lacks the assent and approval of the Apostolic See, is admitted by all to be worthless."

Examining this passage, the first thing to be carefully observed is that in the list of synods to be found here no distinction is drawn between œcumenical and other Councils. Three of the four mentioned were not œcumenical, and therefore for the Bishop of Rome to rescind their acts proves nothing to the purpose.² The whole argument of Leo requires that the Bishop of Rome should prove from history (for we have here a professedly historical proof) that he is above *General Councils*. The only Council of the four which bears this character is that of Chalcedon, and from the enactments of that assembly he takes the 28th Canon, and of this he tells us that it "is admitted by all to be worthless," as lacking the approval of the Apostolic See, filled at the time by Leo

¹ Cyprian, Treatise III., chaps. iv. and v.

² Owing to the fortunate accident of a decrepit Pope being represented at Nice by two priests, his successors were sometimes glad to avail themselves of a precedent which seemed to favour the sentiment that a Pope's dignity was best consulted in staying away.

the Great. But so far from this Canon being "worthless," it was incorporated in the decrees of the Council in spite of the opposition of the legates from Rome, and has come down to us just as much an integral portion of those decrees as any other of its Canons. True, it does not appear in all the Collections, but (as has been well pointed out) we are indebted to the opposition for the best proof of its authenticity. At Florence, in the fifteenth century, it was confirmed. The Papal influence at this Council was supreme. Eugenius's authority was unquestioned.

It is not surprising that the Bishop of Rome should have opposed it through his representatives at the Council, for by it Constantinople is made a "new Rome"; and the primacy of Rome (not supremacy) is affirmed as based on the *accident* of that city being imperial. One sentence from history will reveal the entanglement that is involved in this rejection of a Canon of the Council of Chalcedon. This Council was the fourth General Council of the undivided Church. The whole of Latin Christendom has accepted these four Councils absolutely; our Reformed Church by 1 Elizabeth, cap. i., section 36, has done so, and this acceptance was reaffirmed at Lambeth in 1867. All Roman Catholics have done so. Pope Leo XIII. has done so. Gregory the Great says that he "venerates these four as the four Gospels," and describes them as "the four square stones on which the structure of faith rests."

II. In what has been so far offered, this review has been mainly occupied with details of criticism. It seemed hardly desirable to touch the subject of this document at all, and yet leave its appeals (slight as they are) to history unchallenged. But a broader survey shall now be taken of the Papal position.

And first, let it be noted that appeals to history, as to Holy Scripture, are quite inconsistent with the latest dogma of Rome, Papal Infallibility. This dogma stultifies all such appeals. For these appeals to established precedent are tantamount to distinct invitations to the world to examine and weigh, and form a judgment upon the utterances of infallibility; in other words, they actually solicit men to revolt from the principle of authority, and exercise the right of private judgment, of which right the doctrine of infallibility imperiously demands the unconditional surrender. In fact, it is keeping within the bounds of strictest intellectual sobriety to assert that an infallible authority dishonours his own attribute of infallibility when he invites me to examine his claims (whether to infallibility or supremacy, or any other pontifical deposit) in the light of history.

Very curious it is to mark the shifting of the controversial

ground occupied by Rome through the changed front of the Protestant opposition.¹ At the period of the Reformation the battle was fought on the fair field of Holy Writ. Both sides endeavoured to make good their case by a concurrent appeal to God's written Word. Beaten from this field, Rome entrenched herself behind the dogma of Tradition. Only part of Christ's truth was committed to the canonical Scriptures. To the Church had been committed the deposit of reserved truths. The contention then of the Papacy was that examination of her teaching at any given date would always reveal the perfect accord of that teaching with primitive tradition. She had never changed.

But from this ground also she was dislodged. The task was not a difficult one to prove that she was not primitive; that she had added to the early faith; that *all* her distinctive errors were of modern birth; that transubstantiation was unknown as an Article of the Faith till the thirteenth century; that communion in one kind was not ordered till the fifteenth; that the seven sacraments were not added to the Creed until the Council of Trent in 1546; that the Council of Florence is responsible for the tenet of purgatory (1439); that the stream of the ages need be ascended no higher than to the Council of Trent for the authoritative promulgation of the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass, the adoration of images, and the invocation of saints; while the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary (1854), and the decrees of the Vatican Council pronouncing the Pope infallible (1870), belong to our own day. What was to be done now? To prove herself unchanging with all those innovations paraded before her face might appear a hard nut to crack. But the timely doctrine of Development, a doctrine with which the writings of Cardinal Newman have familiarized an English public, came to her aid. Tradition was abandoned. All these so-called innovations in her creed were but legitimate developments. Their unevolved germ was imbedded in the past. In an embryonic state they were all there.

It was a bold move. Not a few of Rome's children felt, no doubt, it was too bold. For it required her to trace the links that connected the fully matured doctrine with the germ, and to trace, too, the successive stages of the gradual doctrinal evolution.

And now, since the Vatican Council, the disputants have retired from this ground, which offered too exposed a situation to the fire of the foe. Into the citadel of infallibility they

¹ In what follows under this head we are much indebted to Dr. Salmon's "Infallibility of the Church," a book which it is impossible to over-praise.

have retired; and by it Scripture, Tradition, and Development are all necessarily superseded. An unerring living guide has rendered all reference to past authorities, whether Scriptural or ecclesiastical, an impertinence.

An interesting question arises out of these considerations. When driven from this position, will the latest prove the last? What entrenchments can lie beyond infallibility? Are any conceivable? And when the outraged reason of some future age, shaking itself free from the emasculated æstheticism and sentimentality of to-day, rises up against the insupportable incubus thus imposed upon the free intellect of man, to what inner stronghold can the beaten withdraw? Will the adoption of a fifth dialectical expedient be contemporary with the discovery of a fourth dimension?

Beneath the amazing assumption of infallibility lies the assertion of the succession of the Bishops of Rome from St. Peter. Everything depends upon this. If this rock gives way, everything drops to pieces like the "baseless fabric of a dream."

History surely speaks with no uncertain sound on a point of such vital import. Solid and cogent must be the evidence of a fact of such enormous weight in the Divine economy for the spiritual weal of mankind. Providence could never permit the shadow of a doubt to remain after an impartial examination of the authentic records of the past. An unbroken catena of unimpeachable witnesses must run through the early annals of the Church to quell every misgiving and convince the most sceptical. To the Roman Christians of Apostolic days a long letter has been preserved in the New Testament. St. Peter must be the writer of it. To Rome the same sacred source of information represents him as going, a prisoner of Jesus Christ, and there he dwells for two years in his own hired house, "teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him." Is the writer here liable to correction by the youngest? Is he under the cruel necessity of substituting Paul for Peter? And, stepping outside the narrative of the New Testament, must he make out a case for the Chair of the Fisherman from the historian of the Church? Here, then, are facts forming the commonplaces of every student. The earliest lists of Bishops of Rome are headed by three names, i. Linus, ii. Anacletus, iii. Clement. Linus was a personal friend of St. Paul, who is mentioned (the identity has been established by Irenæus and Eusebius) by the Apostle in 2 Tim. iv. 21, and his appointment to the oversight of the Roman community was as much St. Paul's work as St. Peter's. This is the earliest account we possess of the line of Roman Bishops, but another list appeared subsequently. At the end of the second or the beginning of

the third century a work was brought to Rome. This was the "Recognitions of Clement," a kind of theological romance. The writer has no intention of presenting actual facts to his readers. Prefacing this book was¹ a letter purporting to be written by Clement (the third Bishop) to James the Just of Jerusalem, and in it Clement relates how he was consecrated by St. Peter. Touching this book, this circumstance should be accentuated, that the doctrinal portions of the work were rejected by the authorities at Rome of that day, while the narrative portions (which were historically worthless) were readily received. And another list was eventually published, based on this romance, with Clement pushed back past Anacletus and Linus, and made to head the line. But a peculiarly trustworthy proof of the correctness of the earlier list is actually afforded by the Roman Liturgy of to-day, in which the names of the first Bishops are commemorated in the earlier and not in the later order.

Into what a neighbourhood has our inquiry conducted us! The base of a vast system of beliefs, to which two hundred millions of the human race now living are professedly committed, revealing itself as a passage in a sort of religious novel, the doctrines set forth in which have been pronounced heretical by the very Church that is under such immense obligations to the portions which its ban has spared! Could the irony of the situation be more biting? But supposing it could conclusively be proved that St. Peter was the first Bishop in Rome, that without a single break in the line stretching through nineteen centuries the imposition of hands had carried down the ages whatever gifts may be supposed to accrue to his successors, would the Roman claims to universal supremacy be much more valid? Instead of being grounded as they now are upon an unhistorical legend, they would be grounded upon an unwarranted textual gloss. If our Lord had meant that He would found His Church upon St. Peter, and not upon the Rock of the Incarnation then revealed not by flesh and blood to His Apostle, how singularly misleading were His words as He substituted "Petra" for "Petros"—the "rock" for the "stone."

A few words may be subjoined on our own posture towards the unreformed Western Church. From the perusal of the latest Papal encyclical letter, we rise with the reflection: The matters dealt with here, weighty as they may be in the estimate of members of the Roman Catholic Church, are after all of subsidiary importance as bearing upon the relations of honest,

¹ We emphasize "was" as it now prefixes the "Clementines," while it is referred to by Rufinus in his extant preface to the "Recognitions."

straightforward Protestantism with the real question.¹ They do not touch the main issue of our age-long quarrel with Rome. Let our English orders be pronounced valid by the highest Italian authority to-morrow; let the tenet of Infallibility, added to the creed twenty-six years ago by Pius IX., be expunged by Leo XIII.; let that of the Immaculate Conception, not yet fifty years old, be rescinded also, would the way be practically more open for us English Church-people to surrender our spiritual liberties—the priceless heritage for which the martyrs bled? Would it be found compatible with loyalty to our purified formularies, our scriptural Articles, that we should regard the idolatries of Mariolatry, the mercenary compact of Indulgences, the veneration of relics, the perils and pollutions of the Confessional, the materialism of the Mass, as a mere bagatelle—an insignificant barrier, over which, with scarce a shock to the most scrupulous conscience, we might pass again into the old fold? Not so. Until Rome repudiates these errors, and in sorrowful repentance for her long defection returns to the faith once delivered to the saints, the estrangement must be prolonged. Long may our beloved Church, rebuking those of her members who chafe under the restraints of her beneficent guidance, maintain her righteous protest against traditions of men that make void the message of her Lord.

“We are of Cephas” only so far as Cephas is “of Christ.” But when he “walks not uprightly, according to the truth of the Gospel,” the Pauls of Protestantism have but one course before them, to “withstand him to the face, because he is to be blamed.”

And if any nearer home “come in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they may bring us” once more “into bondage,” to these “we will give place by subjection, no, not for an hour.”

A. PEARSON.

¹ The outspoken utterances of the Archbishop of Canterbury in opening his Diocesan Conference at Lambeth on July 14 merit the respectful thanks of all loyal Church-people. We quote a sentence or two: “The attitude of the Church of Rome is an absurdity, contrary to doctrine and to English history. The Church of England was always Protestant, and long before the Reformation she was always protesting and Catholic. She protested against innovations and encroachments and to foreign jurisdiction. In all her resistance, the Church and the nation used their greatest men and performed their greatest acts.”

