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

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

PREFACE.

FOR their sympathetic co-operation during another circle of twelve months, I have the pleasure of thanking the writers and readers of the CHURCHMAN. From many sources gratitude has been expressed for the line which it has attempted consistently to follow. Loyalty to the written Word of God is our chief watchword; next to that, a discriminating attention to the practices and teachings of the Primitive Church; thirdly, a profound confidence in the wisdom, candour and learning of the English Reformers. The truth, fulness and importance of this line is in some degree shown by the weekly invectives of the Roman press in this country against the Review. With such principles the Church of Rome is, unfortunately, at variance. The Council of Trent set Tradition on an equality with the inspired Scriptures as an authority. The practice and teaching of the Primitive Church are, according to the Roman theory of Development, defective. No words are too bad for them to employ in describing the English Reformers. From such a Church we, as English Churchmen, do not think we have anything to learn but by way of warning. Time was when the Roman Church was justly the admiration of the other Churches of Christendom. When once again it has divested itself of its cardinal errors of Universal Dominion, Tradition and Development, it may once more gain that high place—which may God in His own good time grant! None will rejoice more heartily than the descendants of those Anglo-Saxons to whom Bishop Gregory sent Augustine the Monk.

The controversy on the criticism of the Old Testament has been watched by writers in the CHURCHMAN with an inclination to cautiousness against any hastily-drawn assumptions. As the Old Testament is the foundation on which the New is raised, anything like rashness or presumption is unspeakably out of place. Nothing can be accepted except what is demon-

strated beyond all possibility of question. No care is too great in handling matters of vital and essential importance to the hopes and happiness of mankind.

With regard to internal controversies, the attitude of the CHURCHMAN appears to be unassailable in taking its stand on the theology of Hooker, Jackson, Field, and the other characteristic divines of the reformed English Church, and in firmly refuting everything in Dr. Newman's movement which is not in harmony with the patient and exhaustive learning of these great exponents of Holy Scripture and the History of the Church. It is exactly with a view to such points that the Counter-Reformation, which is now in full operation in the Church, is being so vigorously urged; and, at whatever cost, it appears to be our duty to set forth the progress of that movement, and the overwhelming reasons which are against it.

With politics we have, of course, little to do; but all reforms that are well considered in ecclesiastical and social matters we desire to study with intelligent and sympathetic interest.

Never was literature so much occupied as at present in theology and philanthropy. The field that lies before us every year is vast, varied and fertile.

When great issues are at stake, help and co-operation are welcome from all quarters. Believing heartily in our own principles, we earnestly desire to see them prevailing in many directions. The CHURCHMAN is prospering, but it is hardly necessary to add that the more numerous our readers the more hopeful will be our outlook. In many circles of men of moderate or of evangelical views the CHURCHMAN does not seem yet to have made its way. We cannot but think that our readers will be helping the cause of the maintenance of those Reformation principles that are dear to them, if they will endeavour to make it known more widely and to promote its circulation. Amongst the multitude of ecclesiastical papers a review of modest dimensions and of no long standing runs the risk of being unrecognised.

May God, in these days of difficulty, grant to both writers and readers an abundant portion of the Holy Spirit, which may show itself in meekness, forbearance, candour, loyalty, truthfulness, learning and charity!

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

THE

CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER, 1893.

ART. I.—PAPAL AUTHORITY IN PRIMITIVE TIMES.

THE source from which Mr. Puller's book dealing with the Papal authority[1] emanates, gives it a double interest. When the Tractarian party broke up, on its desertion by Dr. Newman, the greater part of its members fell back into the ranks of the National Church, resolute now to defend her not only in her Catholic, but also in her Protestant aspect. A smaller section, unwilling to efface itself as a party, maintained certain shibboleths of distinction, and became known as the Ritualist party. Some of the members of this party, while desirous of a more elaborate ceremonial, have shown themselves warmly attached to the Church of England; but in others the spirit of disloyalty which animated Newman has exhibited itself and has made them depreciate everything Anglican and give their approval to Roman doctrines and practices whenever they are opposed to Anglicanism. The fact of Mr. Puller belonging to the Cowley Society and calling himself "Father," proclaims him an advanced high Churchman; the tone of his book, we are happy to say, shows that he is not in favour of Romanism. We should be glad to see a more general return, on the part of the section of the Church to which Mr. Puller apparently belongs, from a morbid admiration of mediævalism to a healthy love of primitive truth and practice, such as characterized the divines of the seventeenth century, who never forgot to be thankful that they belonged to a Church which, if it was Catholic, was also, and for that reason, Protestant.

[1] "The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome," by F. W. Puller, of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley, with a Preface by Edward Lord Bishop of Lincoln. (Longmans, 1893, pp. 423.)

Mr. Puller goes over little new ground, and we may be tempted to ask, Why say again what has been so well said already? It may be wearisome to well-read students to do this, but it is necessary. Rome keeps her ground by dogged reassertion in spite of refutation, and her reassertions must be met by renewed refutations, else she will boast herself victor and mislead simple souls. A great part of Mr. Puller's argument may be found in Allies' "Church of England Cleared from the Charge of Schism," and a considerable portion of it is an expansion of an article that appeared in the *Christian Remembrancer* in 1855, in reply to R. I. Wilberforce's "Principles of Church Authority," an article referred to at page 60. Nevertheless, Mr. Puller's work is far from superfluous; it is well-arranged, and well-written, and it restates the case in a temperate manner, which may gain an audience for it where words of a sharper or severer tone would not find entrance.

Everyone who maintains the tenet of the Papal supremacy, and everyone who refutes it, has to appeal to a series of historical events bearing on the subject, which must be shown to be in accordance with the theory that he holds, except, like Manning, he shall have in despair rejected the appeal to history as "a treason." We propose to recount some of these events, submitting to our readers the conclusions which Mr. Puller draws from them.

1. The first of these events in the Quartodeciman controversy.

The Christians of Asia Minor had inherited from St. John the custom of keeping the feast of Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon, as the Jews did. Most of the other Churches of Christendom kept it on the next Sunday. In the middle of the second century Polycarp proceeded to Rome to persuade the then Bishop, Anicetus, to adopt the Quartodeciman usage. He did not succeed. Either Bishop treated the other with honour and courtesy, but the various usages continued, the variety being regarded as indifferent. At the end of the same century the question arose again. Victor, a man of overbearing temper, was then Bishop of Rome; and when Polycrates, of Ephesus, wrote in defence of the Quartodeciman practice, he tried to persuade the other Churches of Christendom to cut off the Asiatic from the common unity, on account of their non-conformity in this matter; probably he did break off the communion between his own local Church and the Church of Asia Minor, but he entirely failed to persuade his brother Bishops to follow his example, and they sharply reproached him for his intolerance. The difference in usage continued down to the Council of Nicæa.

The following is Mr. Puller's just comment on the subject:

From the point of view of the Vatican Council, Polycrates' letter was a wicked act of rebellion, and all the Bishops of Asia, by assenting to that act of rebellion, became partakers of the Metropolitan's guilt. But the Fathers of the Church were wholly unconscious of that view of the matter. When St. Jerome writes a short life of Polycrates he says nothing about rebellion or any other wrongdoings, but quotes the most important part of Polycrates' letter, including his refusal to conform himself to Victor's decision, as a proof of the ability and weight of the man. Moreover, St. Irenæus, and numbers of other Catholic Bishops took the same view. No doubt, they thought that there had been wrongdoing, but in their view, not Polycrates, but Victor, was the culprit. They "very severely upbraided" Victor. As far as we know, they said nothing to Polycrates. But perhaps, for our purpose, the most important point to notice is that nobody seems to have supposed that communion with the Catholic Church depended on communion with the Roman See. Victor wrote letters in which he announced that all the Asiatic brethren were "*utterly* separated from communion." The other Bishops objected to Victor's proceeding. They refused to withdraw their communion from Polycrates. He therefore remained united to the common unity of the Catholic Church, although cut off from the communion of the Roman Church. A very important principle underlies this fact. Evidently in the second century the Church was in no way the born handmaid of the Roman pontiff. The theory set forth in the Vatican decrees was unknown. The Roman Church was not held to be the necessary centre of unity.—P. 30.

Mr. Puller adds that judging by the examples of St. Irenæus and other holy bishops of his time, the way to meet Papal claims is "to inveigh against the claimant strongly, and to upbraid him severely, and to refuse to give in to his claim."

2. In the middle of the third century far the greatest prelate in the West was Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage. As such, he was appealed to by the Spanish Church for advice and help in the matter of the Bishops Martial and Basilides. The latter, Bishops of Leon-Astorga and Merida, had been canonically deposed because they had lapsed in time of persecution. Unwilling to acquiesce in the judgment of the National Church, Basilides hurried to Rome, and by an *ex parte* statement induced Bishop Stephen to embrace his cause. Returning to Spain, the two deposed prelates demanded reinstatement. The Spaniards, feeling themselves unequal to a contest with the Bishop of the imperial city, appealed to Cyprian for help. Cyprian gathered a synod of thirty-seven Bishops which examined into the question. Finding that the Spanish Church was in the right, they wrote a letter to Leon and Merida, reassuring the Spaniards, telling them to disregard Stephen's interference, who had acted without proper circumspection, and had allowed himself to be imposed upon by Basilides, and bidding them regard Martial and Basilides as deposed and the men who had been appointed in their place the legitimate occupiers of the sees.

The whole incident (says Mr. Puller) illustrates admirably the Catholic system of Church government. The sentence of the synod of the province is held to be final. The Pope's decision in regard to a matter which had taken place outside his jurisdiction is considered to have no force in itself. It is neither able to reverse nor suspend the decision of the province. The Spanish churches are exhorted to ignore it; but all who act upon it are warned that they will share in the guilt and in the punishment of the miserable men whose action had caused all the trouble. We learn also from this incident that when any Church was in trouble it could apply for help to any foreign Church which it might select.—P. 70.

3. Cyprian of Carthage and Stephen of Rome held different views as to the efficacy of baptism by heretics. Which view was the more correct is unimportant for our purpose. Cyprian, firmly maintaining his own side of the question, held that each might be tolerant of the other's opinion. Stephen, a successor of Victor, threatened his opponent with excommunication. Cyprian, lamenting that Stephen should be so "proud," "impertinent," "rash," "improvident," "obstinate," called a council of eighty-five African Bishops, who confirmed the Cyprianic view. Stephen carried out his threat and cut off the African from communion with the Italian Church. St. Firmilian, contemplating this act of violence, expressed the sentiments of Eastern as well as Western Christendom by turning upon Stephen and crying out, "How great a sin have you heaped up against yourself when you cut yourself off from so many flocks! for you cut yourself off; don't deceive yourself. For he is truly the schismatic who has made himself an apostate from the communion of the unity of the Church. For while you think that all may be excommunicated by you, you have excommunicated yourself alone from all" (Opp. St. Cypr., p. 150).

Here we have the judgment of St. Cyprian and St. Firmilian on the modern Papal claims, and to them must be added St. Augustine, who, while agreeing with Stephen in opinion, has left the record of his approval of Cyprian's conduct, who, he says, would no doubt have yielded to a Plenary Council, if it could have been held.

Mr. Puller comments:

If the Pope be by Divine appointment all that the Vatican Council has declared him to be, what words could be too strong to denounce St. Cyprian's attitude towards Stephen? On that hypothesis he was an insolent rebel, and his eighty-four colleagues, who made no protest, were sharers in his sin. . . . St. Augustine is absolutely unconscious of any taint of rebellion or impropriety in St. Cyprian's attitude. Why should Cyprian need to wait for a Plenary Council when the infallible Pope had spoken and had threatened to excommunicate those who differed from him? The answer, of course, is that nobody dreamed that obedience was due to the Pope. . . . St. Firmilian's are doubtless strong words,

and it was quite time that the prelates of the Church should speak out in no faltering terms of Stephen's arrogant attitude and action.—P. 86.

4. At the beginning of the fifth century Apiarius, a presbyter of the Church of Sicca, in North Africa, was deposed for crime. He fled to Rome, and there accused his Bishop, Urban. Pope Zosimus took Apiarius under his protection, and sent him back to Africa, accompanied by Faustinus, an Italian Bishop, and two Italian presbyters, who were to demand his restoration and the excommunication of Urban, and to make some general claims on behalf of the See of Rome. A council of African Bishops having been summoned, the Italians brought forward a canon of the council of Nicæa, on which they based the Papal claim of interference. The African Bishops replied that they knew no such canon—that their copies had it not, that they did not believe in its existence, but they courteously added that they would write to the other great Church centres and get authenticated copies of the Nicene decrees and canons. They did so, and it was found that no such canon existed. An excuse was made for the Pope that he had confounded together the acts of the councils of Nicæa and Sardica, but as copies of the acts of all the councils were deposited at Rome, he could not have done this, except he wilfully closed his eyes. The act illustrates the crooked policy by which the See of Rome has constantly sought to justify her ambitious courses. Apiarius, praying for forgiveness, was allowed to continue in the ministry, but was desired to remove from the diocese of Sicca. He went to Tabraca, and here he again was guilty of conduct which caused the people once more to demand his deposition. Again he fled to Rome. Again he was taken by the hand by the Pope—Celestine was now Pope—and again the Pope sent him back to Africa with Faustinus, who again demanded his restoration. His spontaneous confession of guilt relieved the African Church from further trouble on his score, but it would not pass by the incident without administering a sharp though dignified reproof to the interfering Italian primates. Already it had been led to pass a canon ordering that anyone appealing to a court the other side of the sea (Rome) was not to be readmitted to communion by anyone in Africa. Now, an African council writes to the Roman Bishop desiring him in future not thus easily to admit to communion men coming to Rome, who had been excommunicated in Africa. "Let your holiness," they say, "reject, as is worthy of you, that bad practice of taking shelter with you which priests and the inferior clergy have, both because by no ordinance of the Fathers has this right been withdrawn from the African Church, and the Nicene decrees have most plainly committed the inferior clergy and the Bishops themselves to their Metropolitans. For they have

ordained with great prudence and justice that all matters shall be terminated in the places where they arise; and they did not think that the grace of the Holy Spirit would be wanting to any province, by which grace the Bishops of Christ would discern with prudence and maintain with constancy whatever was equitable; especially since any party who thinks himself wronged by a judgment may appeal to the synod of his province or even to a general council [of all Africa], unless it be imagined by anyone that our God can inspire a single individual with justice, and refuse it to an innumerable number of Bishops assembled in council." There is more to the same effect, every word of the letter being condemnatory of the modern Roman system. Mr. Puller speaks with refreshing directness and vigour on this case as well as those recounted above.

As honourable men (he says), let Ultramontane writers refrain from pretending that the Church of North Africa in the time of St. Augustine believed in the principles laid down by the Vatican Council. Such a pretence is an impertinence and an act of folly which must alienate every person of good sense and Christian simplicity who is cognisant of it.—P. 203.

We have no hesitation in saying that the manner in which the Quartodeciman controversy and the controversy between Cyprian and Stephen was conducted, and the way in which the cases of Basilides and of Apiarius were dealt with, disprove for ever the theory not only of the infallibility and universal bishopric of the Pope, but of his supremacy over the Church in any form, however modified. And every student of ecclesiastical history knows that they are but illustrations of the tone and temper everywhere prevalent in the Early Church.

What, then, was the origin of that supremacy which undoubtedly prevailed in the Middle Ages, and has in modern times only increased in intensity where it has not been rejected *in toto?* Mr. Puller does well to insist upon the immense effect of the imperial rescript in establishing it. There were various other reasons which helped the rise of the Papacy to the height that it attained, but that eminence would not have been reached but for (1) the grant made by the Roman Emperors, (2) the deceit passed upon the Church by the False Decretals.

There is a general agreement of historians that the Papal monarchy took a new departure and development in the time of Damasus. Why was this?

In Damasus's pontificate a synod was held at Rome A.D. 378, which petitioned the Emperor Gratian, a young man nineteen years of age, to grant to the Bishop of the imperial city a wider jurisdiction than he had hitherto possessed. It was an

understood thing that when the King or Emperor was a Christian, the Bishop of the royal or imperial city should partake of the dignity and power which was enjoyed by the King or Emperor. In Spain, for example, Toledo was not at first even of Metropolitan rank, but when Leovigild transferred thither the royal residence, and when his son Reccared became a Catholic, the Bishop of Toledo at once became Metropolitan of half the province of Carthaginensis, and soon afterwards, by an edict of King Gundemar, he was made Metropolitan of the whole province. Next he was lifted up above his brother-metropolitans, and finally was constituted Primate of Spain. All this because he was Bishop of the royal city. So it was at Rome on a larger scale. Gratian resolved that *his* Bishop should hold a higher position than the other Bishops. He willingly, therefore, listened to the petition of Damasus's synod, and enacted that all Metropolitans of the Western Empire, and all Bishops who chose, were to be tried before the Bishop of the imperial city in case of any charge being made against them, and he commanded the secular officers of the empire to bring the Metropolitans to Rome by force if they were unwilling to accept the new yoke. Papal jurisdiction outside of Rome and the Suburbicarian Church was therefore derived from the State, and granted by the State to the State-Bishop. By the imperial will this jurisdiction was made conterminous with the Western Empire, that is, it was extended for the first time over North Italy, Illyricum, Gaul, Britain, Spain, and Africa. The Council of Chalcedon—an ecclesiastical, not a civil authority—gave a like pre-eminence to the Bishop of Constantinople over the Exarchate of Pontus and "the East." Having tasted the advantages derived from the favour of the imperial power, the Popes anxiously sought an increase of their authority from the same source. In 445 Leo I. asked the Emperor for enlarged powers, and Valentinian III. granted them as readily as Gratian, for was he not honouring himself in honouring his own Bishop? But Leo was wiser in his generation than Damasus. He would conceal the secular source from which his authority came, and attributed it (after he had safely obtained it from the Emperor) to the fact of his being a successor of St. Peter — a notion which sprang out of the (heretical) Clementine Romance, and was adopted as their own from Leo's date onward by the Popes.

The basis, then, of the Papal authority outside the district of Southern Italy is Erastian, not ecclesiastical. The Papal efforts to give it an ecclesiastical foundation would have failed of success had it not been for the enormous forgery of the False Decretals, composed by the pseudo-Isidore in the ninth century, and supposed to be genuine for six centuries. These

forgeries, which represented Popes acting with plenary authority before the decrees of Gratian and Valentinian, served to throw an ecclesiastical cloak over the political and social system established by the Emperors on the petition of the Popes. But the Œcumenical Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon, as well as all ecclesiastical history, remind us that any pre-eminence recognised by the Church in Rome and Constantinople was allowed them solely because those cities were imperial residences.

Mr. Puller proceeds to recount the cases of Meletius and of Acacius, both of which are as incompatible with the existence of Papal supremacy, at the date of their occurrence, as the cases of Basilides and Apiarius. Those who are still unconvinced may with benefit trace the subject further under Mr. Puller's guidance.

F. MEYRICK.

ART. II.—CAIRD'S ESSAYS.

PART II.

PASSING over, for the moment, any discussion of the most elaborate of all the essays contained in the first volume—"The Problem of Philosophy at the Present Time"—we may now proceed to examine the second volume. This is entirely devoted to philosophical problems, and is divided into two main divisions: (1) Cartesianism, (2) Metaphysics. Both of these have seen the light before, in the pages of the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and both are, we regret to say, reprinted without alteration from that great but cumbrous "Thesaurus." This regret is all the more keenly felt because, since 1883 (the date of the first publication of "Metaphysics"), several excellent pieces of criticism have appeared which merit deep attention. Not to speak of Seth's "Hegelianism and Personality," a book no metaphysician can afford to neglect, we have had various searching papers in *Mind* and elsewhere, and two or three books of capital importance, notably Dr. Martineau's "Study of Religion" in 1888, Dr. J. H. Stirling's Gifford Lectures in 1890, Professor James's most suggestive volumes on "Psychology" in 1891, and Dr. W. T. Harris's monograph on the "Logic of Hegel" in the same year.[1] Accordingly, most admirable as is Professor Caird's luminous and subtle contribution to the knottiest problem which can occupy the intellectual faculties of man, one naturally misses

[1] To these must now be added Mr. F. H. Bradley's "Appearance and Reality," a brilliant and thoughtful essay in metaphysics.