

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

China seems bent upon ruining her reputation in the eyes of the civilized world. Public authority must demand, not blind vengeance, but justice, which is the truest mercy; and the full recognition and guarantee of those treaty rights and privileges, the lapse or ignoring of which may endanger the safety of every foreigner in China. In calmer moments one might be tempted to plead that till the staring posters in the streets of London and at every railway-station bookstall shall be clear for, say six consecutive months, from the announcement of murder, outrage and violent crime in England, China cannot in common justice be condemned as cruel, barbarous, and inhuman, because of the barbarous and inhuman cruelty of a band of fanatics in one of its wide provinces.

But these are not calm moments, and I leave the argument of my paper unaltered, and perhaps only fortified by the terrible events at Kucheng on August 1. Put the worst construction possible on these massacres, I still maintain that a country with such strange, unique, and contradictory features, an ancient civilization, a literature of extreme antiquity and of the greatest interest, religions in their original forms marked by pathetic earnestness and high moral codes, pride of race, of history and of the fancied suzerainty of the world, all these rudely shaken by outbreaks of local atrocities indescribable in their horrors, and of cruelty inconceivable in its diabolical details, afford surely to the Christian athlete a foe to be thrown in the Master's name, and by those "wrestling thews" which the Spirit of God alone can give—a foe not to be despised or ridiculed, not to be hated or neglected, but to be won and conquered by faith and prayer and the Gospel of the grace of God.

Such, I am sure, is the vengeance for which those martyred spirits would call could they speak to us from that peaceful shore "where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest."

A. E. M.

August 5.

ART. II.—REUNION.¹

THE chief difficulties and perplexities of life arise when two principles, both of them good, come, or seem to come, in conflict with each other. When that which is plainly right is confronted with wrong, when moral and immoral action are set one against the other, our decision is quickly arrived at, and we pass on; but when one principle leads us forward, and another which seems equally admirable thrusts us back, our interest is at once awakened. We ask ourselves which of the two is to prevail, which should be predominant, and which should give way.

The two principles of truth and unity seem thus to come into conflict. They do not really do so, for where truth is not present unity becomes only conspiracy in error, but they seem to conflict in many particular cases. Now, when this occurs, each man is bound to strike for truth, and, if it must be, to let unity go. *Stet veritas, ruat cælum.* Belief of a truth is one thing; acceptance of a truth which we do not believe for the

¹ Paper read at a meeting of the South-Eastern Church and Lay Alliance, June 19, 1895.

sake of bringing about or preserving union is another. Acceptance substituted for belief is not a virtue, but a vice. We have seen dogmas accepted by men who did not believe them in their own hearts, for fear of rending the Church or causing schism. These men were dishonest before the tribunal of their own conscience and unfaithful to God, whether they were Dr. Newman accepting the dogma of infallibility, which he knew that "an insolent and aggressive faction" had forced upon the Roman Church, or the German bishops who had voted against that dogma, and yet did not dare to carry their words into action for fear of consequences. The *laudabiliter se subiecit* of the man who assails a falsehood and then withdraws his words at the command of authority, instead of excusing the act of withdrawal and making it praiseworthy, adds to it the shame of cowardice.

We must lay down, then, as our first principle that truth must not be sacrificed for anything else; that whatever a man believes to be true, even though it be false, he must not give up until he is convinced of its falsity. If we believe that the world rests upon an elephant and the elephant on a tortoise, we must not accept a truer theory, in order to agree with others, until we are convinced of its greater truth. "First pure, then peaceable," is the scriptural order. No peace is to be found except in truth.

Secondly, what is unity? (a) It is not uniformity. It is not necessary that there should be an identity on all points, great and small. It is not an absorption of smaller bodies in a larger body in such a way that the smaller bodies lose their own independence.

(b) It is not a transcendental, mystical agreement, so rarified as to escape definition, and confined to the region of feeling, existent to-day, and not existent to-morrow.

But (c) it is agreement in fundamentals, with liberty of differing in non-essentials. When this agreement, joined with liberty, is found, there *may be* unity; but unity is not yet arrived at until each side recognises the other as at one with itself in things essential, till each desires to be at one with the other, and until both take measures for becoming united on terms which both approve.

It may be asked, Are there such things as fundamentals? Are not all the statements of Scripture equally true? Yes; they are all equally true, but not all equal truths; that is, there are some statements of Scripture which are of more importance to our salvation than others. For as Archbishop Laud in his controversy with Fisher has said, "This proposition of Christ to St. Peter and St. Andrew, 'Follow Me, and I will make you fishers of men,' is as firm a truth as that which

He delivered to His disciples, that 'He must die and rise again the third day,' for both proceed from the same Divine revelation out of the mouth of our Saviour. And yet both these propositions of Christ are not alike fundamental in the faith" (p. 48). But how are we to know what are fundamentals? Is it not very difficult? It is; but here the Church, which is not the mistress, but the handmaid, of Holy Scripture, comes to our assistance. The Bible is the full, perfect, and sufficient record of the revelation of God to man; but He who gave that revelation gave also to His Church the function of arranging the truths of revelation for man's use, and declaring what are the vital doctrines of Christianity. This she has done with regard to positive truths in the three Catholic creeds which are the creeds of the Church of England, as part of the Church Catholic; and this she has done negatively for us in England by declaring in her articles and formularies what those doctrines are which militate against the fundamental truths of Christianity, and must therefore be repudiated by all who desire to unite in the pure primitive and Catholic faith. It is not sufficiently noticed that for true union to be attained between two persons or two bodies there must be agreement, not only in what they hold, but in what they reject. For example, it is not enough for them to agree that God is to be worshipped; they must also agree that none other but God may be worshipped. It is not enough to agree that in the Holy Communion Christians feed upon Christ; there must also be agreement that that feeding does not take place by the means of transubstantiation or consubstantiation. Else the agreement come to is only seeming, not real, and those who have added to the faith once delivered to the saints seem placed in a more favourable position for reunion negotiations than those of a purer faith.

Now, what present prospects are there of the reunion of divided Christendom? There is one thing, and, so far as I can see, one thing only, which opens a vista of hope. That is, the desire spread abroad in many hearts to bring it about. If the desire come from God, God will effect His purpose in His own way. I believe that it was the Conference of Bonn which struck the keynote which is now echoing throughout the world. That conference was called by that noble truth-lover, Dr. Döllinger, at the instance of a committee, consisting in equal parts of English Churchmen, Orientals, and Old Catholics, for the purpose of conferring one with another, and thereby seeing where and how union could be brought about without the sacrifice of truth. At that conference all the great Christian bodies were informally represented, in greater or less degree, with the exception of the Roman communion, and to our

astonishment it was found that substantial agreement could be, and was, come to on such burning questions as the canon of Holy Scripture, the authority of the original text of Holy Scripture, the liberty and duty of reading Holy Scripture, the use of a language understood by the people, justification, free grace and human merit, works of supererogation, merits of the saints, the number of the Sacraments, tradition, the immaculate conception, confession, indulgences, commemoration of the faithful departed, the nature of the Holy Eucharist, purgatory, papal infallibility, the procession of the Holy Ghost.

The reconciling work of the Bonn Conference was not fully effected, owing to opposition and indifference in England, the immobility of the East, and political complications. But the thought was born of a union which was not Roman, and yet was visible, and the thought brought forth fruit. The idea of reunion is at least now in the air.

Different ways of reunion have been, and are being, proposed. Let us consider them.

There is the Roman way. This is the way of submission. However much it may be wrapped up in honeyed words, any proposals emanating from Rome, whether addressed to ourselves or to the East, are nothing else but demands for submission. How can it be otherwise, when the essential condition of union is the acceptance of an authority which is universal, immediate, and not to be distinguished in practice from that of Christ Himself? What use would any conditions, or limitations, or compromises be, when one party in the negotiation claims to be, and to be recognised as, infallible, and, therefore, to be obeyed whenever he chooses to pronounce upon any matter of faith or morals that may be in question? Supposing that this predominant partner pleases of his grace to allow any seeming concessions in doctrine, discipline, ritual, or practice, is it not demonstrable that they would be granted only as a means of making the fly walk into the spider's chamber, and that they would be withdrawn one by one after they had served their purpose, and that there could be no remonstrance made by the outwitted sufferers who had blindly bound their own hands and given away their liberty? The answer of the Church of England to any Roman advances must be clear and definite. "We will join you, but it must be on the basis of the Catholic faith, 'which faith, except every man do keep—not only whole but also undefiled—without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.' But you have defiled the faith by adding to it the articles of the creed of Pope Pius IV., and the supplementary dogmas promulgated by Pope Pius IX. Give up your doctrines of transubstantiation, sacrifice of the Mass, half-Communion, seven sacraments, purgatory, invocation, images, relics, in-

dulgences, tradition, justification, supremacy, immaculate conception, infallibility, universal bishopric and then we can treat with you. Till then our loyalty to the Catholic faith forbids it."

It is said that we ought to meet Leo XIII. half-way, because he is so well-meaning. That a man is well-meaning is no reason why we should be tempted from the firm rock of revealed truth into the quagmire of human traditions. And if he is a man of personal piety, we must recollect that that piety is tinged with the grossest superstition. In no respect has Leo XIII. drawn back from the aims and objects of Pius IX. ; only he pursues them in a more politic manner. Not one claim, not one doctrine, has been modified ; nay, rather an advance has been made. Leo XIII. has given his full official sanction to the fable of Loretto, to the fable of La Salette, to the fable of Lourdes, to the fable of Compostella, to the fable of Trèves, and to every new superstitious practice which places St. Mary in the position of her Divine Son. But the other day, having wrested from the King of Italy by diplomatic cleverness the nomination of the Patriarch of Venice, he appointed a man whose first utterance was a declaration of the practical identity of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Pope of the day, whose words were to be accepted as Christ's. Are these the acts and these the sentiments which should encourage us to entertain for a moment the thought of the possibility of our union with a society whose doctrines they too faithfully represent ?

The Oriental way of reunion differs essentially from the Roman. Here there is no quasi-divine Pope to whom to make submission ; there is no Pius IV.'s creed, nor Pius IX.'s supplement to it, which must be accepted. All that is required is the acceptance of the Nicene Creed, and the dogmas and decrees of what they call the Seven Œcumenical Councils. We have no difficulty with the Nicene Creed, no difficulty with the six Œcumenical Councils, for these Councils promulgated no doctrine which we do not hold. But there remains the seventh so-called Œcumenical Council, the second Council of Nicæa. This we can never accept, for it teaches the invocation of saints and the adoration of icons and relics ; but this the Oriental Church clings to and gathers to its bosom. It was no Œcumenical Council. It was a Provincial Council of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, repudiated, as soon as its decisions were known, by the then healthier Church of the West at the Council at Frankfort, and its teaching is unscriptural. It is this Council, far more than the question of the single or double procession of the Holy Ghost (which might be adjusted), that makes reunion as proposed by the Oriental Church impracticable. Perhaps there is a stronger obstacle

still, namely, a belief secretly cherished, if not always openly declared, that though Papal infallibility is false, the Oriental Church is nevertheless infallible; and also a doctrine too near to that of transubstantiation.

I have argued that union with either Rome or Greece, as they are, is not possible. Supposing that either one or the other could be effected, should we be any nearer the reunion of the whole Church? Not in the least; for Rome and Greece are irreconcilably opposed to each other. The Oriental prelates have declared Rome to be the apostacy of the latter days, and Rome looks on the Oriental Church as a schismatical and now as a heretical body. A union with Rome would alienate us from the East; a union with the East would alienate us from Rome; a union with either of them would alienate us from the great Protestant communities. The only result would be confusion a hundredfold confounded; not peace, but a sword.

Are we thus driven back on the theory of an invisible, impalpable, spiritual union? But this is no adequate union—certainly not such a union as St. Paul and as our Lord contemplated; for St. Paul says that there is not only one spirit, but also one body, and, therefore, a merely spiritual union does not satisfy his requirement; and our Lord prays for a union which, while based on mutual love, shall be visible to all men. It is better to acknowledge that union is not under present circumstances attainable, than to evacuate the meaning of the word union, and to persuade ourselves that it exists when it is non-existent.

What, then, is to be our conclusion on the subject of reunion?

Now, first, we must accept facts as they are, not create them as according to our imagination they ought to be, or we should like them to be. As a matter of fact, Christians have settled down now according to six chief types or moulds.

There is the Roman type, which accepts the papal monarchy and all its consequences.

There is the Oriental type, which owes allegiance to Constantinople and St. Petersburg.

There is the Anglican type, which seeks to recover and maintain the primitive faith and discipline as found in holy Scripture, and held in the first ages of the Church.

There is the Lutheran type, which prevails in Scandinavia and Germany.

There is the Calvinist type, which is found in France, Switzerland, and Scotland.

There is the Zwinglian type, to which our Dissenting bodies may be assigned without any great inexactness.

All these different classes of men are Christians; all those

who have been baptized, and have not apostatized from the faith by rejecting the Lord Jesus, are Christians, are members of the Church. How can we Anglicans, who form one of the types, unite ourselves with the other types, or with any of them, without thereby alienating ourselves from the rest, and thereby failing to promote, instead of promoting, unity?

First, let us see how far we are already united with each of them.

We are united with those that belong to the Roman type in the faith contained in the three Catholic creeds, except so far as it is cancelled by the later creed of Pope Pius IV. and its supplement by Pius IX., and we agree in the episcopal regimen of the Church, except so far as it is overthrown by the Papal despotism.

We are united with those that belong to the Oriental type in the faith of Holy Scripture and the teaching of the six Œcumenical Councils, except so far as it is perverted by the false teaching of the so-called Seventh Council, and we agree in the government of the Church by bishops, priests, and deacons.

We are united with those that belong to the Lutheran and Calvinist types in a Scriptural faith, except so far as they hold consubstantiation and an exaggerated form of predestination.

We are united with those that belong to the Zwinglian type in the main outlines of the Christian faith, however disproportionately held.

Now, we cannot join closer with Rome on account of her many false doctrines and usurping claims.

We cannot join closer with the Oriental Church on account of the second Council of Nicæa and some practical and doctrinal corruptions. We cannot join closer with the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Zwinglians on account of their respective peculiar doctrines and their defect in discipline. Truth rises up in our path, and warns us back with threats which we dare not disregard. We must be content to acquiesce in the Church remaining in its state of schismatical separation of part from part, for which no one part is altogether answerable. We must wait till it be God's good pleasure, in a way that we know not of, to remove difficulties which are to us insurmountable.

Can we, then, do nothing to satisfy this instinctive desire after union except wait God's pleasure? I think we can. But we must be content with small things. "Askest thou great things for thyself? Ask them not," "Here a little and there a little"—such must be our motto in the home field, in the mission field, in all spiritual action.

The step which I think is open to us to take is this: There are Christians now to be found on the Continent who do not

belong to the Roman, or the Oriental, or the Lutheran, or the Calvinist, or the Zwinglian communions—men who, like ourselves, profess to be seeking to recover purely primitive truth, and who, with us, consider that the true regimen of the Church is by bishops, priests, and deacons. They are not many—about 120,000, all told—but they are to be weighed, not only counted. Twenty-five years ago they formed the most learned and pious part of the Roman Catholic Church. Driven out because they would not accept false doctrine at the dictation of the Vatican Council, they organized themselves apart and rejected the doctrines of Trent, and they are now to be found in more or less numbers in Germany (under Reinkens), Switzerland (under Herzog), Italy (under Campello), Spain (under Cabrera), France (under Loyson), and Austria (under Cech). Here there is nothing to make us check our longing for Christian brotherhood. They stand, I believe, in all essential things on the same basis as ourselves. And here, to their advantage and our own, we may make some advance in Christian union, while with respect to others we wait God's time and God's pleasure.

A question remains—Should we pray for reunion? Christ prayed for union, and therefore we may well do so. But just before His prayer for unity He had promised His disciples the Spirit of truth, who should guide them into all truth. Reverently following this indication of our Lord's will, let us not dissever our prayer for unity from our prayer for the maintenance of the truth. If we pray for the preservation of the truth alone, we may become harsh and severe in guarding it; if we pray for unity alone, we may forget truth in our yearning for peace; if we pray for both, we may desire and strive for both. The following prayer by a former Archbishop of Canterbury is in use at present: "Gracious Father, we humbly beseech Thee for Thy Holy Catholic Church. Fill it with all truth, and in all truth with all peace. Where it is corrupt, purge it; where it is in error, direct it; where it is dark, enlighten it; where it is superstitious, rectify it; where anything is amiss, reform it; where it is right, strengthen and confirm it; where it is in want, furnish it; where it is rent asunder, heal the breaches thereof, O Thou Holy One of Israel. For Jesus Christ's sake."

If we prefer it, we may use the prayer appointed for the Accession Service, where we pray to be "united in the holy bond of truth *and* peace, of faith *and* charity" (Prayer for Unity in Accession Service). Or what could be better than the words of our Church which we know so well?—"More especially we pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church, that it may be so guided and governed by Thy good Spirit

that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life."

In these words of our Church, we pray for unity, but we do not lose sight of truth, nor subordinate its claims to those of peace. Whose heart does not burn at the thought of a united Christendom going forth conquering and to conquer? But we are entrusted with the defence of God's truth, too, and we must defend it.

F. MEYRICK.

ART. III.—SOME CURIOSITIES OF PATRISTIC AND MEDIÆVAL LITERATURE.

PART II.—DOCTRINAL (*concluded*).

BUT we have not yet exhausted the curiosities which belong to this retractation of Berengarius. We must not omit to notice the very curious use which was made of it in England three centuries later.

Assuredly we should have been little disposed to expect to find this retractation cited in support of the teaching of Wyclif and the Lollards. Yet in the treatise "De Eucharistiâ," which was written by Wyclif probably some time before 1383, and not long before his death,¹ this confession of Berengarius is pleaded over and over again as a part of Rome's Canon Law, and as a law which availed to bless and not to curse the doctrine which, under the teaching of Wyclif and his followers, was spreading like wildfire among the people of England.

It is certainly a very curious fact that Wyclif, who in his latter days and in the maturity of his views was, like Berengarius, strong in defence of the tropical or figurative exposition of the words of institution,² should cite in support

¹ See Loserth's Introduction to "De Eucharistiâ" (Wyclif Soc.), pp. lx., lxii.; and especially "De Eucharistiâ," p. 117.

² Witness the following: "Quia ex verbis Christi tam de sacramento panis quam calicis patet ipsum locutum fuisse figurative. Nam non dubium quin panem materiale accepit, benedixit et fregit et ex illo manducare precepit, quem demonstravit dicens: Hoc est corpus meum, quod oportet omnino figurative intelligi sicut et verba de calice. Nec dubium quin, sicut panem et vinum materiale assumpsit, sic ipsum sumi tamquam sacramentum mandavit; aliter enim illusorie equivocasset cum ecclesia. Et sic indubie figurative locutus est Job. vi^o (ut patet per Augustinum); unde miror quomodo aliqua subtilitas potest ex relatione ydemptitatis 'quod pro vobis tradetur' excludere locucionem figurativam, cum antecedens locucio foret ad hoc efficacior; ut in isto dicto Joh. xv^o, 1: 'Ego sum vitis vera' foret evidencius quod excludit figuram loquendo