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

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

to proceed. Even Professor Hommel has not apparently shaken himself sufficiently free from the fascinations of the theory of an Elohist and a Jehovist. Astruc may claim the peculiar honour of having put a century and a half of investigators on a false scent. For myself, I must believe the notion that the words "Elohim" and "Jehovah" are characteristic of different authors to be altogether untenable. Professor Klostermann's suggestion that an Elohistic and a Jehovistic *scribe* have respectively at some very early period copied out portions of the narrative in Genesis is far more likely in itself, and gives a far more probable explanation of the phenomena. But the sources of Genesis are undoubtedly Babylonian records and tradition coloured by monotheistic ideas for the first eleven chapters, and for the rest, written or oral traditions of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, handed down among their descendants. That foreign elements have to a certain extent commingled with these sources seems clear. Abraham's second marriage with Keturah seems due to one of these. The mention of his "concubines" would seem to be another. Another, I think there is ground for supposing, is to be found in the genealogies, which, as I trust we shall hereafter see, present some special features of their own. Another is the account of the death of Isaac. It seems extremely improbable that he should have lingered so many years in the state in which he is depicted in Gen. xxvii. The historical accuracy of the tradition has apparently been obscured during some centuries of oral transmission. But one thing has long been to me perfectly clear, and recent archæological investigation has rendered it clearer: whether we analyse the literary phenomena of Genesis, or treat its contents on the principles of comparative historical study, or examine the archæological treasures so lately brought to light, the result will be the same—the subjective criticism will be discredited and ultimately destroyed.

J. J. Lias.

Art. II.—ROME'S DEPARTURE FROM PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE.

THE student of Church history, who carefully examines the existing records, is easily able to understand the relative positions of the Churches of England and of Rome in the struggles which weakened, and frequently almost shattered, the fabric both of Church and State in this country. It will not be denied that again and again the Bishops of Rome made the most strenuous efforts to gain an ascendancy over, and to

bring within their jurisdiction, the ancient and National Church of England; that several of our kings, generally to secure support for their own personal schemes or ambitions, assented to and encouraged these efforts; and that in a few instances the Archbishops of Canterbury and other Bishops—by reason of their foreign extraction or sympathy with Rome, or else on account of disputes with the King or with their brother prelates—expressed their willingness to accept the dominion of the Pope. But, on the other hand, it is equally certain that the Church of England never once, by any synodical act, nor by any resolution which could be considered to put forward the deliberate opinion of a representative ecclesiastical assembly, gave in its adherence to the doctrine of Papal supremacy. The individual action of one member of a society, even if he hold the position of president, cannot be considered as committing that society to his views, unless he is commissioned so to act by a majority of the votes of the members. And, therefore, the contention is perfectly conclusive and unanswerable that, whether or not this or that prelate acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, the assumption of that jurisdiction was absolutely invalid, unless it could be shown (which it cannot) that the Anglican Church, through its representatives in Convocation or Synod, of its own free will placed itself under the foreign rule in spiritual matters.

1. In the words of Bishop Bilson,[1] the distinguished Elizabethan divine, "By God's law, the Pope of Rome hath no such jurisdiction; for six hundred years after Christ *he had none;* for the last six hundred years, as looking to greater matters (*i.e.*, to be universal Bishop), he *would have none;* above or against the Prince he *can have none;* to the subversion of the faith, or oppression of the brethren, he *ought to have none*[2]—therefore this land oweth him none."

2. Secondly, we must inquire to what extent the Roman Church has altered her doctrines and formularies, whereby they differ from those of the early Church.

Up to the time of St. Augustine's mission, as we have seen above, the various Churches of the East and West were in communion with each other as branches of the Catholic Church of Christ. There was no such idea known as that of Roman Catholicism. The three Creeds—viz., the Apostles' Creed (based upon the teaching of the Apostles), the Nicene Creed (drawn up or agreed to by the General Councils of

[1] Bishop Bilson, "The True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion," pt. ii., p. 321.

[2] Art. xxxvii.

Nicæa, 325 A.D., and of Constantinople, 381 A.D.), and the Creed of St. Athanasius (of doubtful authorship, dating probably from the fifth century, but not generally accepted until the eighth century)—have been regarded as defining the faith of Christianity, and are the only "symbols" which the whole Catholic Church has sanctioned for general reception and belief, as capable of being proved by an appeal to Scripture.[1] But Rome has added a fourth creed—viz., the Creed of Pope Pius IV.,[2] which is more than a thousand years later than the most recent of the other three (having been first published in 1564 A.D., the year following the last meeting of the Council of Trent)—and contains twelve articles of belief, which are in none of the former creeds, and were not proposed as matters of faith till comparatively recent times. These articles include the following:[3]

(i.) *Seven Sacraments.*—The first mention of the Sacraments as being seven in number occurs in the writings of Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, who died in 1164 A.D. The Eastern Church now agrees with the Roman in counting seven Sacraments, but no early Greek Father does so; and this is merely one of several points wherein the East has copied the West in comparatively recent times.[4]

(ii.) *Council of Trent Doctrine of Justification and Original Sin.*—A considerable portion of this doctrine was so novel that it was opposed by a strong minority on the Council, so that, whether right or wrong, the belief thus imposed upon Romanists was something new and different to the standard of the primitive Church.

(iii.) *The Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass.*—The significance and exact import of this teaching depends upon the next article.

(iv.) *Transubstantiation.*—The theological doctrine, held by every branch of the Catholic Church in all ages, has been that Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist. The explanation of the mode of that Presence is the rock on which so many vessels have been wrecked. Transubstantiation is merely a philosophical theory, intended to meet certain subtle intellectual difficulties as to the exact nature of that Presence (which it has signally failed to do), and depends entirely upon the notions entertained by the Realist School of Philosophers as to the relation of "substance" to "accidents." The word

[1] Art. viii.

[2] For text, see "Dissent in its Relation to the Church of England," pp. 202, 203.

[3] See Littledale's "Words for Truth," pp. 7 ff.

[4] Article xxv. defines the position of the Church of England in the matter.

came into existence in the eleventh century, during the Berengarian controversy, and was authoritatively adopted at the Lateran Council, under Innocent III., in 1215 A.D. The decree runs: "The true Body and Blood of Christ are verily contained in the Sacrament of the Altar under the appearances of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the Body, and the wine into the Blood, by Divine power." This doctrine was reaffirmed at the thirteenth session of the Council of Trent, 1551 A.D. If we go back to the period preceding mediævalism, we find that the Romanist doctrine was unknown,[1] the early Christian writers hesitating to define closely that which Holy Scripture has left a mystery. Though the name is still retained, the realistic interpretation of the schoolmen (that, although the "substance" of the bread and wine is transformed into the actual physical Body and Blood of Christ, the "accidents," *i.e.*, the look, taste, smell, etc., remain unchanged, thus implying a stupendous and continuous miracle) has long been abandoned by Roman theologians.[2]

(v.) *Communicating under One Kind.*—This practice was denounced as a Manichæan heresy, and as "sacrilegious" by Pope Leo the Great, 440-461 A.D.; as a "great sacrilege" by Pope Gelasius I., 492-496 A.D.; it was forbidden, save in cases of necessity, by Pope Urban II., in the Council of Clermont, 1095 A.D., and by Pope Paschal II. in 1118 A.D. It was first authoritatively sanctioned by the Council of Constance in 1415 A.D., and, consequently, is a very late innovation upon ancient doctrine and custom.[3]

(vi.) *Purgatory.*—The doctrine of Purgatory was affirmed at the Council of Florence, 1439 A.D., although the Greeks who attended that Council rejected it, as unknown to Oriental theology.[4] Cardinal Fisher, in his book against Luther (1535 A.D.), says: "Since it was so late before Purgatory was admitted into the Universal Church, who can be surprised that at the earlier period of the Church no mention was made of indulgences?"

(vii.) *Invocation of Saints.*—This custom began to creep into the Church about the fourth century, so that even the earliest mention of it shows that it originated too late to rank as part of the primitive Christian belief. If we test the early examples of invocation of saints, they are rather ejaculatory utterances to the saints (similar to our mention of Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, in the *Benedicite*, which no one would regard as a prayer to them) than direct intercession. Invocations of the modern kind, asking the saints to confer favours and graces,

[1] Cf. Council of Celcyth, 816 A.D.; "Homilies of Ælfric," 987 A.D.
[2] Art. xxviii. [3] Art. xxx. [4] Art. xxii.

as from themselves directly, are not found till the ninth century.[1]

(viii.) *Veneration of Relics.*—The worship of images was first licensed at the Second Council of Nice (a packed assembly) in 787 A.D., and was promptly repudiated and condemned by the Council of Frankfort in 794 A.D.; while the "Caroline books," drawn up at the instance of the Emperor Charlemagne, are a standing witness to the opposition raised against this novelty at the outset.[2]

(ix.) *Indulgences.*—There is no trace of indulgences, except the remission of penances inflicted on those who disgraced their Christian profession, until 1084 A.D., when Pope Gregory VII. offered remission of sins to all who would take up arms against the Emperor Henry IV. It was not till 1391 A.D. that "plenary indulgences" (*i.e.*, remission of all the temporal punishment due to sin) were first granted. This, therefore, is a new doctrine.[3]

(x.) *The Roman Church to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches.*—As the Gospel was first preached at Jerusalem, and Rome was evangelized from thence first by those who reported St. Peter's Pentecostal sermon there, and afterwards by St. Paul, it is to Jerusalem only that the "mother of all Churches" could historically or theologically apply. None of the many hundred churches founded both in the East and West during the first six centuries were the result of Roman missions, and the Christianizing of Kent (long subsequent to the founding of the British Church) was the first-fruits of Roman missionary enterprise. "Mistress of all Churches" may mean "sovereign" or "teacher." In the former sense, though Rome constantly made efforts to establish such supremacy, the Eastern Church never accepted it at all, and several of the Western Churches, as, *e.g.*, the Anglican, resisted it (as we have shown) in principle and in detail. In the latter sense, the facts all point in the opposite direction. It was the East which taught Rome, giving her the Gospel, the Nicene Creed, and her first Liturgy. Thus this doctrine is both novel and untrue.

(xi.) *Swearing Obedience to the Pope.*—The Church of North Africa in 419 A.D., and again in 424 A.D., enacted Canons repudiating the Papal claim to interfere in the affairs of the African Church. And the Western Church on several occasions deposed the popes, the last case being as late as 1415 A.D. This would have been impossible if the Church had from earliest times recognised the Pope as Christ's Vicar on earth.

---

[1] Art. xxii. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*

(xii.) *Receiving the Decrees of all Synods and of Trent.*—The first four General Councils of Nicæa, 325 A.D., of Constantinople, 381 A.D., of Ephesus, 431 A.D., and of Chalcedon, 451 A.D., have been universally accepted by Christendom. But as no Councils of later date have comprised representatives of all branches of the Catholic Church, the decrees and dogmas enacted at more recent synods cannot be regarded as binding, save locally.[1]

It has been thought desirable to enter into detail in regard to the articles of this remarkable Creed, because they embody the majority of the points on which the Anglican Church differs from Rome; and it has been shown that these doctrines are neither primitive nor apostolic.

Another claim put forward by Romanism is that the *Bishop of Rome is to be regarded as the universal Bishop.* This claim was unheard of until Leo I. (about 450 A.D.) asserted the supremacy of the Roman Bishop as the successor of St. Peter. In 606 A.D. Pope Boniface III. demanded that the Bishop of Rome should be recognised by Christendom as Episcopus Episcoporum, or universal Bishop. It was again claimed by Nicholas I. (853-867 A.D.). But this very title is condemned in the strongest terms by Pope Gregory the Great (590-604 A.D.). He describes it[2] as "profane, superstitious, haughty, and invented by the first Apostate. . . ." "If one bishop be called universal, the whole Church falls if he should fall." "Far from Christian hearts be that blasphemous name." "I confidently affirm that whoso calls himself, or wishes to be called, universal priest, is in his pride a forerunner of Antichrist."

The attempt to aggrandize the position, and establish the supremacy of Rome, acquired considerable impetus by the publication early in the ninth century of the False Decretals. The name decretal was applied to the letters of Popes bearing an answer to questions proposed to them by some bishop or ecclesiastical judge, in which they gave their decision on the point raised. A collection of these papal canons and decretals, from the pontificate of Siricius (385 A.D.) to his own time (525 A.D.), had been made by the Abbot Dionysius Exiguus. Isidore, Archbishop of Seville, undertook, in 635 A.D., to revise and complete this collection. The False Decretals, which profess to be the work of Isidore, but have since been proved to have been a clumsy forgery, were first issued in 836 A.D. They traced back the decretal epistles of popes, not to Siricius, but to a period when no Papal decrees were even dreamed of—in fact, to the days of St. Clement, Bishop of

[1] Art. xxi.

[2] Ep. v. 20; vii. 27, 33.

Rome in 91 A.D. The letters attempt to prove that the Bishop of Rome was the successor of St. Peter, that the keys of heaven were in his hands, and that the foundation of the Church rested on him; that all Archbishops and Bishops were subject to the Pope, from whom they derived all the power they enjoyed; and that it was his prerogative to excommunicate both kings and princes, and to declare them incapable of reigning. So universally were these forgeries accepted that the greater portion was received into the Papal code, which is still the source of Roman Catholic ecclesiastical law.[1]

Another modern Roman doctrine is that of the *Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.* The festival of her conception first began to be observed about the twelfth century, and gradually the opinion of the Immaculate Conception began to be entertained. It was first taught by Peter Lombard in 1160 A.D., but St. Bernard wrote against it as "an error," "a novelty," and "a superstition," arguing that our Blessed Lord alone was conceived without sin. In the following century Duns Scotus, a Franciscan friar, revived the doctrine, which was opposed by St. Thomas Aquinas, a Dominican, and has frequently been denounced as heresy by Roman Catholic divines. In 1854 A.D., the Vatican Council decreed this dogma to be an article of faith, the Bull of Pope Pius IX. declaring "That the Blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instance of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin." This, then, is certainly not a primitive or Catholic doctrine.

We will mention only one other modern Roman assumption —the *claim to Papal Infallibility.* The Church in the Middle Ages held that the promise of Christ, "He shall guide you into all truth," was a promise to the Church, as represented by a General Council, that it should be kept from error. The next point that arose was the question whether the Pope, as the natural president of a General Council, was superior to it or the reverse. The Council of Constance, 1414 A.D., decreed that the Pope is subject to a council in matters of faith, and Pope Martin V. accepted the decision. It was not till the present generation that a Pope ventured to declare his personal infallibility when speaking *ex cathedrâ* as the mouth of the Church, and the Vatican Council (in 1870 A.D.) accepted the declaration. The following is a formal definition of the doctrine: "That when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedrâ*, that is, when in the exercise of his office

[1] "Theoph. Angl.," part ii., cap. vii.

as pastor and teacher of all Christians, and in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines that a doctrine of faith or morals is to be held by the universal Church, he possesses, through the Divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed, in defining a doctrine of faith and morals; and, therefore, that such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not by force of the consent of the Church thereto."[1] The doctrine involves Romanists in considerable difficulties,[2] for Pope Honorius (625-638 A.D.) was unanimously condemned by the sixth General Council as a heretic, and every Pope, for several succeeding centuries, was required at his consecration to pronounce a solemn anathema against him. Either, then, Honorius was a heretic, and, therefore, not infallible, or he was not a heretic, and, therefore, the popes who anathematized him were not infallible.

Again, Pope Paul V., in 1616 A.D., issued a decree condemning as "false, unscriptural, and destructive of Catholic truth," the opinion that the earth moves round the sun. Galileo was forced to abjure his views, and the sentence, passed by Pope Urban VIII., in 1633 A.D., ordered that Galileo's compulsory denial of the earth's motion should be considered binding, as a theological doctrine, on all Christians.[3] Do modern Roman theologians accept this as an infallible utterance?

I do not profess to have by any means exhausted the list of subjects on which, both in doctrine and ritual, the Roman Catholic Church of the present day has departed from the primitive Apostolic Church, and has thereby lost her claim to the title of Catholic. The only "old religion" to be found among Romanists is that part of their belief and practice which agrees with the standards of the Church of England. That which is peculiar to Romanism is at best mediæval, while much is not only modern, but extremely modern, as, for example, the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility, which have been repudiated by many eminent theologians belonging to the very Church which enacted the doctrines as Articles of Faith.

Thus, it has been shown that, in whatever quarter the "old religion" (that is, the Christian religion as founded by Christ and His Apostles, and carried on by their successors, in its primitive Scriptural simplicity, pure and unmixed with modern

[1] See "Dissent in its Relation to the Church of England," p. 206.
[2] Art. xix.
[3] "Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome," p. 181.

traditions and superstitions) is to be met with, it must be sought for elsewhere than in the Church of Rome.

MONTAGUE FOWLER.

ART. III.—SOME LATENT FORCES OF THE CHURCH.

IT may truly be said that what is called "Church Reform" is attracting a great deal of notice, and at many diocesan and other conferences of Churchmen and laymen lately held the subject has been approached by men of divers schools of thought and of different positions in the world. In offering these reflections, then, I may plead that I am following a widespread example. And, if any should be inclined to consider that it is both impious and unnecessary to try to throw some *new* light upon an institution as *old* as the Church of England, may not a justification for our position be found in some words of Mr. Arthur Balfour, spoken at Manchester as recently as January of this year? The words, indeed, were not uttered with any reference to Church Reform, but it is probable that most people will on that account deem them none the less, and, indeed, perhaps all the more, pertinent to the present purpose. Thus he says: "Do you suppose that, either in politics or in ordinary life, it is enough to have a thing in order to keep it?

"To preserve anything, be it health . . . be it an institution of your country . . . be it anything you please, something more is required than sitting still and enjoying what you have got.

"Effort is the very secret of our existence here on earth, and it is mere folly to suppose that sitting still and saying you do not want your institutions changed will be enough to preserve them. . . . No policy requires longer effort . . . than to preserve that which you have got, to prevent it deteriorating, and if possible to improve it. . . . We are no opponents of reform. We are no believers in any such strange superstition as that a machine will go on indefinitely doing its work without care, without cleaning, without repair, sometimes without alteration."

Encouraged by these words, we will mention one or two ways in which, as it seems, the strength and usefulness of the Church of England might be increased.

In making our suggestions, we will pass by such scandals as are caused by the simoniacal holding of benefices, and by the difficulty of expelling criminous clerks.

These are, indeed, hideous hindrances to the welfare of the