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

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

mere habit borrowed from the Egyptians, with a factitious sanctity, why did he not go further? How is it that he gives us the least chance of arguing that Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, all forgot or neglected to circumcise their children?[1] How is it that the redactor, who has been, as we are given to understand, so busy in refashioning the later narratives, so as to induce his readers to believe that worship at the One Sanctuary was an ancient Mosaic precept, and not an invention of later times, has not introduced a single reference to the practice of circumcision in the subsequent history, and that even 'priestly" writers, such as Jeremiah and Ezekiel, never by any chance allude to circumcision as a sign of the Abrahamic covenant. That Ezekiel, the "father of Judaism," should so strangely have forgotten his fatherhood as to make no allusion to the most significant rite of the religion of which he was the inventor, is remarkable indeed. On the other hand, the moral significance of the rite is eloquently indicated in Deut. x. 16. The significance of this passage is striking indeed if we have here the words of the great Lawgiver, addressing, on a solemn occasion, the posterity of Abraham; while, if it be the language of a compiler in the reign of Hezekiah or Manasseh, and if it refer to a rite which was not as yet recognised as involving any sense of consecration, the language is strained and in no very particularly good taste.[2] Thus, the Old Testament writers, by their silence as well as by the occasional hints they undesignedly let drop, confirm the view that, by whomsoever and at what time soever this passage was written, the rite of circumcision was established under the circumstances, and for the objects mentioned in this chapter, namely, to mark out Israel as a peculiar covenant people of God. More minute criticism of the chapter must be deferred to another paper.

J. J. Lias.

Art. III.—THE POPES INFALLIBLE TEACHERS OF MORALS.

THE Head of the Roman Church became in the course of ages a highly composite personality. He was a patriarch, a temporal sovereign, a feudal over-lord, a public patron, a private doctor, a personal Christian, the assumed or assuming Head of the West and then of Christendom, and claiming finally absolutism in things spiritual, while throughout a large

[1] We should note that Gen. xxi. 24, 25, is arbitrarily separated from JE's narrative *because* there is in it a mention of Isaac's circumcision.

[2] Jeremiah quotes this passage in ch. iv. 4.

portion of this time he asserted the right to proclaim religious wars (to say nothing of wars waged by himself for his purely temporal interests), to hold at his disposal crowns and fiefs, to cancel treaties, absolve from oaths, and release sovereigns and subjects, liege-lords and vassals, from their mutual engagements. We cannot, in estimating his morals, exclude from view any one of these relations. Moral regards enter into every one of them, and in every one of them the primary principles of morality, often in the widest fields of influence, often with unblushing effrontery and overbearing insolence, have been flagrantly violated by some pope or other. But notice first that throughout the entire series of official acts, like the spinal marrow through the vertebræ, runs the principle of coercion by violence. Such coercion, by every means at the disposal of the temporal power, was the keynote of the mediæval Papacy. Themselves temporal potentates, with a larger share of astuteness than the average of their compeer rulers, and with at least an equal share of ambition, the popes of the entire period seem, with few exceptions, to adopt without scruple the maxims of despotism and precedents of violence which they inherited from the dregs of Roman imperialism. The Church caught at the hand of the civil power and abused it as an engine of intolerance with repulsive eagerness, as soon as the decrees of Nice were signed; and Catholic and heretic were persecutors or persecuted, according as the court was Catholic or heretic and *vice versâ*.

It is, indeed, one of the broadest facts of history that the nefariousness of applying temporal penalties to coerce the religious conscience was a lesson not learned until every religious body had, according to the measure of its power and its weakness, in turn both inflicted and suffered persecution. It was a lesson never learned of the popes, nor has it ever been learned by them. The doctrine of Trent upholds coercive violence, and not a few texts of leading Roman teachers anticipate or repeat the doctrine of Trent. Every bishop's oath of allegiance to the Pope still binds him to persecute and attack (*persequar atque impugnabo*) all heretics. Given the power, it will start again to energy of life. The false principle rebuked by our Lord in the memorable saying, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of" (Luke ix. 55), enjoyed unbounded ascendancy from the time of St. Augustine downwards, and, indeed, was upheld by his authority. It was in his eyes an exercise of charitable compassion to punish the disseminator of heresy by the temporal sword. He quotes the text, "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth," in approval of temporal potentates assuming to be vicegerents of heaven on this behalf, and urges it as a

foremost duty of the Civil State, now become Christian, to uphold that faith through the extirpation of its enemies by the carnal weapon.

Jerome, with his fiery impetuosity, goes further, and "is surprised that the bishop" of one whom he deemed a heretic "had not destroyed him in the flesh for the benefit of his soul," and urges that "piety and zeal towards God could not be deemed cruelty"; and elsewhere that "sternness is the most genuine mercy, since temporal punishment may avert eternal perdition" (Epist. cix. to Riparius; *Comment.* on Nahum i. 9). St. Leo (447 A.D.) speaks of the "severity" of the secular laws of "Christian emperors" against heresy as having been "long helpful to the mildness of the Church, which is content with such judgments as priests can pass, and shrinks from bloody penalties,"[1] but omits to notice that those secular laws were always enacted at the urgency of the bishops, who further goaded on the secular power whenever remiss in executing them. The first recorded judicial sentence of death for heresy had occurred before in 385 A.D.; but it was by authority of the tyrant and usurper Maximus upon Priscillian, a Spanish bishop, and his associates, convicted as Manicheans. This excited universal horror at the time, and especially was reprobated by St. Martin of Tours. Yet the supreme and "infallible" arbiters of morals following St. Leo, who had expressed a hardly qualified approval of the execution, built that false principle later into their policy as a main pillar of it.

Similarly, "St. Raymond of Pennaforte, the compiler of the 'Decretals of Gregory IX.' (following Gratian), who was the highest authority in his generation, lays it down as a principle of ecclesiastical law that the heretic is to be coerced by excommunication and confiscation, and if they fail, by the extreme exercise of the secular power" (Lea's "Hist. of Inquisition," p. 229). Long earlier than this, "Leo the Great (St. Leo, 440-461 A.D.) insisted with the Empress Pulcheria that the destruction of the Eutychians" (heretics of the time) "should be her highest care"; and "it became the general doctrine of the Church, as expressed by St. Isidore of Seville, that princes are bound to preserve the purity of the faith by the fullest exercise of their power against heretics" (*Ibid.*, pp. 215, 216). So that "in handing the Emperor the ring (at his coronation), the Pope told him that it was a symbol that he was to destroy heresy; and, in girding him with the sword, that with it he was to strike down the enemies of the Church" (*Ibid.*, p. 225). But his supposed duties did not end here. Later, we find an

[1] St. Leo, Epist. i. 15.

oath required of every ruler to assist the Church not merely in destroying heretics, but in detecting heresy (*Ibid.*, p. 313); and, in fact, "every prince and ruler was made to understand that his lands would be exposed to the spoiler if, after due notice, he hesitated in trampling out heresy." The penalties against it "extended to all who should neglect a favourable opportunity of capturing a heretic, or of helping those seeking to capture him. From the Emperor to the meanest peasant, the duty of persecution was enforced with all the sanctions, spiritual and temporal, which the Church could command" (*Ibid.*, p. 226). The false and revolting principle thus adopted was applied by the adopters with a refined precision and a ruthless persistency which dwarf and distance the efforts of such comparatively bungling *amateurs* in persecution as Nero or Diocletian.

Indeed, it is only in the scientific method of persecution that the great mass of the popes are supreme experts and past masters. A considerable number reach several degrees of eminence as canonists, but rather as devising church-rules to suit the times than as harmonizing in a coherent whole the highly complex system which grew up under their auspices.[1] As theologians, they are sadly poverty-stricken. St. Leo, Gelasius, Gregory I., and Gregory VII., are all that are worth naming in the first thousand years, whilst a dogmatic ignorance is the mark of many. But in persecution it is difficult to assign the palm, so wide is the competition.

Now, I venture to assert that this false principle and no mere moral teaching, *ex cathedrâ* or other, was for a millennium or more the governing factor in the ethics of Christendom as led by the "Infallible"—one repudiated now with all the energy of horror by the voices of the long misled and terrorized nations, as well as by the eternal test of Gospel truth. To that bloodthirsty falsehood the "Infallible" still stands absolutely pledged, and the "two swords" which he grasped so long are red to the hilt with that ferocious teaching and practice.

Here, then, the subterfuge of distinguishing practice from teaching will not serve. The case, too, is widely different from that in which it is rightly held, that the unworthiness of the office-bearer leaves untouched the efficacy of his official

[1] Sir J. Parker Deane, Q.C., D.C.L., addressing the Church Congress of 1892, is reported to have said: "We have several collections, and one collection in particular called the canon-law, which professes to be under the authority of various popes, by whom it has been sanctioned—a concordance of different canons. Anybody who looks carefully at these canons will find that the concordance is often like other concordances—a differing one. They do not agree."

acts. In morals you cannot separate the teacher from the man; besides which the practice in respect to persecution only reinforces the teaching. From persecution, to pass to other moral topics, the Pope, taken as a continuous personality throughout the ages, with all Christendom claimed as his pupils, commits in turn every enormity before their eyes, until, with the Papacy for their model, the highest places in the Church are filled with men the most deeply sunk and steeped in sensuality. Having drawn all appeals, as well as cases of "first instance" in which he cared to intervene, to himself, and become the Arches Court and high justiciary of Western Europe, his tribunal speedily becomes infamous for venality, extortion, and corruption—for every vice which can defeat justice, protract litigation, and enrich the judge and his clerical staff at the cost of the suitor. Then, as a public conscience awakens at last under the influences of the Reformation, the Papal court is the last to reform; and down to the day when the Pope ceased to be a temporal sovereign, his realm was the worst governed of all contemporary Christian Europe, unless, perchance, it were that contiguous kingdom of the Two Sicilies, which for some ages he claimed as a fief, which lay under his shadow, and had imbibed most fully the baneful contagion of his example. Unless his advocates are prepared to maintain that in matters of civil government morals are of no account, the standing rebuke of the pretence of this "infallible" moralist is to be found nowhere so largely written as in the experiences of his own sometime subjects.[1]

[1] For many evidences of the woeful misrule of the States of the Church, see vol. iii. in Bohn's edition of Ranke's "Popes," *e.g.*, No. 51 in that appendix, pp. 229-233, showing the horrible growth of brigandage and bravoism under Gregory XIII. (1572-1585), and how his *laissez-faire* system fostered and intensified their outrages. No. 86, p. 315, for the detail of the heavy burdens of taxation due from the Roman barons to Paul V. (1605-1621), and from the vassals to the barons. No. 88, p. 319, showing how, in spite of heavy imposts, . . . the Papal government possessed nothing, the interest (on the debt) consuming nearly the whole of the revenue in 1605. No. 134, pp. 437, 438 (Report of the Venetian Envoy in 1663), speaking of the ecclesiastical dominions as utterly borne down by their burdens, of the voluntary expatriation of many proprietors in quest of some better-governed realm . . . imposts on all things eatable, besides personal tolls and taxes . . . oppressions and extortions studiously invented . . . of the utter misery of the inhabitants, the dearth of manufactures, etc. No. 151 (another Venetian envoy), describing the region as "desolated of her children, ruined in her agriculture, overwhelmed by extortions, and destitute of industry," under Innocent XI. (1676-1689). No. 162 (Mocenigo's Report, in 1737, to the Venetian State), p. 478, speaks of "the impediments presented by the Roman Government to the prosperity of its subjects;" states "the general government to be corrupt from the very foundation; breach of trust and dishonesty as being the order of the day; the expenditure as having exceeded the income, and no prospect of

"Why rake up the past horrors and recall the vanished nightmares?" someone will ask. The reason is that the claim to be infallible makes every crime indelible. In view of that claim the past can never bury its dead out of sight. It is, as urged above, for the purpose of that claim, as if one occupant had filled "the chair of Peter" from first to last. By claiming infallibility for the whole series Pius IX. virtually cemented their personalities in one solidarity with himself, and adopted and revived all the monstrosities which the world would only too willingly let die. Hence it happens that the cornucopiæ of enormities, as illustrating moral "infallibility" in the Papacy, which history presents to us is so vast and varied that it is utterly impossible to sample them in detail as they deserve. One can but cull one or two of the more rank and virulent, and at the same time more familiar, specimens of this *bouquet de mille fleurs*. One can but pick up one or two big and glaring pebbles from the shoal which lies at the feet of the historian of the Papacy, leaving who will to fathom and to drag the bed of the great ocean of intrigue, chicane, extortion, venality, simony, heathenish voluptuousness, heretical pravity, and heartless cruelty which rolls beyond.

But instead of pumping from the dregs of these tenth-century popes of the puddle, as described by Baronius,[1] let us take the

---

a remedy; and that the Pope (Clement XII.) had betaken himself to the *expedient of lotteries . . . the obvious destruction and ruin of the people.*" There is one only glimpse of one Papal reign during this period, in which a sound and successful attempt was made to turn to account the abundance of wool and silk by establishing a large industry at St. Michael ad Ripam; but it seems to have fallen into decay in the subsequent reigns. Now, if political virtues are moral, political vices must be immoral. Here is a thoroughly representative, if not an exhaustive, assemblage of the latter, forming an object lesson in the art and method of misgovernment, in the face of which any *ex cathedrâ* teaching on the virtues would sound like a mockery of the afflicted and suffering subjects.

Ranke has a special section (§ 2 of Bk. VIII.) on the "Increase of Debt in the States of the Church," showing how "the popes resorted in a manner the most reckless and precipitate" to loans, and then to augmented taxation to raise the sum due for interest. The previous section of the "Lapse of Urbino" (*i.e.* to be under Papal authority) shows the callous sharp practice of Urban VIII. in order to obtain possession of it from the last independent duke. Ranke adds: "The duchy was at once subjected to the system of government prevailing in other districts belonging to the Church, and very soon there might be heard throughout it those complaints that the government of priests invariably calls forth" (Ranke's "Popes," Bohn's edit., vol. ii., pp. 299-303). For a deplorable picture of the Papal States, as misgoverned under Gregory XVI., see Mahony, better known as "Father Prout," quoted by Dr. Salmon ("Infallibility," lect. xxiii., pp. 466, 467). This brings us close to the time of the Papal sovereignty ceasing; the proof of the statement above in the text is thereby completed.

[1] Annals, 912, viii.

man who stands at a Himalayan height above them, the *facile princeps* of Papal history—Innocent III. In him the Petrine primacy coincides, as it were, in perigee with our native monarchy in apogee, as personified in John "Lackland." This has branded his image indelibly on the memory of England. Most Englishmen who know history at all know something of that episode, since emphasized by the full vigour of Shakespeare's genius, in which the most shameless of our sovereigns laid his crown and his subjects' liberties in the dust of the Pope's footstool, and can easily follow this attempt to sketch in outline the steps of that process through which our country had the happiness, for a time, at any rate, of being under "infallible" direction. Broadly put, the English Church sided with the barons' demand for justice and freedom against a felon King; the Pope sided with the felon King against justice and freedom and the Church of the realm.

In 1207 A.D. Innocent III. proceeded to elect,[1] and later to consecrate as Archbishop of Canterbury, a cleric whom he specially favoured. This was Stephen Langton, whose patriotism rebuked and baffled his overbearing patron in the end, but who appears first as forced upon the Church and realm by this illegal intrusion. The Pope, in spite of the precedents of six centuries, overrode every undoubted right of each of the parties who claimed a concurrent voice, and treated all alike, as though conspirators against his own indefeasible claim. The parties referred to were the monks of Canterbury, the bishops of that province, and the King. This latter, therefore, was entirely within his rights in refusing to acknowledge the Pope's nominee. The Pope, on receiving the royal letter of indignant protest, warning and defiance, at once, after consecrating his own nominee at Viterbo in Italy, placed the entire kingdom under an interdict, thus depriving all orders and degrees of men of all the ordinary resources of spiritual life, merely as a means of putting pressure on the King. The King carried on the war by oppressing, distressing and plundering the Church's property, and outlawing the clergy of all ranks who upheld the Papal interdict. The Pope retaliated by excommunicating the King, and formally releasing all his subjects from their oaths of allegiance, thus dissolving so far as in him lay the entire bond of all authority except his own (1211). Not content with this, which he ordered to be published throughout Europe, he further pronounced on John the sentence of deposition from the throne,

[1] The election was *in form* made by a deputation of the Canterbury monks, to which body it pertained; but *in fact* by the Pope's threat of excommunication addressed to them while in Rome on that business.

and advertised the crown of England as the lawful prize of any who would undertake to seize it—an advertisement speedily answered, as the Pope of course intended and expected, by the King of France. On the intervening details it were needless here to dwell. Suffice it to say that this, coupled with a distrust of his own subjects, eventually brought King John to his knees, and (1213) discovering that, if he could make the Pope his friend, he would have nothing to fear from the French enemy, he resolved to pay the price for that protection by submitting to the Pope's terms, too well known to need recitation here. Pandulph, on his return through France, peremptorily bade the French King to desist from his expedition against England, who stormed and raged at the indignity of being thus befooled. But the wary legate kept the excommunication of John still standing until the stipulated terms were fulfilled.

Meanwhile, the magnates of the realm, finding the King and the Pope now in ominous conjunction, and dreading the unbridled violence of the former, now secure of the protection of the latter, formed the league which secured eventually under the Great Charter the liberties of their country. Their at first secret, but afterwards avowed, leader was that very Stephen Langton whom Innocent, hoping to find in him a prop to his own influence, had forced on the Church and realm as Archbishop of Canterbury. It is noteworthy that neither he nor the barons ever supposed for a moment that the protection of the "infallible" moral guide would afford them any relief from atrocious tyranny. England, in fact, had yet to suffer, and its sufferings were twofold. First came on the scene a new legate to settle the details of compensation and execute the Pope's will in spiritual matters, as also to receive, duly sealed and attested, John's formal deed of surrender. The Pope, who was no doubt well informed of every turn of events, determined to support his vassal against the demands of the latter's subjects for freedom and good government.

The crusade of extermination against the Albigenses and their neighbours the Waldenses was consummated with a mixture of treachery and atrocity to which the earlier record of heathen persecution presents but a feeble parallel—all under the direct instigation of Pope Innocent III. Then, too, arose the Inquisition, to freeze the blood of humanity and continue, in realms undisturbed by civil broil or external aggression, horrors which had derived their only possible plea of extenuation from the ferocious passions kindled by war. In the temporal disputes within his own papal realm, Innocent showed himself where no question of heresy was concerned as remorseless and unscrupulous as where the extinction of

heretics was his avowed object. Thus, interposing in a disputed succession between two noble brothers, he "instantly ordered the territories in dispute to be laid waste with fire and sword, suspended the common laws of war, sanctioned the ravaging their harvests, felling their fruit trees, destroying mills, and driving away cattle."[1] I take these examples purposely from the reign of Innocent III., because he was a man not only undeniably great—the greatest, perhaps, of the long papal line—but one guided by a strong sense of religious duty, however monstrously perverted, and capable of rigorous self-denial within limits of his own fixing, but utterly stern and inflexibly unbending against all whom he viewed as delinquents. In his own eyes he was vindicating the *læsa majestas* of heaven, represented on earth, as he deemed, by himself. This was his highest idea of government, and by its application, thorough and unflinching, he became one of the scourges of mankind.

HENRY HAYMAN.

ART. IV.—CONGREGATIONALISM:

A SKETCH AND A SUGGESTION.[2]

CONGREGATIONALISM was the child of the storm. It was rocked in the cradle of persecution, and was constrained to be as a man-of-war from youth up. The times were restless. The Holy Scriptures in the mother tongue had opened the gateway of a large hope. The work of Wickliffe and of Erasmus was bringing forth fruit in its season. "It was impossible to silence the great preachers of justice, mercy, and truth, who spake from the Book" (Green). "A new moral and religious impulse" went forth, and men's minds were moved as the wind moves the trees of the forest. The awakening had been slow; but it brought with it the unquenchable desire to know the mind of God directly from the authentic revelation of God, and to have a service of worship in the language "understanded of the people."

Henry VIII. was the foe of anyone who did not conform to his imperious will—from the Pope who claimed supremacy in the English Church, to the Protestant who ventured to differ from the Pope and the King in the matter of the Roman

[1] Milman, "Lat. Christ.," ix., p. 184.

[2] Nonconformist, as well as other authorities and writers, have been consulted and freely quoted in this paper.