

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

the leading tone of St. Paul's writings, and love of St. John's, so is hope the grace which shines most brightly in St. Peter's. As it has been well said, "He who in loving impatience cast himself into the sea to meet the Lord is also the man who most earnestly testifies to the hope of His return." How consistent is this with the spirit of him who, when his Master spoke of His cross and its attendant sufferings, rashly ventured to rebuke Him; and on the other hand, when he beheld His glory, as rashly proposed to make three tabernacles, in the vain hope that that glory might then be fully revealed and remain on earth.

These, then, are some of the marks which silently testify that to St. Peter's own hands we owe, under God, these most precious parts of the Church's inheritance, and thus also reflect some additional light on the truth of the whole of the Sacred Canon.

W. BURNET.



ART. V.—THE MEANING OF THE WORD "CATHOLIC."

"**E**MPTY talk is on the increase in the world," wrote the author of "Letters from Hell." "Vanity of speech! To be sure, the world would never do without its talk, but the superabundance is alarming; a new deluge threatens; the spirit is lost in hollow words. The world used to be more simple, I am sure, in olden times; straightforward statements used to be current much more than they are now. Invention in all spheres is on the increase—the invention of pretences remarkably so. One feels inclined to call out despairingly, as Hamlet did, 'Words, words, words!' I am sure words are the dominant power nowadays in so-called intellectual pursuits; it is not the informing spirit, but the phrase, which is puffed and offered for sale."

The remark is very true at all times. And the older the world grows, so much the more liable we are to the temptation of taking for granted the words that pass for current coin, and of indolently accepting all the mass of incoherent meanings which have been attached to them in their wayward pilgrimage through the innumerable mass of human minds.

The word about which I wish to write in this paper is in its true meaning one of the grandest and most beautiful that can be presented to the intelligence of man—I mean the word "Catholic." In its perverted sense, it has been used so as to become one of the most mischievous and poisonous which ever darkened glorious and eternal truths. "Among the sources of those innumerable calamities," wrote Bishop Horne,

"which from age to age have overwhelmed mankind, may be reckoned as one of the principal—the abuse of words." "Beware," wrote the eminent Church historian and poet Robert Southey, "how you allow words to pass for more than they are worth, and bear in mind what alteration is sometimes produced in their current values by the course of time."

Of the good old word "Catholic" we naturally and rightly hear a great deal at the present moment; and as it is just one of those words which are not very well understood, it may not be a waste of time if, with these warnings before us, we try, without any preconceived bias or partiality, to consider the word and its use.

Now, it is a very extraordinary thing, and one of the great mistakes which dull, popular, uninformed, orthodox Protestantism has allowed to undermine its credentials, that the great mass of the people in this country use the word quite ignorantly as equivalent to the word "Roman." Only a few days ago I was reading a very excellent and clever story, in which it was said, "The family had always been Catholic," meaning Roman. To confine the word to any particular locality is a contradiction in terms. The great Church philosopher, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, a man of the utmost breadth of mind, even goes so far as to say on this point: "The adherents of the Church of Rome are not Catholic Christians. If they are, then it follows that we are heretics and schismatics, as, indeed, the Papists very logically, from their own premises, call us. And *Roman Catholics* makes no difference. . . . There can be but one body of Catholics, from the very force of the definition." And, indeed, as a matter of fact, the official title of that great Church is "Holy Roman." Roman is the point on which they chiefly insist. I ask you to dismiss from your minds any servile idea that there is some special connection between Rome and the word "Catholic." The Roman Universal Church is a contradiction in terms. Those who have a sort of hazy notion that this word has anything to do with sublime architecture, gorgeous ceremonial, superb music, and mediæval doctrines, are probably hardly aware of the solecism of which they are the victims. They are really thinking of quite a different word (or words) altogether.

You will not need reminding that this splendid word "Catholic" itself does not occur in the New Testament. The word simply means "Universal." Whenever we use the word "Catholic," let us for a time use the word "Universal," and then we shall get into the habit of understanding its true meaning. If the novelist whom I was reading had said, "The family had always been Universal," he would have been vividly aware of the meaningless ineptitude of his application.

And first you would probably like to know that this interesting word, which had such a chequered and astounding future before it, was used in its ordinary sense of Universal not only by pagan authors, such as Pliny, but also not uncommonly by ecclesiastical writers. Justin Martyr, a Father of the second century, speaks of the Catholic Resurrection, meaning, of course, the Universal or General Resurrection. Tertullian, another writer of that age, speaks of the Catholic goodness of God, meaning obviously not the Roman, but the Universal goodness of God.

Then it came to be used as an epithet of the General Christian Church, faith, tradition, and people, among the first writers employing it being Ignatius, Bishop of Smyrna, and Clement of Alexandria.

Then it was employed in the Creed of the Eastern Church, that which we now recite as the Nicene Creed, with reference to the whole body of Christians, living and dead: "I believe in the Holy Catholic or Universal Church." This had nothing to do with Rome, for the usage did not at first extend to the Western Church at all. It was employed in the same sense in the Creed of Arius, the heretical leader, who imitated the Creed of the Eastern Church as nearly as possible.

Next it was applied not only in a general sense to the whole Church, but also in a special sense to any portion of the Universal Church present in a particular place: the portion of the Universal Church present in Ephesus, the portion of the Universal Church present in Alexandria. This was no doubt by way of distinction from heretical and separatist bodies. From this usage it came to be taken in a larger sense still, as equivalent to Christian when contrasted with heathen, or orthodox as distinct from schismatics. The well-known Christian poet in Gaul, Prudentius, speaks of the Catholic Faith, meaning the Faith held by the Universal Church, and Catholic nations, the nations accepting the Faith of the Universal Church. In the same way another writer, Pacian, says, *Christian is my name, Universal my surname*. In the year 341, at the Council of Antioch, the Universal Churches are spoken of, in contrast to the followers of the heretic Paul of Samosata. Again, in the year 359, in the Council of Rimini, the Universal Church is mentioned in opposition to heretics. So also in the Athanasian Creed, which is of a later date, you get Universal Religion, Universal Church.

That was how they used this word in the earlier days—very much in the sense of *general*. Later on men were driven to find a rationale and explanation of the epithet, especially when different sides both claimed it, in the contro-

versy with the 450 schismatical Bishops who followed Bishop Donatus. These ingenious Donatists said that Universal did not imply being in union with the general body of Churches, but the keeping of all the Divine commandments and sacraments. So St. Augustine, in reply, insists once more on the universality of the Church. St. Cyril of Jerusalem dilates in rhetorical and rather fanciful terms on the word in this sense, as intimating that the Church subjugates all men, teaches all truth, heals all sin. And in somewhat a like manner the General Epistles in the New Testament, those not addressed to any Church in particular, were in the third century called Universal, because they were written for all Churches alike.

So at last we come to St. Vincent of Lérins, a famous presbyter of Gaul, who has given us a definition which is, I believe, accepted by all alike, though we cannot say that all act upon it equally. He died about the year 460, so he is an authority of very respectable antiquity. In regard to truths and doctrines he defined this good word Catholic or Universal to mean: "That which has been held always, that which has been held everywhere, that which has been held by all alike." St. Vincent uses it of doctrines; but if it is to be applied also to customs and practices of the Church, they must be brought to the same test, and the word must have the same meaning: "That which has been done always, that which has been done everywhere, that which has been done by all alike." St. Vincent's definition has no special binding authority of its own; but it has been generally received, and it seems true, both historically and theoretically.

I may here add that the Eastern Church does not use specially the title of Universal in regard to itself, but prefers the official designation, "Holy Orthodox." At present it pronounces formal excommunication against both the Roman and Anglican communions, as well as the whole of the Protestant denominations; but individual Bishops seem inclined to treat our English Churchmen in a more friendly and brotherly and universal spirit.

"I believe in the Holy Catholic or Universal Church." So we say in our own Creed. Let us take an authority of our own Church and see how he explains this word. I do not know any writer more serious, more thoughtful, more widely accepted, than Hooker. He gives us a glorious and beautiful view of the Universal Church.

Listen, then, to Hooker: "The Church of Christ, which we properly term His Body mystical, can be but one, neither can that one be discerned through the senses by any man, inasmuch as the parts thereof are some in heaven already with Christ, and the rest that are on earth (though their natural

persons be visible) we cannot discern whether they are infallibly and truly of that body.

"And as the everlasting promises of love, mercy, blessedness, belong to the *mystical* Church: even so on the other side, when we read of any *duty* which the Church of God is bound to, the Church whom this doth concern is a *sensibly known company*. And this visible Church in like sort is but one, continued from the first beginning of the world to the last end. . . . The unity of which Visible Body and Church of Christ consisteth in that uniformity which all several persons thereunto belonging have by reason of that *one Lord*, whose servants they all profess themselves, that *one Faith* which they all acknowledge, that *one Baptism* wherewith they are all initiated. The Visible Church of Jesus Christ is therefore one, in outward profession of those things which supernaturally appertain to the very essence of Christianity, and are necessarily required in every Christian man. . . .

"For lack of diligent observing the difference, first between the Church of God, *Mystical* and *Visible*, then between *Visible sound* and *Visible corrupted* (sometimes more, sometimes less), the oversights are neither few nor light that have been committed. . . . Such is the error and misconceit wherewith others being at this day likewise possessed, they ask us where our Church did work, in what cave of the earth it slept for so many hundreds of years before the birth of Martin Luther? As if we were of opinion that Luther did erect a new Church of Christ! No! the Church of Christ which was from the beginning is, and continueth unto the end; of which Church all parts have not been always equally sincere and sound. . . . We hope, therefore, that to reform ourselves, if at any time we have done amiss, is not to sever ourselves from the Church we were of before. In the Church we were, and we are so still. Other difference between our estate before and now we know none, but only such as we see in Judah; which having some time been idolatrous became afterwards more soundly religious by renouncing idolatry and superstition."

The same glorious meaning is put into the word Universal by our Prayer-Book. "More especially we pray," it says, "for the good estate of the Catholic (or Universal) 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 (not of letter, but) of spirit, in the bond (not of mere forced external organic unity, but) of peace, and in righteousness of life." That is a true, accurate, primitive ideal. Beautifully true, charitable, and comprehensive also are the words of the

English Bidding Prayer in the Canons: "Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, that is, for *the whole congregation of Christ's people dispersed throughout the world.*"

The very marked difference that was made between our usages before and after the great change of 350 years ago, to which Hooker alluded in the passage I have quoted, was perfectly legitimate, and in accordance with the laws of the primitive Church. The unity of primitive times was a unity in the main points of doctrine, not of uniformity of practice. So long as the different Churches held to the great Creeds of Christendom, submitted to the General Councils, and held to the same form of government, they were recognised as full members of the visible Holy Universal Church. Every Church was at liberty to make choice for herself in what method or form of words she would perform her services. It was no breach of unity for different Churches to have different modes and circumstances and ceremonies in performing the same holy offices, so long as they kept to the substance of the institution. What was required to keep the unity of the Church in these matters was, that any particular member of any particular Church should comply with the particular customs and usages of his own Church.

Take an instance. St. Augustin's mother, Monica, was much perplexed when she came to Milan, because that Church kept Saturday as a festival, whereas she had always kept it as a fast, after the custom of the Church of Rome. St. Augustine asked St. Ambrose, the Bishop of Milan, and he replied that when he was at Milan he did not fast on Saturday, when he was at Rome he did. So St. Augustine and his mother, whatever Church they came to (provided they were in communion with it), should observe the customs of that Church.

Take another instance. St. Augustine complains of those who raised such litigious questions, as to think nothing right but what they themselves do; only because they used to do so in their own country; or because a little shallow reason tells them it ought to be so; or because they have perhaps seen such things in their travels, which they reckon the more learned, the more remote it is from their own country. Customs really varied considerably in the practice of different Churches. Some fasted on Saturday, some did not; some received the Eucharist every day, others on Saturday and the Lord's Day, others on the Lord's Day only. Whatsoever else there was of this kind, they were all things of free observation.

Take another instance. St. Irenæus, speaking of differences in keeping Lent, some Churches for forty hours only, some for forty days, some merely for the week before Easter, says: "We still retain peace with one another, and the different

ways of keeping the fast only the more commends our agreement in the faith."

Take another instance. St. Jerome declares that the custom of one Church ought not to be subverted by the contrary custom of another; but every province might abound in their own sense, and esteem the rules of their ancestors.

Take another instance. St. Gregory the Great said to Leander, a Spanish Bishop: "There is no harm done to the Universal Church by different customs, so long as the unity of the faith is preserved."

Take yet one more instance. The same St. Gregory, Bishop of Rome, was directing Augustine the monk, the first Archbishop of Canterbury. Augustine asked him what form of Divine service should he settle in Britain—the old Gallican or the Roman. And how it came to pass that when there was but one faith, there were different customs in different Churches; the Roman Church having one form of service, and the Gallican Churches another. Gregory replied: "Whatever you find, either in the Roman or Gallican, or any other Church, which may be more pleasing to Almighty God, I think it best that you should carefully select it, and settle it in the use of the Church of the Angles newly converted to the faith. For we are not to love things for the sake of the place, but places for the sake of the good things we find in them; therefore you may collect out of every Church whatever things are pious, religious, and right, and, putting them together, instil them into the minds of the Angles, and accustom them to the observation of them." And there is no question but that Augustine followed this direction in his new plantation of the English Church.

We have thus been led to see that things which are Catholic or Universal can, from the nature of the case, be very few and very simple. According to the rule of St. Vincent, "What has been done always, everywhere, and by everybody," they must include the time and writings of the Apostles themselves. They would comprise the teaching contained in the two Creeds, the two Sacraments, and the institutions of the Church of the earliest centuries. When we come to think about the official dress of the clergy, rituals, ceremonies, and usages, many of these may be of high and venerable antiquity, but none of them can very well be Universal.

It is in accordance with these principles of the primitive Church that the Preface to our Book of Common Prayer lays it down: "That the particular form of Divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, *being things in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable that, upon weighty and important*

considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those that are in place of authority from time to time seem either necessary or expedient."

To the same effect is the Thirty-fourth Article, on the traditions of the Church :

"It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly alike: for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren. Every particular or National Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

In the same way our Book of Common Prayer, in the Introduction on Ceremonies, declares that : "Although the keeping or omitting of a Ceremony, in itself considered, is but a small thing, yet the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is no small offence before God. 'Let all things be done among you,' saith St. Paul, 'in a seemly and due order.' The appointment of which order pertaineth not to private men. Therefore no man ought to take in hand, nor presume, to appoint or alter, any public or common order in Christ's Church, except he be lawfully called and authorized thereto."

And again in the same Introduction :

"Christ's Gospel is not a Ceremonial Law (as much of Moses' Law was), but it is a religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit; being content only with those ceremonies which do serve to a decent order and godly discipline, and such as be apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and special signification, whereby he might be edified."

And at the close of the same Introduction :

"And in these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only. For we think it convenient that every country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best, to the setting forth of

God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition; and that they should put away other things, which from time to time they perceive to be most abused, as in men's ordinances it often chanceth diversely in divers countries."

These were the principles on which our Church vindicated its position as Catholic or Universal 350 years ago, and justified the changes which were then indisputably made. The primitive principle was that each provincial Church should maintain its own autonomy, and observe its own rites and ceremonies, and obey its own authorities without troubling about the authorities of other Churches. In seeking for a Universal ritual or Universal customs, such a Church would be talking of what absolutely does not exist, and is impossible. The Catholic faith is a right term, and so is the Catholic Church. When we come to the smaller matters of observance, "these things are alterable and indifferent."

And so the present Bishop of London, when Bishop of Peterborough, wrote: "The idea of a National Church," he said, "is in no way repugnant to the conception of one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. Its local name signifies that it consists of members of that Church living in a particular country. All members of the Church are one through faith in God as revealed in the Scriptures; and that faith is expressed in the Creeds of Christendom.

"These local bodies of believers have no power to change the Creeds of the Universal Church, or its early organization. But they have the right to determine the best methods of setting forth to the people the contents of the Christian faith. They may regulate rites, ceremonies, usages, observances, and discipline for that purpose, according to their own wisdom and discretion."

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

Review.

A Manual of Psychology. Two Vols. By G. F. STOUT, M.A., LL.D.
London: W. B. Clive.

IT is impossible for the clergy, as a body, to receive training in every department of mental activity, or even perhaps in as many as they would themselves wish. But certainly, among the subjects that are most commonly omitted, it is a pity that the science of the mind itself generally finds a place. A clergyman's work in dealing with different characteristics often most subtly developed, in education and in preaching, would be so much simplified and assisted by an even elementary acquaintance with