

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

ART. III. — ANGLICAN RESISTANCE TO ROMAN CLAIMS.

THE history of the religious revival in England during the period since the accession of her Majesty to the throne must, in order to be appreciated and understood, be read in connection with that which tells us of the conditions of Church life in the preceding centuries. Perhaps there is no law regulating the relationships of corporate life, whether ecclesiastical, political, or social, which is more certain and unerring in its working than that of reaction. Whenever the pendulum swings with exceptional force in one direction, we may assume with confidence that, sooner or later, it will swing to the other extremity of its range with equal vigour. The records of the Church of Christ in all ages furnish numerous instances in confirmation of this statement; and the vicissitudes of the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church are equally prolific in affording illustrations. We shall endeavour to examine, in the following pages, the way in which many of the details of modern Church movements are based upon the usages of the primitive Church, and are merely a restoration of what was temporarily lost in the compromises which had to be accepted during the sixteenth century.

The story of the Reformation of the Church of England has been frequently told, and the events from which it sprang have been considered from various points of view, according to the bias of each individual historian. Yet, when allowances are made for the colouring which is frequently inseparable from strong conviction, there is a consensus of opinion that the causes of the mighty change which was effected in the religious aspect of Europe three hundred years ago may be traced to a period far anterior to that when the moment for action arrived.

One is tempted, in undertaking to deal, however superficially, with this deeply-interesting subject, to extend the investigation to the corresponding, and contemporaneous, Reformations in various parts of Europe: that in Germany, of which Luther was the founder; in Bohemia, the birthplace of John Huss; in Switzerland, the home of Zwingli and Calvin; and in France, under the influence of the Huguenots. But even the briefest summary would require a volume to itself; and I shall therefore only refer to other countries in so far as their Reformers impressed their influence on the leaders of religious readjustment in England.

Before we come to the consideration of the causes which operated in bringing about the Reformation, we must enter

on a short retrospect of Anglican Church History, for the following purpose. We are frequently told that England was a Roman Catholic country from the time of St. Augustine till the reign of Henry VIII., when that monarch abolished Romanism here, and founded the Protestant Church in its place.¹ It is a wearisome task to be compelled, again and again, to refute a statement which has no foundation in fact, and which is recognised as absurd by the veriest tyro in the study of history. Yet it is necessary, in view of the misconceptions which have been, and are still, repeated and impressed upon those who have lacked the will or the opportunity to inquire for themselves, that the truth of the matter should once again be stated.

To do this, it will be sufficient to show : *first*, that throughout the period from the earliest introduction of Christianity into Britain until the reign of Henry VIII., the Church in this land, while remaining in communion with Rome, never ceased to oppose and resent the constant attempts of the Papacy to acquire a supremacy over her ; and *secondly*, that the Roman Church during the Middle Ages again and again departed by her own act from the primitive and Apostolic faith of the Catholic Church, and that on this account the Anglican Church, which, in common with other branches, had been induced to accept some of the superimposed doctrines of the Papacy, was justified in rejecting and purging herself of those tenets by which she had been corrupted through her connection with the Roman See.

1. First, then, can it be shown that the Church of England ever became Roman Catholic, that is to say, ever agreed, through her synods or other deliberative assemblies, to place herself under the authority and jurisdiction of the Church of Rome, or ever acknowledged its supremacy in any way ?

Soon after the Church of Christ was founded on the Day of Pentecost, the Apostles were scattered in various directions, preaching the Gospel. Wherever they won converts to the faith, a branch of the Church was established. By degrees it became necessary to organize these congregations into districts, afterwards called dioceses, under the superintendence of Bishops, who were originally consecrated by, and became the successors of, the Apostles. When the Bishops desired to meet for deliberation, one of their number was called on to preside, and this honour was conferred on the Bishop of the chief town in the province, who assumed the title of Metro-

¹ Even Macaulay, in his "History of England," falls into this extraordinary error.

politan.¹ Thus, we find the Church of Rome, the Church of Antioch, the Church of Alexandria, etc. The fact that the seat of government of the mighty Roman Empire was at Rome gave additional power and prestige to the Bishop of that city.

When the earliest General Council of the Christian Church was held at Nicæa, in 325 A.D., under Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, it is clear that no authority or precedence was accorded to the Church of Rome. She was not even represented by her Bishop (he was too old and infirm to attend), but merely by two presbyters. Although we have no record of British Bishops having attended this particular Council, we know that three of them, viz., Eborius of York, Restitutus of London, and Adelphinus of Caerleon-on-Usk, were present at the Council of Arles in 314 A.D.,² and that episcopal representatives from Britain took part in the Council of Sardica in 347 A.D.,³ and of Ariminum in 360 A.D.⁴ Thus, up to the time of the coming of St. Augustine, 597 A.D., the British and Roman Churches were in communion with each other and with the rest of Christendom, and were mutually independent. In other words, both branches of the Church were Catholic, and neither was what is now known as Roman Catholic.

What is meant exactly by the term *Catholic*? It is derived from a Greek word meaning "general" (in the sense employed in our Prayer-Books of the "General Confession," "General Thanksgiving") or "universal." The term is never used in the Bible, either in the Greek Old Testament (the Septuagint) or in the New Testament. It first appears, among Christian writers, in the Epistle of St. Ignatius to the Church of Smyrna, as early as the beginning of the second century, where it describes the Universal Church, in contradistinction to any local branch. It occurs in the same sense a few years later in the letter from the Church of Smyrna on the martyrdom of St. Polycarp. In the same century, St. Justin Martyr speaks of the catholic, *i.e.* general, Resurrection. A hundred years later, St. Clement of Alexandria and others attached to the word the sense of orthodoxy, *i.e.*, the faith of the whole Catholic Church, as opposed to the doctrines of local or heretical sects. Gradually the term came to signify (1) the Church of the whole world, as distinguished from any portion or portions thereof; (2) this same Church as distinguished from the sects; (3) the teaching of this Church, as containing the *whole* of the Divine revelation and precepts, instead of

¹ Concil. Nic., Canon 4.

² Concil. Arelat., Labbe, i., p. 1430.

³ St. Athanasius, "Apol.," ii. init.

⁴ Sulp. Sever. H. S., ii. ad fin.

merely portions of it; (4) the Church and its doctrines as applicable to all sorts and conditions of men. In this fourfold meaning the adjective is used by St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Augustine of Hippo. None of the more ancient Fathers who define it include communion with the Roman Church as intended or implied.

2. The next point for consideration is this: Did the Church in Britain come under the authority or dominion of Rome in consequence of the mission of St. Augustine? When Augustine landed in Kent, having been sent by Pope Gregory, he found that the greater part of the country was sunk in heathenism through the Anglo-Saxon conquest, although the British Church, with its ecclesiastical organization and its threefold orders of the ministry, had survived, and was settled in Wales, where most of the Christians had taken refuge. Many conversions followed the preaching of St. Augustine. When, a few years later, he convened a conference of the British Bishops, in order that he might persuade them to acknowledge him as Metropolitan, and to conform their customs (such as the date on which Easter was observed, and the method of triple immersion in Holy Baptism), to the practice of the Roman See, he discovered that he had to deal with a fully equipped and independent Church, which for nearly two hundred years had kept the faith, unaided by Popes and Papal delegates, and had no intention of being dictated to by a stranger. The Bishops emphatically declined to pay obedience to the Bishop of Rome, or to vary their time-honoured customs, which followed the practice of the primitive Church, while Rome had recently made the innovations advocated by St. Augustine. They also regretted that they could not submit to him as the Pope's representative, being already subject to their own Metropolitan, the Bishop of Caerleon-on-Usk, who was, under God, their spiritual overseer.¹ The doctrines of the Church in this country were practically those of the whole Catholic Church at that period; the service-book (the predecessor and basis of what we now call the Book of Common Prayer) was specially drawn up to meet the circumstances and requirements of the nation, and was based upon the primitive liturgies of the Church, without adhering either to the Roman or the Gallican ritual. Thus, no advance was made, as far as St. Augustine was concerned, in the attempt to establish a Papal supremacy in England.

3. We next proceed to a further question: Did the Bishops of Rome acquire a patriarchal jurisdiction in England subsequently to the time of St. Augustine? This involves a wide

¹ "Some Notable Archbishops of Canterbury," pp. 16-18.

retrospect of the vicissitudes of the Church, but it will not be difficult to show that no such jurisdiction was ever conceded or acknowledged.

Within a few years of the death of St. Augustine, that part of the country, especially the kingdoms of Kent and Essex, which had been converted through his instrumentality, relapsed into heathenism. The Christianizing of the Northern portion of the British Isles was accomplished in the seventh century by Irish, Scottish, and Saxon missionaries under St. Aidan and St. Finan (of Iona and Lindisfarne), as well as St. Chad and others, who were all independent of Rome.¹

The appointment and consecration by Pope Vitalian of Theodore as Archbishop of Canterbury in 668 A.D., in response to the request of the Kings of Northumbria and Kent, has been cited as a proof of Roman jurisdiction in England. But the history of Theodore's episcopate shows how strongly the Greek primate (he was a native of Tarsus) asserted his independence of the Latin See. Bede tells us how the Archbishop's allegiance was mistrusted by the Pope; and the story of Wilfrid's deposition from the See of York, his two appeals for Papal interposition, and the way in which that interference was disregarded and resented alike by the secular and ecclesiastical authorities, proves that up to that date the Church of England had retained her absolute freedom from Roman dictation or control, and that neither Church nor State were moved or impressed by the thunder of Papal anathemas.

Again, at the Council of Cloveshoe, held in 747 A.D., the submission to Papal authority, which was urged by Boniface (the "Apostle of Germany" and Archbishop of Mentz), and recommended by Archbishop Cuthbert, was vetoed, and it was expressly stipulated that no higher court of appeal than that of the Archbishop in synod was acknowledged.

This submission was, however, rendered in 787 A.D., by Offa, King of the Mercians, who, in furtherance of his own ambitions, and in order to curtail the dignity and power of the Archbishop of Canterbury, established a third archbishopric (that of Lichfield, which lasted for about twenty years), and by means of enormous bribes² obtained from Rome a pall for the new Metropolitan. But it must be remembered that this was the individual action of a King, for the carrying-out of his own purposes, and was in no sense ratified by the Church in synod, nor by the nation in conference.

The general aspect of national life in England underwent

¹ Bede, iii., pp. 3, 5. (Theoph. Angl., p. 158.)

² Matt. Paris, "Hist. Ang.," p. 155.

important changes at the time of the Norman Conquest. As the conquered and conquering races began gradually to amalgamate, the interests of the rulers became identified with those of the people; the Church guarded jealously, and occasionally was driven to fight for, her liberty, when her monarchs, aided by the Popes, infringed her rights, and demanded an allegiance to Rome, which she never consented to give; and in process of time the royal prerogative became limited by the admission of representative houses to a share in the administration.

When William planned the conquest of England, he sought the countenance and support of Pope Alexander II., and pretended that he desired to bring the country under the dominion of the Papacy. As Mr. Freeman writes: "England's crime—in the eyes of Rome—the crime to punish which William's crusade was approved and blessed—was the independence still retained by the island, Church, and nation." After the Conquest, Pope Gregory VII. sent three Legates to demand William's homage for the kingdom. This was refused, and the appeal of the Norman Archbishop Robert—the first appeal of an English Bishop to Rome since that of Wilfrid (Robert had been replaced by Stigand)—was ignored, as was also the decision that the latter's consecration was invalid; and Stigand continued to retain the primacy for nineteen years longer, and received canonical obedience from the other Bishops and the clergy.

The harsh ecclesiastical laws passed by William were due in great measure to Roman influence, especially to that of Hildebrand (Gregory VII.), who aimed at exalting the Papacy into the position of universal arbiter in all disputes, and as the suzerain, recognised as such, of all prelates, princes and kings. The endeavour to enforce this attitude, and the encouragement given to our rulers to buy the temporal support of the Popes by bribes, was the cause of the constant struggles through which the Church passed during the next three centuries.

The dispute between Anselm and William Rufus and King Henry I., in consequence of the former declining to do homage to the latter (obediently to an act of a Roman synod forbidding prelates to accept the symbols of investiture, or to do any act of homage for preferment), ended in a compromise, which retained the necessity for doing homage to the Sovereign.¹

About this time the national Churches in different countries were persuaded that every Metropolitan must obtain the pall from the Pope.

¹ "Life of Anselm," by Dean Church, cap. xii.

The *Pall*¹ was a white woollen collar, with pendants behind and before, made of the wool obtained from two lambs which had been blessed by the Pope on St. Agnes' Day. In its original form it was not a sacerdotal ornament, but a splendid mantle forming part of the Imperial robes of state, which no one save the Emperor might possess. Gradually permission to wear it was granted to men of learning and distinguished ecclesiastics, and in process of time the Bishops of Rome came to confer it on other Bishops of the West. At first the Emperor's consent was required in all cases; then merely in regard to those Bishops who were not his subjects; and finally was dispensed with altogether. The pall was thus looked upon as an honourable distinction, and not in any way a badge of authority or restricted to Metropolitans. Gregory the Great was the first Bishop of Rome who bestowed the pall on his "Vicars," as they were called. These were generally the Archbishops of their respective Churches, and their oath at consecration merely amounted to a profession of the Christian faith, any other oath being prohibited by the Fourth Council of Constantinople (870 A.D.),² which was regarded as a General Council by Rome, though rejected by the Eastern Church. It was not till the year 1099 A.D. that an oath of canonical obedience to the Pope was imposed *with* the pall,³ to the surprise of kings and ecclesiastics; and we know that King William II. declared that he would banish from the kingdom any Archbishop who had so acted, if he violated his allegiance to the Crown under plea of compliance with the oath.⁴ Here we have once more a proof that the attempted subjection of the Church of England to Rome was firmly resisted.

When the pall, in accordance with the usual custom, was conveyed by a Papal Legate, it not unfrequently happened that this representative of the Papacy claimed precedence over the Archbishop of Canterbury by summoning and presiding at national synods. One such attempt was made in Anselm's time, and indignantly repelled.

A description, however brief, of the continuous struggles during the Middle Ages between the aggressive attacks and attempted jurisdiction of the Papacy on the one hand, and the bold and determined stand maintained by the Church and realm of England against her on the other, would occupy far more space than is at my disposal. It will be sufficient for my purpose to enumerate a few of the protests raised against Papal encroachments, in addition to those already mentioned.

¹ Bishop Gibson's "Codex," p. 105, note.

² Concil. Constant., iv., Labbe, tom. viii., p. 1131.

³ By Pope Paschalis II.

⁴ Matt. Paris in "Guil. Ruf."

In the Constitutions of Clarendon, 1164 A.D., passed by the King in council with the barons and prelates, it was enacted (in order to prevent the constant appeals to Rome): That in all civil and criminal causes the clergy should be arraigned in the King's courts: that in ecclesiastical questions appeals should lie from the Archbishop to the King; and that no Archbishop, Bishop, or "other exalted person," should leave the kingdom without royal permission, or do evil and mischief to the realm when abroad.

At a Parliament held at Westminster in 1246 A.D., the King, the Bishops, the Abbots, the Earls, with the whole baronage, clergy and people, drew up a strong protest against the "execrable extortions" of the Pope, and against his interference in the ecclesiastical affairs of the country.

The Statute of Carlisle, passed in 1297 A.D., at the first complete representative Parliament ever assembled (including the clergy of both provinces), was the answer of England to Pope Boniface's Bull, "*Clericis Laicos*," which forbade the clergy of all Christian countries to pay contributions to the secular power without his permission. When Boniface found what he had done, he revoked the decree, but his presumption cost him dear, as soon afterwards the Papacy came under the control of the sovereigns of France.

The Statute of Provisors,¹ passed in 1350 A.D., enacted that the King and other lords shall present unto benefices of their own or their ancestors' foundation, and not the Bishop of Rome. This Act was passed to rectify the shameless arrangement of the preceding reign, by which, from 1317 A.D. to 1334 A.D., eighteen bishoprics in England were "reserved" for nominees of the Papacy. A second Statute of Provisors was passed in 1363 A.D., and a third, under Richard II., in 1389 A.D.

The Statute of Præmunire,² in 1353 A.D., declared that all who should sue for redress in the Papal courts should be put out of the protection of the law of England, and forfeit all their goods to the State. Pope Martin described it as "execrable," and wrote: "By this the King of England assumes the spiritual jurisdiction, and governs the Church as completely in ecclesiastical affairs as though he had been constituted by Christ His Vicar." A second Act was passed in 1365 A.D., repudiating the tribute to Rome, to which King John had submitted. The great Statute of Præmunire, of 1393 A.D., was directed against the procuring at Rome of Bulls, instruments, or other things which touch the King, his crown, or his realm. It was once more re-enacted under Henry VIII., who

¹ 25 Edw. III., c. 4.

² 27 Edw. III., c. 1.

in a series of declaratory Acts (*i.e.*, measures which did not create new laws, but vindicated and enforced those already in existence) terminated for ever the Pope's jurisdiction in England.

MONTAGUE FOWLER.



ART. IV.—WHAT ARE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD HYMN TUNE?

IF the proud boast of the ancient Roman, "*Homo sum, nihil humanum a me alienum puto,*" may be freely expanded to mean that "nothing appertaining to the Church is outside the purview of *THE CHURCHMAN,*" it will form a perfectly adequate reason for devoting a few pages of that magazine to the consideration of the question above propounded. If we agree with the Bishop of Durham that "the praise of God is the soul and inspiration of worship,"¹ surely the vehicle by which that praise is to be offered, be it the words or the music, cannot but form a subject for serious thought. For more than thirty years it has been the writer's privilege to discharge, so far as that can be done by a layman, the duties of Precentor in one of the leading churches of a large manufacturing town in the North of England, in the midst of a population with whom singing appears to be almost a natural gift, so general is the aptitude shown for taking an intelligent share in the practice of the art of song, and where in consequence part-singing is cultivated to an extent greater than in any other district—some parts of Wales perhaps excepted—with which he is acquainted. And it is in the hope of promoting the careful consideration of what is not the least important portion of their duty by all those—whether of the clergy or the laity—to whom is entrusted the duty of selecting and arranging the music for the church they serve, that he thus ventures to submit to them some reflections suggested by so lengthened an experience, and to formulate the principles by which he has been guided.

It is by no means so easy a thing as at the first one would think it ought to be, to secure a good tune for every hymn. Too often "the tune in the book" is taken as the be-all and end-all of selection; and yet I am very sure that the compilers of those books themselves would be the first to acknowledge how, in the endeavour to provide each hymn

¹ Lenten Letter to his Clergy, 1896.