

UNION WITH ROME IMPOSSIBLE.

BY THE REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

IN a letter dated May 28, 1932, published in the *Irish Times*, Cardinal MacRory, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, revived the burning question of the Union of the Church in reply to a sermon by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Gregg. The words of the Cardinal are to be noted by all who are interested in the idea of the Unity of the Church. He lays down emphatically the often-repeated Roman principle that those Churches which are not in communion with the Roman Church are no part of Christ's Church. His words regarding the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Protestant bodies of Western Christianity are as follows: "I refused to regard them as any part of Christ's Church: I regarded them and regard them as the Church at all times—and never more than in the first ten centuries—regarded heretical and schismatical bodies, as severed branches no longer nourished by the vital sap." He quotes with approval a letter from a co-religionist who asks: "Can any Anglican explain to us to-day how their position differs essentially from that of the Arians, Nestorians and others, let us say, of the year 500?" and who defends the Roman method of preserving unity by expelling those who differed from it. And he proceeds: "If then in proving in my Pastoral the Church's Unity, I took no notice of the Eastern Orthodox Church or the countless Protestant religious bodies, the reason is because they are outside Christ's Church. . . . Their existence, however sad and deplorable, in no way destroys or impairs the Church's Unity." This is the logical consequence of their initial fallacy that they and no other Church constitute the Christian Church, outside of which there is no salvation. I trust that those Anglicans who are hoping for reunion with Rome will realise the actual position of affairs, and discontinue those efforts which are thus regarded with pity and contempt by those with whom they desire to be reunited. The papally discredited Conversations at Malines are unpleasantly recalled to our minds.

Ten years ago, February 6, 1924, the late Archbishop Davidson described how "it came about almost fortuitously that a gathering was arranged in which a few leading Roman Catholic Churchmen should meet a few Anglicans for conversation about the differences which separate our churches." To stamp out "an endeavour to discuss, thus privately, our differences would, I say it unhesitatingly, have seemed to be a sin against God."¹ In view of the fact that "chance" has been eliminated from the New Testament, doubtless because "Fortune" was worshipped by many pagans, it must strike us as odd that the spurning of a *fortuitous* offer should seem a sin against God to any Christian, although Horace advises "nec fortuitum spernere caespitem" (*Od.* ii. xv). However, it was

¹ *The Conversations at Malines, 1921-5*, Oxford Press, p. 54.

probably deemed a clever stroke of diplomacy to take advantage of the gratitude of the Belgian Cardinal to the British troops to have this question of the Roman conditions of recognising Anglicans as members of the Church of Christ discussed. The result of this private and unauthorised Conference was not, however, one to fill the hearts of the Anglican members of the Conference with elation. The Archbishop said: "the point at issue, or at least one of the great and far-reaching matters, which I was anxious should be adequately handled, was the question of papal authority as a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church" (p. 56). This was startling to many of us, who understood that the Vatican Council of 1870 had settled that matter once and for all. A study of the decrees of that Council would have made clear to him the eternal position of the Roman Church. Dr. Jackson, writing in 1626, repudiated its claims to *supremacy* and *infallibility*. The Vatican Council simply reiterated what it has been saying for centuries.

Here is what it said in 1870 regarding the authority of the Pope: "If any one say that the Roman pontiff has not the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, not only in matters of faith and morals, but also as regards discipline and the government of the Church throughout the world, or that he has only the principal portion and not the plenitude of that supreme power, or that his power is not ordinary and immediate, as much over each and every Church, as over each and every pastor and believer—let him be *anathema*." The Pope claims authority not only over Canterbury, but over the English clergy and laity. And I fail to see how this is not clear to every one who has read this decree.

Dr. Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church* would also have made very clear to him what is the permanent attitude of the Church of England to such claims based upon the so-called Petrine texts, which have been understood in a different way from the Roman by the greatest theologians, and buttressed upon the confessedly false decretals. When the Vatican Council—1870—published the constitution, *Pastor Aeternus*, declaring that the Pope has infallibility in matters of doctrine and supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church, it meant that Ultramontanism, or the Roman theocracy, was sounding forth its triumph over the Universal episcopate. For many years there had been a conflict in France and Germany between the Roman Curia and the national episcopates. Gallicanism in France was a protest against the autocracy of the Pope. It began in the thirteenth century, when the popes claimed that they had a right to interfere in the secular affairs of a nation and to depose sovereigns. The Gallican theory was enunciated by Richer (1559–1631) during the Reformation. Bossuet (1682), in the declaration of the French clergy, maintained that the temporal sovereignty of Kings is independent of the Pope, that General Councils are above the Pope, and that the infallible teaching and authority of the Church belongs to the Pope and bishops conjointly, and that the papal decrees require the consent of the Church.

This placed infallibility in the Church diffusive or at large. Febronianism (called after a writer who wrote under that name on the state of the Church and the legitimate power of the Pope) was the name of the corresponding movement within the Roman Catholic Church in Germany, and is still strong in the Universities. It was directed against the monarchical power claimed by the Pope over the episcopate. The theory was that the Church is based upon the collective episcopate, the Pope being only "primus inter pares," and subject to General Councils, and without the power to summon them.

They did not regard the Pope as much their enemy as the Curia, which they held should be fought by thorough popular education—"the first remedy against the abuse of ecclesiastical power," and by national and provincial synods. The *principatus* of the Pope was not one of jurisdiction but "of order and consociation" (*ordinis et consociationis*), they declared.

Both these movements, Gallicanism and Febronianism,¹ were the outcome of a strong national feeling for independence. It has always been the policy of the Roman Curia to crush such national feeling. They were also the last rallying efforts of the Roman Catholic episcopate against the papacy, before it lay crushed completely by the Vatican Council of 1870. Proceeding on the principle of Cyprian that the unity of the Church is in the collective episcopate, they had withstood the growing intolerance and assumptions of the papacy—by which they were eventually overshadowed. So Ultramontanism triumphed. Its principle was enunciated by Von Dollinger, who opposed it (1865): "the pope is the supreme, the infallible, and consequently the sole authority in all that concerns religion, the Church, and morality, and each of his utterances on these topics demands unconditional submission, internal no less than external" (*Encycl. Brit.*, "Ultramontanism," vol 27, 577). Thus the Roman Curia triumphed over the Roman episcopate, and the Roman bishops are no longer independent officers, but merely papal delegates.

The Anglicans who took part in these peculiar conversations at Malines and who signed the report, in both languages, the Bishop of Truro, Dr. Frere, Bishop Gore, Dean Armitage Robinson, Dr. B. J. Kidd and Lord Halifax, can only be described as the Archbishop's emissaries. They were by no means representative of the Church of England and had received no authority from that Church to act in its name. When the Anglicans² insisted (*les Anglicans soulignèrent*, p. 35) that the papacy had not merely a "Primacy of Honour," but also a "Primacy of Responsibility," it was a surrender to Ultramontanism, a confession that the Pope was one like St. Paul "who had the care of all the churches" (2 Cor. xi. 28)—a care St. Peter never had. They retreated from the Cyprianic

¹ See articles "Febronianism" and "Gallicanism" (*Encycl. Brit.*).

² The English report suppresses the word "Anglicans." It has only the words "It was insisted." See the French report, also signed by the Anglicans.

position that the unity of the Church is centred in the collective episcopate by acknowledging that it lies in the Roman pontiff. Was not this a betrayal of the Anglican Church, which has contended for its freedom and independence since the days of Magna Charta (1215), when it was laid down that "the Anglican Church shall be free and have its rights and liberties unimpaired"—a charter that was declared null and void by a bull of Innocent III, published two months afterwards? It was nothing less than an attempt to undo the work of the Reformation and to set back the clock. So every fair-minded member of the Church of England must regard it. The Lambeth Appeal cannot be legally or logically cited for these conversations. It gave no authority for action, it merely expressed a hope. "We cherish the earnest hope that all these communions (in east and west and non-episcopal) may be led by the Spirit into the Unity of the Faith."

It is a good thing to define one's terms in controversy. What is "the unity of the Faith" for the Roman Catholic? It is the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. See Cardinal Mercier's letter, p. 63—"The return of England to the Unity." (I would point out, *en passant*, the frequent inaccuracy of the English rendering.) *L'unité*¹ here is *the* unity, not unity. This inaccuracy conceals the Roman claim. "The return of England to the Unity would be such a beautiful and such an edifying spectacle that one could not procure soon enough for the religious souls the comfort they expect from it." This means the return of England to Rome. See the Bull of Pope Pius V excommunicating Elizabeth and her supporters, declaring that they are cut off from the unity of the Body of Christ, "*a Christi corporis unitate praecisos*" (1570). See the apostolic letter of Pope Leo XIII, 1895: "We have not ceased to pray and still humbly pray for the return of Christian nations now divided from us to the unity of former days" (p. 11). He tells of a holy league for the conversion of England—"a society of pious people to pray for the return of the English nation to the Church" (p. 5). He is gratified to see "how the number of those religious and discreet men who sincerely labour for reunion with the Catholic Church is increasing." He urges English Catholics to use a prayer for the conversion of their brethren, for England is "the Dowry of Mary" (p. 16). They are to use this prayer—"O sorrowful Mother! intercede for our separated brethren, that with us in the one true fold they may be united to the Supreme Shepherd, the Vicar of thy Son," presumably that he may say to them on their return to his fold: "Ye were as sheep going astray, but are now returned to the shepherd and bishop of your souls" (1 Peter ii. 25). For him—the Pope—salvation in the Unity of the Faith, means salvation in the Roman Church. He reminds us that in pre-Reformation days "the English race was wholly devoted to this centre of Christian unity divinely constituted in the Roman bishops"—an advance beyond Cyprian's principle that "the tangible

¹ Le retour de l'Angleterre a l'unité (The English translation has "The return of England to unity").

bond of the Church's unity is her one united episcopate, an apostleship universal yet only one, the authority of every bishop perfect in itself and independent, held individually and in their corporate capacity by all." ¹

The Roman Catholics thus regard the Pope as the centre of Christian Unity. To return to his fold is to return to the unity of the faith. In the Roman Catholic Summary of the points of doctrine agreed upon by the Anglicans and themselves, we have this very point conceded by the former, "that the pope should be in fact a centre of unity and a head exercising authority over all" (p. 89). They end by expressing gratification "that Anglicans have learned to appreciate that unity—from which they have suffered a long and sorrowful separation." Is this cynical and ironical description true of the four centuries of education, religious happiness and freedom from superstition and advance since we threw off the yoke of Rome?

Where is this thing going to stop? "The Anglicans," the report says in conclusion (p. 95), "are ready to make sacrifices for the cause of union." There are no doubt a number of advanced men who would sacrifice much (of what is not theirs to sacrifice) to be in union with Rome, and to have a Roman acknowledgment of the validity of their orders. But they may rest assured of one thing, that Rome will never recognise the validity of Anglican orders. She would stultify herself more than she would venture to do. History is not her strong point, but she remembers that she excommunicated Elizabeth and her adherents, and has declared English orders to be heretical and schismatical. In Rome there is the Holy Office, "a sacred congregation of the Roman and Universal Inquisition," still watching keenly the affairs of us "heretics," as we are called. It was established in 1542 by Paul III. Though it dare not employ the methods of the sixteenth century, it is able to embitter the lives of "non-Romans." ² It insists on rebaptising converts who have already been baptised. As baptism by heretics is invalid through defect of form or matter or even of intention (!), the rite must be administered. ³ In cases of mixed marriages the papal decree of 1908, *Ne Temere*, has aggravated the feud between the churches by requiring that the rite shall be performed by a Roman priest and that the children shall be brought up Roman Catholics. This decree has operated harshly, in Ireland especially, and has been at work in England as well. Our Bishops have had to protest against it. ⁴ The Roman Curia also claims the right to annul marriage, as in the notorious Marlborough case, on the most petty pleas, to oblige the rich. The

¹ *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, C. 5 (Benson's *Cyprian*, p. 182).

² The Roman Church calls them "non-Catholics." Her own claim to catholicity owing to her adoption of uncatholic doctrines is ridiculous.

³ I have known a case where they insisted on the Protestant husband who had been baptised in the Church of Ireland submitting to rebaptism. This is nothing but the heresy of Anabaptism.

⁴ The Bishop of Chelmsford, for example, at the recent Diocesan Conference (1934).

Roman Catholic religion favours the rich, who can pay for masses for the souls in purgatory, where the poor, who have no friends to pay for masses, must perforce remain. The doctrine of "intention" is not only dangerous but suicidal. There is no consecration where the priest does not intend to consecrate, no marriage where the priest or one of the contracting parties does not intend that there should be a marriage. The final appeal is "subjective." The differences between the Anglican Church and the Roman are not therefore only doctrinal, they are also moral. To return to the Unity—that is to the Pope—would involve greater sacrifices than the English people will permit. This retrograde step might be taken in a docile age, but the present age is impatient of such subjects of discussion as the apostolic continuity of Rome, knowing that the chain of descent is only as strong as the weakest link, and aware that there are many rotten links in that chain. There is only need to glance through the pages of Platina's *Lives of the Popes*, a work dedicated to a Pope, Sixtus IV, and approved by the Roman cardinals, to realise the terrible character of some of these "vicars of Christ," whose deeds are unprintable, but which must be remembered when their successors speak with arrogant claim to be "the mouthpieces of God." Among them we find evil creatures like Alexander VI, John XII, John XXII, to mention a few out of many, worldly infidels like Leo X, and anti-popes not a few. The popes themselves who took measures—we dare not describe them—to annul the acts and rescind the ordinations of their predecessors, proved themselves to be unworthy to be linked in any line of respectable, much less apostolical, descent. Others who were condemned as heretics by General Councils are proof that the Roman Church is not the depository of sound doctrine. Rome is unchanging and unrepentant. Leo XIII, a pious bishop, thus refers to the papal attempts to crush the Reformation. "Our predecessors made every prudent effort to put an end to it." Among these prudent efforts may be numbered the burning of hundreds of English men and women, an archbishop and bishops among them, the fomenting of rebellion in Ireland and England, the inciting of foolish persons to murder their Queen. "Whosoever sends her out of the world will not sin, but will acquire merit."¹ So runs a letter of 1580 from the Cardinal of Como, conveying the Pope's decision to the nuncio Sega. It was the same Pope, Gregory XIII, who struck the medal "Strages Ugonottorum" and ordered a "*Te Deum*" to be sung to commemorate the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. The unrepentant Roman Church will never acknowledge that such methods and actions were follies, much less sins.

Why mention such deeds of horror and infamy? To remind our people and the Church of England of the history and character of the papacy, which some Anglicans, e.g. those of the Malines Conversations, attempted to exalt into a super-prelatical authority responsible to God for the whole of Christendom, churches and individuals, completely ignoring its history, and what Roman writers

¹ Meyer's *England and the Catholic Church*, Eng. Trans., p. 491.

like Platina, Du Pin, Baronius, Guicciardini, and others have been compelled in the interests of truth to say about the popes.

It does not surprise those who have read this report that its publication was held back for several years by the Archbishop of Canterbury, lest it should imperil the passing of the Prayer Book Measure. It is the Pope's bull of condemnation that has saved us for the moment from the indignity of further Malines conversations. Dr. D'Arcy, the Primate of all Ireland, an outstanding figure of the British episcopate, said of these conversations: "I am confident that the people of England will recognise that the Anglican representatives at Malines were ready to give away those liberties which men of the British race prize more dearly than life itself." No document reveals more plainly the wide divergence of views between the Anglican bishops who approved of these Conversations and the great mass of the English people, who disapproved of them. Recent secessions among the Anglican clergy and others to Rome prove that the movement is steadily advancing, and that our people require to be educated in the particulars of this controversy lest they should be impressed by external attractions and extravagant claims and drawn away by specious arguments and pretensions from the spiritual faith of their forefathers.

The claims of the Roman Curia are immense and unbounded. Every state must be subordinate to the Pope, who claimed from the eighth century the power of granting kingdoms and deposing monarchs. Legislation that conflicted with his interests was invalid. For example, a pope annulled Magna Charta, and another condemned the ecclesiastical law of Prussia (1875), while the Spanish people, to secure their freedom, were recently compelled to throw off the papal yoke altogether. The State might be disobeyed, if it conflicted with the Roman Church, which is herself in conflict with religion, freedom, education, enlightenment and progress, and by setting up one super-mundane tribunal aimed at crushing out the spirit of every individual and the soul of every nation. In 1870 episcopacy made its last stand against papalism. Instead of the brotherly union of coequal authorities, the essence of episcopacy—we have the autocracy of one—in a system which is not episcopal but papal. This is an object lesson for the Church of England. The centralisation of this Church is proceeding apace. The present Bishop of Norwich¹ said "the Church of England ought to recognise the fact that it has been passing more and more under the immediate supervision of Lambeth." He refers to many matters which tend to transfer the larger responsibilities of the bishops to "one permanent centre." What is the meaning of the boast of the Anglicans at Malines of the 368 Bishops summoned to the Lambeth Conference "looking to Canterbury as their centre" (p. 20)? What is the idea? Is it to obtain the position of patriarch for him? A western patriarchate with the primate as patriarch on one side, and an eastern patriarchate on the other, supporting and buttressing up a great central Church, a super-Church, may

¹ THE CHURCHMAN, 1929, Jan., p. 31.

bean attractive idea to a certain class of mind, but what would St. Paul have thought of it? The validity of his orders was questioned: but that did not trouble him. What would St. Paul have thought of the claims of the successors of the apostle whom he withstood, because he was condemned? What would St. John, who denounced Diotrophes, "who loveth to have the pre-eminence"?

Again, what was the object of dangling before the eyes of the Anglicans the advantages the Uniat Churches enjoy in the Roman communion? (p. 24), and which the Anglicans would enjoy if they became a Uniat Church in the Roman fold?

(a) The use of the vernacular and the English rite.

(b) Communion in both kinds.

(c) Permission for clergy to marry.

These were not even promised by the Roman Catholic representatives. They said that "precedents exist which partially are in agreement with the desires expressed by the Anglicans, but that such precedents come from the Uniat Churches of the East. There is no absolute bar to the granting of these desires, at any rate in part, but the Roman Catholics present¹ were not in a position to anticipate what judgment the Holy See would pass on the motives that prompt these requests."

I suppose we ought to be obliged to these emissaries of the Archbishop of Canterbury for asking permission for us to retain our wives, and the use of the vernacular and the English rite, but we want to know, why are we not to be allowed to retain our Bible? We are to be allowed, then, certain privileges conditionally, and as a vast concession from Rome, for owning her sway, returning to her fold, recognising her supreme dominion and infallibility—privileges that our ancestors wrested from the popes, after much suffering and persecution, but the Bible is to be taken away from us. Forsooth, the *Anglicana Ecclesia* and all Churches depending on her are to be reduced to the condition of the Uniat communities living in subjection to Rome.

Among the tracts published by the Alcuin Club, of which the late Dr. Gore was president, is one "*On the Uniats and their Rites*" (1924, Mowbray). The writer, Mr. Stephen Gaselee, asks: "Should we for the sake of unity feel any repugnance in forming a Uniat Church, keeping our own rites and canon law, in communion with the Pope?" (p. 14). He admits that he "should not hesitate for an instant." He asserts that, "granting certain premises, no question of principle would be involved," and dangles before us, as an incentive to accept, the possibility that "we and the Uniats might form common ground for a *rapprochement* of Rome and Constantinople" (p. 14). This means that, when we have bent our necks beneath the same spiritual despotism, which he admits the Uniats are feeling, we, with other vassals of Rome, will then be in a better position to induce the Orthodox Church to do likewise. The fable of the fox who had lost his tail occurs to our minds.

¹ Bell wrongly renders "Roman Catholic representatives." (They were not "representatives." The French is "*présents*.")

Less partisan accounts of the Uniat, and supported by authorities, are given in Margaret Dampier's *Orthodox Church in Austria* (London, 1905, p. 47), Kattenbusch's *Unierte Orientalen*, Herzog's *Real Encyclopædie*, 3rd ed., and various articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

Ever since the fall of the Greek empire, the popes have tried to get the oriental Churches to submit to their jurisdiction. In some places they succeeded in inducing Greek communities to submit to their claims, by granting them many privileges, and by allowing them to retain their own rites, liturgies, wives and beards. These are called Uniat Churches, being in absolute dependence on the Pope. The individuality of these dismembered Churches, thus taken away from their own Orthodox Church, was gradually effaced, while those who would not accept the Union, like many of the Roumanians, were harshly treated. In 1700, the Roumanian Church of Transylvania was united with Rome, the emperor offering to set those who accepted free of taxation. In that Act of Union the bishop, arch-priests, and clergy of the Roumanian Church in Transylvania bound themselves "to accept, acknowledge, and believe all that Rome accepts, acknowledges and believes." "We desire," they said, "to be reckoned members of the same Church." Is the *Anglicana Ecclesia* to be forced by Anglican bishops or their emissaries into making this submission to Rome, into becoming Roman Catholic? For to become a Uniat is the same as becoming Roman Catholic. The Transylvanian primate Athanasius, who effected this union in 1700, doubtless a polished gentleman, was a perjured traitor; but he was well rewarded by Rome. Many of the Roumanians who have been forced against their will into the Union were Protestants. It may doubtless give joy to some to look forward to the time when they will have a Roman Catholic theologian, a "causarum generalis auditor," attending the conferences and synods of the Anglican Uniat Church; and when a Uniat Archbishop of Canterbury will be forbidden to correspond with a non-Uniat Archbishop of Armagh, just as the Roumanian Archbishop is forbidden to correspond with the Greek or Serbian bishops (Dampier, p. 49).

Is all this beside the question? Should anyone think so, let him read the Encyclical letter of Pope Pius XI (1923), printed among Dr. Bell's *Documents on Christian Unity* (Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. 32-48), and which contains eleven pages of eulogy of St. Josaphat, who devoted himself to the work of making his countrymen submit to the supremacy and enter "the one fold" (p. 35). (The infallible Roman Catholic will persist in this erroneous translation. It seems that the Greek Testament is "tabu" with them. The words of our Lord are "one flock," not "one fold," John x. 16.) To St. Josaphat himself, who proselytised so successfully for Rome, the Pope makes a long prayer, and asks the assistance of his prayers for the furtherance of this union with the papal see. This document at any rate serves the purpose of showing what great honours—canonisation and the prayers of

popes—await those who labour to make their countrymen members of a Roman Uniate Church.

This encyclical is followed by that of the Patriarch of Constantinople complaining of these very proselytising efforts of the Roman Church among the members of the Greek Church. "No one ignores what is taking place even now, disturbing the internal peace of the Churches, and especially those in the East, on which new afflictions and trials are thus brought through their own co-religionists" (p. 45). When the Anglican Church has been made a Uniate Church, it may not feel much pressure at first; but it will in the course of time. It all depends upon the moving spirit of the *Curia*. And it is possible that a spirit may break out at any time with a distinctly hostile pressure, squeezing those who will not submit, even out of their native land.

In an article on the Uniat Churches in Chambers's *Encyclopædia* we read, "when circumstances permitted, more stringent rules were imposed." "The Union, as the pact is styled, is not uniform in aught else but the unremitting efforts of the Propaganda to efface the individuality of these dismembered churches."

For example, Pope Pius IX in 1862 established a special congregation at Rome (*de propaganda fide pro negotiis ritus orientalis*) for settling the affairs of the Greek Christians. He began to interfere in a Romanising manner with the rites of the Armenians and Chaldeans by his Bull "Reversurus," 1867, and his intolerance brought about a schism. Leo XIII in 1894 adopted milder methods, only requiring a full and perfect union in the faith, and going so far as to recognise three patriarchs of Antioch.

But Pius IX's methods may be revived at any time, as one pope does not feel bound by another pope's arrangements.

Therefore, instead of joining the number of these flabby Uniat Churches, whose soul is in the safe keeping of the Pope, now when it is suggested that the times are favourable for the Anglicans and that the Pope may write another letter permitting these conversations to be resumed in some other place, and under some other cover, we should make a common stand with other Christians who are struggling for their religious liberty with the common enemy of spiritual freedom, Bible Societies and Protestant Churches and organisations.

Those Anglicans who are working to bring us into the servile condition of the Uniate Churches can hardly, with sincerity, lay this flattering fiction to their souls that they are "setting a great example of Christian humility and making a real sacrifice for the sake of unity" (Report, p. 16); when they are but following, no doubt unconsciously, the example of Athanasius—not the Saint, but the Transylvanian primate—who solemnly swore before the Patriarch of Jerusalem to maintain the ancient liberties of the Transylvanian Church (1698), and when securely in his See, proceeded to carry out unification with Rome at the Synod of Karlsburg (1700). They themselves know what sacrifices they are making and that such sophisms are easily exposed. Every one who

reads her books and decrees must see, unless he is blind, and hear unless he is deaf, and understand unless he is a fool, that the Roman Catholic Church holds as an article of faith that submission to the authority of the infallible Pope is essential to membership of the Christian Church. She stands there, holding out her arms and saying : " Come unto me all ye that are wandering in the wilderness of Protestantism ; my poor sheep that I had to drive out from the Unity of the Faith for the good of your souls. Return, and I will give you rest. Your brain, restless through freedom of private judgment, will be set free from that freedom. Your souls stained with the sin of apostasy will be purged and redeemed from the sinful, sorrowful past, and will have the assurance of that salvation which I alone can bestow."

That is the attitude of that bishop who claims to be the " universal bishop." When that claim of being " œcumenical bishop " was first made by John, Patriarch of Constantinople, 585, Gregory the Great said of him : " Whosoever calls himself a universal bishop is by his own choice the precursor of anti-Christ," and himself declined the title.

We can have no reunion with Rome until she has withdrawn her claims of supremacy and infallibility based on erroneous interpretation of Scripture and false decretals, and has reformed her methods. We acknowledge no earthly headship of universal Christendom. That, as Dr. Swete said, " would be equally subversive of peace and liberty, whether it had its seat at Constantinople, or Canterbury, or Moscow, or Rome. Such an endeavour can only end in a speedy failure or in the creation of a spiritual autocracy."

Our last reunion with Rome, in 1554, cost us over 300 martyrs—an Archbishop of Canterbury among them—and a great scholar to boot. We can only be reunited with her when she has changed her heart and methods and ceases to interfere in the affairs of the nations ; as she did in Ireland during the Great War, putting her ban upon conscription.

Finally, the question arises, " Will Rome last for ever ? " Will she eventually dominate the world, or will the advance of humanity, knowledge, freedom and Christianity in the various countries now unhappily under her sway, sweep her power away ? Will Rome, the persecuting Church that has attained her present power not by the charity and hospitality of the early centuries, but by the cruelty and craft of later times, be superseded by a Church that will be truly catholic, that will be characterised by faith, love and truth, a Church that will recognise but one Head—Christ, and will permit no bishop to usurp the title of His Vicar, but in which every one who loves the Lord Jesus in sincerity and truth, may find a home for his spirit and a rest for his soul ? 'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wish'd, for in such a Church there would be a bond of spiritual union stronger than death and unbreakable, because formed by love, which is " more precious than knowledge, more illustrious than prophecy, and more excellent than all other gifts " (Irenæus),

and such a Church would be both universal and spiritual, as Irenaeus sang again, "The Glorious Church is everywhere, because they who receive the Spirit are everywhere."¹

Out of this incident in the drama of Christian diplomacy the papacy emerges with increased dignity. Although not a friend of the Church of England, it acted the part of a friendly power in ordering the cessation of conversations which, on one side, savoured of disloyal intrigue.

OLD TREASURE. By the Earl of Lytton. *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.

This is an Anthology of passages from the Bible, including some from the Apocrypha. It is designed to be read consecutively, and it has a definite aim. The aim is to illustrate from the Bible the Love of God as revealed in Nature as well in direct communication with His chosen ones.

The compiler has—wisely and rightly for his purpose—allowed himself freedom in using the A.V., or the Prayer Book version (in the case of the Psalms), or even in some cases other versions of his choice. Many no doubt would dispute the assumption that some parts of the Bible contradict others and that therefore some parts are to be discarded. But no one can find fault with this selection of passages, all of which speak in living tones of love and power to human hearts. The books chiefly drawn upon are Job, Psalms, Isaiah and the Gospels. Apart from its intrinsic merits many will value this compilation on account of Lord Lytton's personality. It is interesting to have such a beautiful appraisal of Holy Scripture from so distinguished a statesman and administrator.

GRACE DARLING. By Constance Smedley. *R.T.S.* 1s. 6d. net.

This account of Grace Darling contains nearly 200 pages of very readable narrative. It was written for Elizabeth Ann Collett, granddaughter of the ex-Lord Mayor of London. It is a story worth telling and worth reading, and is a remarkably cheap production.

CIVILISATION AND THE UNEMPLOYED. By A. M. Cameron, M.A. *Student Christian Movement.* 3s. 6d. net.

It is easier to engage in practical work amongst the unemployed than to write in a satisfactory way about the problem of Unemployment. Miss Cameron has devoted much time and attention to it, and in this book she records her experiences and makes many suggestions. Social workers will find much to think about, much to be thankful for, and doubtless some statements and assumptions from which they will dissent.

¹ *Irenaeus of Lugdunum* (Cambridge University Press), by F. R. M. Hitchcock, pp. 246 f.