

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

abound in mediæval literature ; besides, out of the thirty-three solecisms thirty are also in a MS. which they approve of. This was the Codex Gerardimontensis, which Gence, a follower of Gerson, takes as the text of his edition, and which agrees in almost everything with the Brussels MS. even to its contents. Gence claims it as the prototype from which the other is taken. Dr. Hirsche, however, points to the greater probability of its being the other way, as the majority of the works in both are indisputably those of Thomas à Kempis. As to the erasures and corrections, they are made by Thomas himself, and almost certainly such alterations as an author might make. Of course all this evidence would be of no avail if, as is asserted by the Gersonists, MSS. exist before the time of Thomas ; but as to this Dr. Hirsche has paid great attention, and points to the uncertainty of palæography in deciding the question, and these apparently older MSS. have been shown to have been of later date from including works undoubtedly written in the fifteenth century. Dr. Hirsche was unable to enter into the question of contemporary evidence, on which point we have the proofs advanced by Kettlewell and Cruise ; he has, however, done his best to prove to the unprejudiced reader that Thomas à Kempis is certainly the author of the "*Imitatio Christi*."

L. A. WHEATLEY.



ART. VI.—UNITY AND SCHISM.

IN the May number of the CHURCHMAN Chancellor Smith, writing on "*The National Church and Unity*," has criticised an article in the February number on "*The Catholic Church—Schism*." I think the Chancellor has somewhat misapprehended the article, and has sometimes expressed himself with ambiguity. I have not suggested that the external unity of the Church militant was a matter of indifference. On the contrary, I earnestly desire the mutual recognition and communion of all the visible Churches of Christ, their union, and the incorporation in one visible body of all members of the Mystical Body. For this object I pray and labour. I refer to "*The Three Churches*" in the CHURCHMAN, January, 1894. But I am unable to concur when the Chancellor, after stating that "*polychurchism*" is in the abstract unlawful, goes on to say, "*This reflection clearly imposes upon us the duty to eradicate all the causes which lead to its existence and promote its growth*." What! are we Anglicans to give up Episcopacy, which is the main cause of visible disunion with

the Church of Scotland? What! are we Anglicans to abandon the supremacy of Scripture—"that everlasting protest," as Archbishop Tait said, "by which in our Prayer-Book and Articles we point to Holy Scripture as the standard of truth"? And shall we rescind the protest of Articles vi., xi., xiv., xix., xxii., xxiv., xxv., xxviii., xxx., xxxii., xxxvii., which separate us from Rome? This is the aspiration of Lord Halifax. *Hoc Ithacus velit*. These suggestions must shock the loyalty of the Chancellor. I must add I regret the reference to the words of Ridley and Latimer in the days of Queen Mary, misleading if applied to justify union or communion with Rome, and, indeed, the answer is to be found in the next page (412) of "The National Church and Unity."

The critic quotes me as laying down "that physical schism is sinful when a man, in opposition to the voice of his conscience, abandons one ecclesiastical unit and resorts to another, but that it is not sinful when a man does so in obedience to the voice of his judgment and conscience." This, says the Chancellor, "can only be maintained on the footing that there are no such things as sins of ignorance," and my observations on Newman, Manning, and their associates are mentioned as cases in which I inconsistently stigmatized as schismatical men who may have been fully conscientious. This interpretation of my article (p. 232) is not accurate. I did not speak of ecclesiastical units *simpliciter*, such as the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches, the Greek and Roman bodies, but of congregations (*cætus*) which are and have the notes of visible Churches, and of congregations which do not possess these notes. I refuse to apply the ugly word "sinful" to the conduct of a man who, holding the Catholic faith, passes at the dictate of his conscience from one to another visible Church—I may view his *mistake* with regret—but I apply the word to members of a visible Church who wilfully and not ignorantly desert it against their conscience, and also to those who, whether ignorantly or not, pass over from a visible Church with the Bible in their hands to communion with a body which does not possess the notes of and is not a visible Church.

The Anglican Church, our Church, declares dogmatically that amongst the essential notes of a visible Church are the preaching of the pure Word of God and the due administration of the sacraments. These notes are wanting in Rome. I refer also to the Black Rubric and Articles xxx., xxxi. The guilt, however, in the latter case, whether a sin of ignorance or not, is in the adoption of impure doctrine, not the consequent act of separation, and so I understand St. John's condemnation to be directed against the anti-Christ, not because they went

out, but because they were anti-Christ, probably men who denied "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." It is well when anti-Christ leave a visible Church of Christ and go to their own place. When members of a congregation embrace false doctrine, whether sceptical or superstitious, and cannot or will not be persuaded to recant, the sooner they excommunicate themselves the better for the Church of Christ.

I do not think five pages was too much space for a discussion on the words "one Catholic Church." The question is one of supreme importance in itself, and in consequence of the confusion which arises from the ambiguous use of the word "Church" in theological papers. It is used in various significations by the Chancellor. The intention of my article was to prove that the reiterated precept by writers of the so-called High Church Party, "Hear the Church"—assigning to supposed human utterances authority co-ordinate or superior to that of Scripture—was erroneous and *absurd*, inasmuch as no Church exists with a voice to which such authority can be reasonably assigned. Such is not the Catholic Church, the mystical body of Christ, for that spiritual entity has no voice. Such is not the Church composed of all baptized persons; these are in no practical sense incorporated; neither they nor any majority of them have any collective or audible voice. Such is not any supposed combination or aggregate of all particular visible Churches (which Hooker recognises as in a sense one Church), for these have no concurrent voice or recognised organ of expression. The Lambeth Conference could not pretend to be their representative. Such is not any particular Church, nor does any particular Church claim such authority except on the assumption that it is not particular, but Catholic or Universal—an assumption intolerable to members of all the Reformed Churches. Where is the Church to instruct us with authority as to the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, and to establish that authority as equal or paramount to the Word of God?

For myself, I have searched in vain, and I can find no Church which is entitled to say, "Hear my voice," or to which my allegiance is due, except the particular Church of which I am a member, though there are other visible Churches which command my respect and consideration, and I concede that my Church has no claim upon the allegiance of members of any other visible Church.

I have said I heartily desire the unity of the Church. But no reasonable man can hope for union or communion between the Reformed Churches amongst themselves so long as Episcopacy and the doctrines of Apostolical Succession are alleged

to be "fundamental truths," *essential* to the existence of a Church; and not only union and communion, but recognitions as visible Churches of Christ, are denied to all who do not accept these doctrines; just as union with Rome is also impossible so long as the Reformed Churches hold Scripture as the rule of faith.

ROBERT R. WARREN.

Notes and Queries.

A RENDERING OF 1 CORINTHIANS XV. 23-28.

"BUT each one in his own rank. The firstfruits is Christ. Next are those who are Christ's at His coming. Then will be the end, as soon as He shall have resigned the kingly office to God, even the Father; as soon as the latter shall have made impotent all rule, both authority and power alike.

"For He must be King until God shall have set beneath His feet all enemies. Death is the last enemy to be made impotent. For God did place beneath His feet all things in subordination. Yet it is clear that whenever He shall say that all things are placed in that subordination, the all things are exclusive of Him Who made them subordinate.

"And as soon as ever all things shall be subordinate to Him, then the Son too shall become subordinate to Him Who made all things to Him subordinate, that God might be all in all."

H. J. N. MARSTON.

Review.

Degeneration. Translated from the German of Dr. MAX NORDAU.
London: Heinemann, 1895.

NEW books, at once so bulky and so prolix, have attracted more attention in recent years than the remarkable volume lying before us. No doubt the very title of the work is responsible, in some measure, for the widespread interest it has excited; and the subject, which that title indicates, is of itself a stimulating one, for the public is very curious to learn new facts and indulge in various speculations upon its own diseases, whether physical or mental and moral, and to gossip glibly thereon. But the main interest of Max Nordau's work is something more than this. It is a sincere and honest attempt to lay bare, not in any spirit of prurieny, but decidedly and vigorously, some of those "streams of tendency *not* making for righteousness" which are flowing so foully and so unrestrained through the strata of contemporary thought. The book is often unjust, and the writer's opinions are often curiously wrong-headed and inconsequent (not seldom exasperatingly inconsistent); but of its real sanity and cleanness there can be no shadow of doubt.

It is written throughout with admirable vigour and directness, and