

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

to repeat that the existence of discrepancies and inaccuracies is not denied. What is denied is that the correct explanation of them is given by the German school of criticism. We have no right to draw conclusions so large from premises infinitesimally small. No one wishes to deny that additions may possibly have been made in later times to the Mosaic institutions; no one insists any longer that the law of tithe laid down in Deuteronomy cannot have been subsequently modified. What we contend is, that a few discrepancies like these, backed up by a few arguments *ex silentio*, and a few suggestions of improbabilities, do not afford a sufficient foundation for the sweeping conclusions which have been drawn from them as to Deuteronomic and post-exilic falsifications—I regret the word, but no other will express the truth—of the facts, in the interests of a religious party.

P.S.—In a postscript to my paper of January, 1898, on “The Authorship of the Pentateuch,” I find my frequently treacherous memory has betrayed me into a slip. I inadvertently substituted JE for P as the author of whom the phrase “Paddan-Aram” is characteristic. The mistake only slightly affects the argument. JE, of course, could not possibly have had access to the cuneiform inscriptions, and could not, therefore, have used them in his narrative, as it is suggested the post-exilic writers did. P, on the contrary, might possibly have studied them; but it would be a strange anachronism, supposing him to have done so, to credit him with displaying the rare insight and scrupulous accuracy in dealing with his authorities which is sometimes, though not by any means invariably, found in a modern scholar, with the fear of the critics before him.

J. J. LIAS.



ART. II.—A ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

THERE is nothing more surprising, and therefore more worthy of consideration by the historical and ecclesiastical student, than the reaction in favour of Romanism, or the counter-Reformation, as it has been called, in Germany as well as in the Latin nations, at the end of the sixteenth century. The chief agent in the work was the Society of Jesus. And what were the means which these clever workers selected for carrying out their purpose—a purpose which they did carry out so successfully and effectually? Those who desire to

know this should turn to Ranke's "History of the Popes," vol. ii., English translation. There, and in other records of the time, they will find that the measures differed according to the countries. In Spain and Italy, where Philip II. and Pope Caraffa ruled, the Inquisition was all-sufficient. By fire, by confiscation, by exile, by torture, by remorseless and inflexible severity, Protestant opinions, which had grown up with extraordinary vigour, were crushed or burnt out, and a basis of operation being thus secured, the Papacy planted its feet upon the two peninsulas, and lifted itself up for its gigantic struggle to win back Europe to its sway. In that struggle it was at first unexpectedly successful, and the tide of Protestantism was driven back from the Alps and the Pyrenees to the shores of the Baltic. But among Teutonic nations the Inquisition could not be relied on as an adequate instrument. Teutons, even when they used it, could not be trusted to use it with a sufficiently unbending rigour. Something else was needed. What? The disciples of Loyola answered, Catholic colleges and universities.

They began at Vienna; Bishop Urban of Laybach was confessor of Ferdinand I. Beating about for a means of restoring Romanism, he came across the Jesuit Le Jay, and heard from him of the scheme devised by the Society of establishing Catholic colleges, and also possibly universities, as a means of propagating and restoring what they called Catholicism. Urban advised his Imperial penitent to establish such a college at Vienna.

"Ferdinand eagerly embraced the project, and in the letter he addressed on the subject to Ignatius Loyola, he expresses his conviction that the only means of preserving the declining cause of Catholicism in Germany was to give the rising generation learned and pious Catholic teachers. The arrangements were quickly made. In the year 1551 thirteen Jesuits, among whom was Le Jay himself, arrived at Vienna, where Ferdinand instantly granted them a dwelling, chapel, and stipend, and shortly after incorporated them with the university, and assigned them the superintendence of it" (Ranke, ii. 26).

Next they proceeded to Cologne, where by flattery of the burghers they got possession of the endowed school, established under a Protestant regent. They willingly accepted considerable restrictions in order to prevail on the city to entrust the school to them, and those restrictions were as effective as such restrictions always are.

In the same year they established themselves at Ingolstadt, through the pressure of the Duke, who thought it necessary, after making concessions in favour of Protestants,

to give aid also to the rival faith. Under the Duke's patronage, they became a power in the university.

"From these three Metropolitan settlements the Jesuits now spread in all directions. From Vienna they immediately extended over the whole of the Austrian dominions. In 1556 Ferdinand I. removed some of them to Prague, and founded a school there, intended principally for the young nobility. . . . In Hungary Nicholas Olahus, Archbishop of Gran, at the time of the general decline of Catholicism in Hungary, perceived that the only hope of support for it was from the common people, who were not entirely alienated. But here also Catholic teachers were wanting. In order to form them he founded a College of Jesuits at Tyrnau in 1561, and gave them an allowance out of his own income, to which the Emperor Ferdinand added the grant of an abbey. . . . They were immediately after summoned to Moravia also. . . . Shortly after we find them likewise established at Brünn. From Cologne the Society spread over the whole of the Rhenish provinces. Six Jesuits were sent to the Archbishop of Trèves from Rome; the rest came from Cologne. They opened their college with great solemnity on February 3, 1561" (p. 28).

Next, a college was established in the University of Mayence, and a preparatory school at Aschaffenburg.

"The Society continued to advance higher up the Rhine. What they more particularly desired was an establishment at Spire, partly because the body of Assessors to the Kammergericht included so many remarkable men, over whom it would be of the greatest importance to obtain influence, and partly to place themselves in immediate and local opposition to the University of Heidelberg, which at that time enjoyed the greatest celebrity for its Protestant professors. The Jesuits gradually got a footing at Spire" (p. 31).

Their influence spread to Frankfort, to Würzburg, to Innsbruck, to Halle, to Munich. "In order to restore the University of Dillingen to its original purpose, Cardinal Truchsess resolved to dismiss all the Professors who then taught there, and to commit the institution to the exclusive care of Jesuits. In the year 1563 the Jesuits arrived in Dillingen and took possession of the chairs of the University."

"This was a most extraordinary progress of the Society in so short a time. As late as the year 1551 they had no firm station in Germany. In 1566 their influence extended over Bavaria and Tyrol, Franconia and Swabia, a great part of the Rhineland and Austria. They had penetrated into Hungary, Bohemia, and Moravia. The effects of their labours were already perceptible. In the year 1561 the Papal Nuncio

affirms that 'they gain over many souls, and render great service to the Holy See.' This was the first counteracting impulse, the first anti-Protestant impression that Germany received. Above all, they laboured at the improvement of the universities; they were ambitious of rivalling the fame of those of the Protestants. In Ingolstadt they soon persuaded themselves that they had attained an equality with any other university in Germany, at least in the faculty of theology. Ingolstadt acquired, in the contrary spirit, an influence like that which Wittenberg and Geneva had possessed" (p. 33).

The control of first and secondary schools came into their hands *as a consequence of their possessing universities*. The children were taught once more to observe the Roman Catholic fasts, to wear rosaries, to go on pilgrimages, and parents were affected by the enthusiasm of their children. Papal theology was revived in Germany, through the instrumentality of universities, with "a Catholic atmosphere."

The same thing occurred in Poland. In Braunsberg, in Pultusk, in Posen, in Wilna, Jesuit colleges were established, with similar results. For the conversion of England, colleges were established at Douay and at Rome, the means being supplied by Pope Gregory, Cardinal Allen, and leading Roman ecclesiastics. This led to the mission of Parsons and Campion to England, to the plots entered into against Elizabeth's life by seminary priests and their disciples, and the nearly successful attempt to overthrow Protestantism in England.

We see, then, that the method especially selected by the adversaries of the Reformation in order to resist and overthrow it was the institution of Roman Catholic universities and colleges with "a Catholic atmosphere"; and that this means did succeed in rolling back Protestantism from the greater part of Germany and other Continental countries which had embraced it, and that it led to the troubles and attempted assassinations in Elizabeth's reign, arising from the devout and fanatical teaching of the seminary priests.

But at least these universities and colleges were established by Roman Catholic money and Roman Catholic patrons. Is it not something like madness on the part of England to propose to establish a Roman Catholic University in Ireland with "a Catholic atmosphere"—*not* with Roman Catholic money, but our own—unless our purpose and desire is to overthrow Protestantism in favour of the rival Papal Church in Ireland?

That there are advocates of the scheme who have no such purpose in their minds we know well. There are politicians who, untaught by many disappointments, still believe that they can remove "the last grievance" of Ireland, and imagine

that the effect of the concession would be that "union of hearts" which can never exist as long as Rome has dominant sway in Ireland, and which will only be delayed and prevented by strengthening the hands of the Roman Church in that island. It is true, too, that it is advocated by organs of opinion such as the *Guardian* and the *Spectator*, but it is notorious that the *Guardian* is least to be trusted where the interests of Rome are concerned, and the *Spectator's* Liberalism makes it occasionally shut its eyes to the consequences of encouraging any form of opinion. It is well known likewise that Roman Catholic sentiment finds more than its proportionate expression in many of our weekly and daily papers. Hereafter there may be an even larger supply of writers educated in "a Catholic atmosphere," who will make their living by journalistic writing as editors and sub-editors of apparently Protestant periodicals.

It will be said, "Are you afraid, then, in behalf of Protestantism, of a Roman Catholic University, and is not this a shameful confession?" We are not afraid of it, but is it not altogether unreasonable to provide our adversaries with the weapons that they most desire, and which they have elsewhere used so successfully? We are not afraid of the Russian arms in China, but what sort of policy would it be to build their railways with our money in order to bring their soldiers across the Continent without expense to them? We are not afraid of the French, but what wise man would have built them a powerful fort at Fashoda, and put them in possession of it with the view of soothing their exasperated feelings towards us? Chivalrous regard for an adversary's interests is not the principle on which a successful war can be carried on; and until Rome repudiates her exclusiveness, our relations with her must be those of war—a fact which neither politicians nor Romanisers recognise.

We ask, further, why Ireland should be specially favoured, and on what principle the English Roman Catholic gentry have not as great a right to demand a university with "a Catholic atmosphere" as the Irish gentry. Is not the atmosphere of Oxford and Cambridge as dangerous to Roman Catholic students as that of Trinity College, Dublin, or as that of Queen's College, at which there are so many Roman Catholics even now present? As soon as the Irish University is established and endowed, the claim will no doubt be made for an English University, and how could it be consistently resisted? We may trust Cardinal Vaughan not to forget the arguments which Protestant politicians and journalists are gratuitously providing him with.

To say, as has been said, that Irishmen have a special

right to a Roman Catholic University because "there are nearly three Roman Catholics in that country to one Protestant" is a fallacy of statistics. For what class is a University intended and adapted? Not the labouring class, not the car-drivers, not the little shopkeepers, but the gentry and professional men. Strike off all the lowest and lower-middle classes from both sides, and the remainder would stand in a very different relation to each other than three to one. The Irish gentry are for the most part Protestant, not Roman Catholic; and the Irish aspirants to a university training in "a Catholic atmosphere" have no greater claim to it than their English co-religionists—and the English claim would be pressed so soon as the Irish were satisfied.

The Press informs us that Pope Leo XIII. has sent £16,000 to England to establish a college (probably hereafter to be affiliated to the Irish University) in which converts among the clergy of the Church of England may be received and maintained and instructed. If the Pope thinks well to employ his vast resources in instituting Roman Catholic collegiate institutions in Ireland also, he can consistently do so. But that Protestant England should erect his University for him, thus enabling him to use his funds for proselytizing purposes in England, as well as supplying him with agents to carry them out, is unreasonable in itself, and a thing which we are confident that public opinion will not endure without quickly avenging itself on the authors of the scheme.

At a meeting of the "Roman Catholic Reunion" held in Birmingham various Roman Catholic dignitaries assembled, among whom was an "Archbishop, of the Order of St. Benedict," and speeches were made in favour of the proposal. In the report of the meeting we read that the "Bishop of Clifton" made the chief address, his first argument being "that Lord Kitchener had obtained approval for a Mohammedan College for Khartoum in the Soudan, because the people were Mohammedans, and he thought the same argument would apply to Ireland." Let us examine the argument—which by the way appears to have been borrowed from the *Guardian* newspaper. Let the Irish Roman Catholics be treated, says the Bishop, like the Soudanese Mohammedans. Very good. What is to be the character of the teaching in the Soudanese College? Religion is to be entirely excluded from it. Let it, then, be excluded from the Irish College and University. Proselytism is impossible in it, for there will be no students but Mohammedans. But Irish bishops, having formed their "Catholic atmosphere" will invite, not to say bribe, Protestant students into it; and they represent themselves as so singularly "liberal" by doing so

that the effect of the concession would be that "union of hearts" which can never exist as long as Rome has dominant sway in Ireland, and which will only be delayed and prevented by strengthening the hands of the Roman Church in that island. It is true, too, that it is advocated by organs of opinion such as the *Guardian* and the *Spectator*, but it is notorious that the *Guardian* is least to be trusted where the interests of Rome are concerned, and the *Spectator's* Liberalism makes it occasionally shut its eyes to the consequences of encouraging any form of opinion. It is well known likewise that Roman Catholic sentiment finds more than its proportionate expression in many of our weekly and daily papers. Hereafter there may be an even larger supply of writers educated in "a Catholic atmosphere," who will make their living by journalistic writing as editors and sub-editors of apparently Protestant periodicals.

It will be said, "Are you afraid, then, in behalf of Protestantism, of a Roman Catholic University, and is not this a shameful confession?" We are not afraid of it, but is it not altogether unreasonable to provide our adversaries with the weapons that they most desire, and which they have elsewhere used so successfully? We are not afraid of the Russian arms in China, but what sort of policy would it be to build their railways with our money in order to bring their soldiers across the Continent without expense to them? We are not afraid of the French, but what wise man would have built them a powerful fort at Fashoda, and put them in possession of it with the view of soothing their exasperated feelings towards us? Chivalrous regard for an adversary's interests is not the principle on which a successful war can be carried on; and until Rome repudiates her exclusiveness, our relations with her must be those of war—a fact which neither politicians nor Romanisers recognise.

We ask, further, why Ireland should be specially favoured, and on what principle the English Roman Catholic gentry have not as great a right to demand a university with "a Catholic atmosphere" as the Irish gentry. Is not the atmosphere of Oxford and Cambridge as dangerous to Roman Catholic students as that of Trinity College, Dublin, or as that of Queen's College, at which there are so many Roman Catholics even now present? As soon as the Irish University is established and endowed, the claim will no doubt be made for an English University, and how could it be consistently resisted? We may trust Cardinal Vaughan not to forget the arguments which Protestant politicians and journalists are gratuitously providing him with.

To say, as has been said, that Irishmen have a special

right to a Roman Catholic University because "there are nearly three Roman Catholics in that country to one Protestant" is a fallacy of statistics. For what class is a University intended and adapted? Not the labouring class, not the car-drivers, not the little shopkeepers, but the gentry and professional men. Strike off all the lowest and lower-middle classes from both sides, and the remainder would stand in a very different relation to each other than three to one. The Irish gentry are for the most part Protestant, not Roman Catholic; and the Irish aspirants to a university training in "a Catholic atmosphere" have no greater claim to it than their English co-religionists—and the English claim would be pressed so soon as the Irish were satisfied.

The Press informs us that Pope Leo XIII. has sent £16,000 to England to establish a college (probably hereafter to be affiliated to the Irish University) in which converts among the clergy of the Church of England may be received and maintained and instructed. If the Pope thinks well to employ his vast resources in instituting Roman Catholic collegiate institutions in Ireland also, he can consistently do so. But that Protestant England should erect his University for him, thus enabling him to use his funds for proselytizing purposes in England, as well as supplying him with agents to carry them out, is unreasonable in itself, and a thing which we are confident that public opinion will not endure without quickly avenging itself on the authors of the scheme.

At a meeting of the "Roman Catholic Reunion" held in Birmingham various Roman Catholic dignitaries assembled, among whom was an "Archbishop, of the Order of St. Benedict," and speeches were made in favour of the proposal. In the report of the meeting we read that the "Bishop of Clifton" made the chief address, his first argument being "that Lord Kitchener had obtained approval for a Mohammedan College for Khartoum in the Soudan, because the people were Mohammedans, and he thought the same argument would apply to Ireland." Let us examine the argument—which by the way appears to have been borrowed from the *Guardian* newspaper. Let the Irish Roman Catholics be treated, says the Bishop, like the Soudanese Mohammedans. Very good. What is to be the character of the teaching in the Soudanese College? Religion is to be entirely excluded from it. Let it, then, be excluded from the Irish College and University. Proselytism is impossible in it, for there will be no students but Mohammedans. But Irish bishops, having formed their "Catholic atmosphere" will invite, not to say bribe, Protestant students into it; and they represent themselves as so singularly "liberal" by doing so

that no politician or public opinion can object, whereas it is in fact giving them the very position for affecting young men's minds, the very $\pi\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\tau\hat{\omega}$, that they seek and cannot now obtain. Further, how did Lord Kitchener obtain the money for the establishment of the College? Was it from our taxes? No; but by an appeal to those who were willing to give. Let the "Bishop of Clifton" and his friends employ the same means. Let them appeal to their wealthy fellow-religionists who are spending their money on "Catholic cathedrals" and "Catholic schools" and other "Catholic" agencies in England. Let them appeal to the Pope for another grant from his inexhaustible Peter's Pence, out of which he sent the other day £16,000 to be employed in proselytizing endeavours among the English clergy. Did Kitchener knock at the door of every tax-payer in England, and say, "You shall give me your hard-earned money for the propagation of Mohammedanism"? He would not be the popular man that he now is had he done so. Politicians hardly understand that this is a matter which touches consciences. We should not be surprised to find that there were not a few hitherto quiet citizens who would refuse to pay taxes part of the product of which was to be expended on propagating Popery in the British Isles.

An important pronouncement has been made by Mr. Balfour. In his letter of January 23 he urges, with his wonted talent and persuasiveness, the unhappy idea which he has taken up. Mr. Balfour is deservedly one of the most popular men in England; he must take care lest the fly that he has admitted into the pot of ointment should make the whole of it lose its savour in his countrymen's estimation. On the present occasion he proposes to buy off Ulster and Nonconformist opposition by offering Belfast a University similar in character to that of his intended Dublin University, but Presbyterian instead of Roman Catholic. We trust and we believe that Ulster will not accept the boon at such a price. If they should do so, they would show that they are degenerate indeed as compared with those Nonconformists who nobly refused the offers of James II., which were made, not for love of them, but to enable concession to be made to Romanists. The restrictions proposed by Mr. Balfour, while they are intended to soften Protestant opposition, are exactly those which shrewd Roman Catholics might themselves have suggested, and probably did suggest. "No public endowment would be given to chairs in philosophy, theology, or modern history." Then the only safeguard against disloyal and Ultramontane teaching would be removed. If the Crown endowed, the Crown might nominate the professors. If the

Pope and his prelates, directed by the Jesuits, nominate, we may imagine the character of the teaching on the History of Queen Elizabeth, or the Battle of the Boyne, or the relation of Ireland to England, or the Temporal Power of the Pope, or the Reformation; and having created our Frankenstein monster, we could neither control nor dismiss him. And then the other "restriction," that "All scholarships paid out of public funds would be open to competition irrespective of creed," would have tempted clever young Protestant boys to put themselves under and drink in the principles of Jesuit theology from men who never spare the waxen temperament of youth. Could anything be more satisfactory to the long-headed directors of the Vatican? *Hoc Ithacus velit et magno mercentur Atridæ*. And even this is not all; for the Irish bishops, having found that they have only to say *Non possumus*, to make politicians submit to their claims, would make further demands at the last moment, on the threat of otherwise withdrawing their students, and the opportunist Ministry of the day would be obliged to yield. We are again putting the yoke of Papal authority on our necks. Whether Mr. Balfour's scheme is to be accepted or rejected is, at the moment we write, being submitted to a foreign potentate. Will Englishmen bear that?

Mr. Balfour tells us that if we refuse a Romish University we shall lay ourselves open to "the taunt that, in the judgment of Protestants themselves, Protestantism has something to fear from the spread of knowledge." It is not spread of knowledge that we fear, but the spread of false teaching which overlays truth with error, and so is the contradictory of sound knowledge, making young minds incapable of accepting truth because preoccupied with its phantom and parody, and unwilling to think or know because thought and knowledge are tabooed by authority which they are day by day instructed to regard as infallible. We do not prove ourselves afraid of the effects of dynamite rightly employed because we decline to gratuitously supply it to men bound by oath to seize every opportunity for blowing up our most cherished institutions.¹ Nor, if we wish to advance thought, shall we drill and arm those who forbid thinking except in their own way, which we hold to be, if not negation of thought, incompatible with

¹ Roman Catholic bishops take this oath at the most solemn moment of their life: "Hæreticos omnes, schismaticos, et rebelles eidem Domino nostro (Papæ) vel successoribus *pro posse persequar et impugnabo*" ("Rom. Pont.," p. 63; edit. 1818)—"I will take vengeance on and assail all heretics, schismatics, and rebels against our Lord Pope and his successors." English and Irish Protestants are in the estimation of these bishops heretics, schismatics, and rebels against the Lord Pope.

freedom and with loyalty and with truth. Is it come to this, that our money, drawn from us by taxes, is to be used for bribing young Irishmen into lecture-rooms where they will hear that Elizabeth was a bastard and a heretic, that James II. was the lawful king after 1688, that Usher, Bramhall, Taylor, and other Irish Churchmen ought to have been burnt as Cranmer and Latimer and Ridley were burnt, and that if the Pope tells them to do so, they are bound to revolt from Queen Victoria, and place upon her throne whoever may be the Papal nominee? We do not believe that the scheme will be realized, but reputations may be lost over it and Ministries wrecked.

F. MEYRICK.



ART. III.—THE PRAYER-BOOK MEANING OF THE WORD “REGENERATION.”

IT may seem a somewhat bold thing in these days to call attention to the question of the meaning of the word “regeneration” as used in the Book of Common Prayer, and as bearing upon the interpretation of the baptismal services. The venture is made, however, as a matter of conviction, and also because it is felt that Churchmen of Reformation principles have not always sufficiently given that calm consideration to the meaning of the word as used in our Prayer-Book which it undoubtedly demands. “A vague and inaccurate use of words,” it has been said, “often engenders rash opinions, and leads to mischievous consequences.” And “the judicious Hooker” reminds us that “the mixture of those things by speech which by Nature are divided is the mother of all error. To take away, therefore, that error which confusion breedeth distinction is necessary.” The necessity for the caution is, we think, exemplified in the case of the word “regeneration.” There is undoubtedly an ambiguity in the word itself. Men have fixed a meaning, or meanings, upon it, and interpreted the Prayer-Book by the light of those meanings, instead of ascertaining that the sense in which they use the word corresponds with its use in the Book of Common Prayer. It may not, therefore, be a useless task just to try and indicate what has, of course, been pointed out before, and at much greater length, as to the meaning of the Church of England in her use of the word “regeneration.” That it is a point which presents certain difficulties is an acknowledged fact; but the existence of difficulties, or even of differences of opinion, should not prevent investigation if entered upon in