

The Church Guardian

— : EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR : —

L. H. DAVIDSON, Q.C., D.C.L., MONTREAL

Address Correspondence and Communications to the
Editor, P. O. Box 504, Montreal. Exchanges to
P. O. Box 2168. For Business Announcements See page 16.

CALENDAR FOR DECEMBER.

DEC. 2—First Sunday in Advent.

" 9—Second Sunday in Advent.

" 16—Third Sunday in Advent. [*Notice of
Ember Days and St. Thomas.*]

" 19—EMBER DAY.

" 21—ST. THOMAS. A. & M. Ember Day.

" 22—EMBER DAY.

" 23—Fourth Sunday in Advent. [*Notice of
Christmas Day, St. Stephen, St.
John and Innocents' Day.*]

" 25—CHRISTMAS DAY. [Pr. Ps. M. 19, 45,
85. E. 89, 110, 132. Athan. Cr.
Pr. Prof. in C. Ser. till Jan. 1, inc.]

" 26—ST. STEPHEN, the first martyr.

" 27—ST. JOHN. Ap. and Evang.

" 28—INNOCENTS' DAY.

" 30—First Sunday after Christmas.
[*Notice of Circumcision.*]

THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER'S REPLY TO CARDINAL VAUGHAN.

At the opening of the last Diocesan Conference, the Lord Bishop (Rt. Rev. Dr. Moorhouse) in his inaugural address, is reported by the *Manchester Courier* to have spoken as follows:

It has pleased Cardinal Vaughan, in an address delivered in this diocese upon the reunion of Christendom, to attack the English Church, and to affirm that the only possible condition of Christian reunion is unconditional submission to the Roman see. There is no need for me to say much about the Cardinal's attempt to belittle the Church of England. He describes the Church of England as "confined to one race, and to a land walled round by the sea." This is not true, if even the Church of England be spoken of in its narrowest sense. It is the Church of England, and no other, which exists by name, and, in fact, in a continent nearly as large as Europe, Australia, and in our vast possessions in North America. It is the Church of England, and none other, which is spreading its missions so rapidly in India, in China, in Africa, and in every part of the earth. And if we speak of that larger body which sent its 145 Bishops to the last Lambeth Conference, and which describes itself as "in full communion with the Church of England," we must add to all these the Churches of the Anglican communion in the United States of America. It was, surely, in a moment of strange forgetfulness that Cardinal Vaughan described all these Churches as "confined to one race, and to a land walled round by the sea."

But however large a communion this may be, however distinguished for its numbers, its extent, its labours and its learning, the Cardinal could still, no doubt, ask about it the question, "Who would direct the inquirer to Canterbury as the city of the living God, built upon the hill?" Of course, in the Cardinal's lips, this means "as exclusively the city of God built upon the hill." And in answer to that question I reply, Certainly we of the English Church should give no such direction. We do not be-

lieve that the Anglican Church, or the Roman Church, or the Greek Church, or any other Church is identical with the Catholic Church of Christ. No one of us would take St. Augustine to mean by the Church, as the Cardinal takes him to mean, the Church of Rome; nor should we dream of advancing such a claim for the Church of England. To do so would be to assume the very conclusion which is to be proved. And it is precisely upon that conclusion, upon that claim of the Church of Rome, involving, as it does, those other claims, that salvation can not be assured in any other communion, and that reunion can only be effected by submission to the Roman pontiff, that I desire to say a few words to you to-day.

Let us distinctly understand, in the first place, what the Roman claim amounts to. It is not merely the claim that Rome is "the mother and mistress of Churches" by their own consent, or by virtue of the decrees of any general council, but, as the language of Pope Leo in respect to the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon has made clearly apparent, because the Bishops of Rome, as the successors of St. Peter, have an inherent right to universal supremacy in virtue of their office. Thus the Roman Church holds, for instance, that the last Vatican Council had no other office than to declare a fact previously existing. That council did not make the Pope infallible under specified conditions; it only pronounced that he already was so in virtue of his office. To establish the Roman claim, then, it must be shown, not only that St. Peter was infallible, and that he taught and died in Rome, but that, first, he was Bishop of Rome; that, secondly, his prerogative of infallibility was held by him as Bishop, and not merely as apostle; and that, thirdly, his infallibility was in such sort attached to his office that it descended necessarily to all his successors in the Roman see. It is idle to tell us that St. Peter taught and died in Rome. Many learned Protestants admit that. It must further be shown that all the propositions which I have mentioned can be established. A chain is no stronger than its weakest link, and, if any of the three links I have mentioned should snap, the claim will have no reasonable foundation.

No one denies that the Catholic Church had power, in order to adapt her administration to the varying needs of the world, to create such offices as those of Metropolitan and Patriarch. She did create such offices; but we hold that they were of her creation, and that history shows clearly what was the motive of her action. The first three General Councils, in determining the precedence of existing patriarchs, clearly reveal to us this motive. The Council of Nicaea decreed as follows: "The old custom in use in Egypt, in Libya, and in Pentapolis should continue to exist,—that is, that the Bishop of Alexandria should have jurisdiction over all these (provinces), for there is a similar relation for the Bishop of Rome. The rights which they formerly possessed must also be preserved in regard to Antioch, and in the other eparchies." Here the well-known custom of the Roman patriarchate is cited as an illustration of the rule which is applied to Alexandria, Antioch, and other eparchies. We see, in this canon, that there is accorded to Rome (in the language of Professor Huxsey) "only the custom of precedence and priority of place, which was always willingly conceded, and would be so still if nothing more had been claimed."

Observe, however, in this Nicæan arrangement of precedence, that Alexandria is placed before Antioch. Now, how could this be, if that precedence depended on the inherent right of sees, and not on the appointment of the Church? The Roman writers allege that St. Peter founded the Church of Antioch, and that St. Mark, his disciple (however, under the possible direction of St. Peter), founded that of Alexandria. How comes it, then, that the Church of

the disciple is placed before that of the Master? The reason is obvious. Because Alexandria was the second city in the empire, and Antioch only the third. This principle of arrangement comes out even more evidently in the 3rd Canon of the Second General Council. "Let the Bishop of Constantinople have the precedence (*ta presbeia*); of honour after the Bishop of Rome, because it is New Rome." Ancient Byzantium was distinguished for nothing but its magnificent position and the democratic turbulence of its inhabitants. No one claimed for the Church there that it had been the seat of an apostle. And yet, because of its civic privileges, because Constantine had made it New Rome, and for no other reason, it obtained ecclesiastical precedence over the apostolic see of Antioch.

In the Third General Council the fathers of Chalcedon proceeded further. They declared that not only the see of Constantinople, but that the see of old Rome also obtained its ecclesiastical precedence on account of its civil position. The words of the 28th Canon relating to this matter are as follows: "Rightly have the fathers conceded to the see of old Rome its privileges on account of its character as the imperial city; and, moved by the same considerations, the one hundred and fifty bishops have awarded the like privileges to the most holy see of New Rome, judging, with good reason, that the city which is honoured by the imperial power and the senate, and which enjoys equal precedence with the elder imperial Rome, ought also to be magnified like it in ecclesiastical matters, holding the second place after it."

This decree, if admitted at Rome, would have entirely destroyed the principle upon which the Roman claims were founded, and, therefore, it is hardly wonderful that first the papal legates, and then Pope Leo, violently protested against it. If once it were admitted that ecclesiastical precedence was given to the Roman Bishop by the Church, and not determined by the inherent rights of his Episcopate, rights supposed to be derived from St. Peter, the vast edifice of Roman usurpation, already rising visibly above the ground, would be toppled down. Leo then immediately took up the position that "there is a difference between the secular and ecclesiastical order, and it is the apostolical origin of a Church, its being founded by an apostle, which gives it a right to a higher hierarchical rank." He even went so far as to say of the 28th Canon, to the Empress Pulcheria: "In union with the piety of your faith, I declare it to be invalid, and annul it by the authority of the holy apostle, Peter." This protest and assumption, however, notwithstanding, the Churches of the East held fast to the decree, and, though Rome clung long to her protest, at length, in the fourth Lateran Synod, A.D. 1215, she declared, in the 5th Canon of that Synod, that the precedence against which Pope Leo had protested should be granted to the Bishop of Constantinople.

I have thus endeavoured to show you, by the decrees of the three first General Councils, what was the real principle regulating the precedence of ancient bishoprics, including that of Rome. We are entirely in harmony with that principle. When the world consisted of a single empire, it was natural that, for convenience of administration, the Church should follow the civil divisions of that empire, placing Bishops in its cities, Metropolitans in its Provinces, and Patriarchs in such unions of provinces as might be most convenient. When, again, on the breaking up of the Roman Empire, the peoples of Europe established distinct nationalities, it was convenient, for the same reasons, that the lines of her organization should follow the national boundaries. It was thus that "the holy Church of England," as she is called in the pre-Reformation legislation of the Edwards, came into being, and obtained her own distinct rights and peculiarities.