# APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION AND THE PROBLEM OF UNITY

McCRADY

Class BV665
Book .M33
Copyright No.

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

# Apostolic Succession and the Problem of Unity

# Apostolic Succession and the Problem of Unity

By the Reverend
Edward McCrady
*Rector of Grace Church,*
*Canton, Mississippi*

The University Press of
Sewanee Tennessee 1905

BV665
.M33

LIBRARY of CONGRESS
Two Copies Received
DEC 26 1905
Copyright Entry
Oct. 23. 1905
CLASS a XXc. No.
130412
COPY B.

Copyrighted 1905
By
EDWARD McCRADY

rec'd. WBW 10 D 43

# The Lambeth Articles

I

The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the ultimate rule and standard of faith.

II

The Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

III

The two sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

IV

The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration, to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called by God into the Unity of His Church.

# Contents

I

THE PROBLEM STATED

II

MEMBERSHIP IN THE CHURCH CATHOLIC

III

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON THE SUCCESSION

(A) ARTICLES AND FORMULARIES

(B) ACTS OF PARLIAMENT

(C) TESTIMONY OF ACCREDITED WRITERS

IV

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH ON THE SUCCESSION

(A) ARTICLES AND FORMULARIES

(B) TESTIMONY OF ACCREDITED WRITERS

V

CONCLUSION

# Introduction

In writing an introduction to this book I do not intend to convey the impression that I have, in any way, contributed to its contents. The book is the author's work, and his alone. While I do not agree with all that is written, I think it well and strongly written, and that it ought to find place in the discussion of the subject of the unity of Christendom. Where the issues are so great, so profoundly important, no region ought to be left unexplored, no question (no matter how old or how often investigated) should be left undiscussed in its new bearings, no amount of patient, charitable investigation ought to be regarded as onerous; but the discussion should be utterly free, completely full and without passion. No subject connected with it should be held so sacred that it may not reverently and respectfully be tested. In this spirit of respectful investigation the author has entered into the discussion, sometimes with questions which he seeks to answer, sometimes with declarations which he considers that the Church's teaching warrants. The real merit of both questions and declarations can best be tested in the open court of the Church's sifting and searching processes which inevitably tend to the illumination of the truth. Into this open court the book enters, its author anx ous to con-

tribute to the unity of God's people, and that what is of error in his work should be exposed.

His intention is not to undermine the existing order or organization of the Church, but to make a serious and earnest examination into what that order and organization are and what they rest upon. If the argument seems to antagonize the theories and doctrines of present-day writers, may it not be that these writers have themselves misconceived the Church, and with honest but mistaken intent misstated her position? The author's effort is not to assert or to establish a theory of his own making, but to discover the Church's practical doctrine, and then present it in its significant bearing upon the great question of Unity, which he rightly regards as the foremost ecclesiastical question of the day. That the Historic Episcopate is a practical necessity to stability in Church government has become his firm belief, which has grown out of his patient study of the history of the past. When the Roman Church replaced the Historic Episcopate with Papal sovereignty and sought to fix this strange doctrine upon the Catholic Church, disintegration resulted; and when the Protestant Churches discarded the Episcopate, segregation and confusion resulted as a natural consequence. The author believes that the Historic Episcopate is worthy, and is destined to become a basis of unity, not because it is a doctrine of necessity, but because it has proved its practical necessity to stable government.

Those who disagree with his conclusions will be

stimulated by his arguments. Those who agree with them will be fortified, and their belief in unity, and their hope for unity, rekindled.

For myself, I must decline to be construed as belonging to any party in the Church. Party shiboleths have a tendency to narrow one's conceptions of the Church, to fix one's conception of that which is a living organism, to limit and sometimes prevent, and sometimes even predetermine, one's search for the truth.

THEODORE D. BRATTON

# Apostolic Succession and the Problem of Unity

# Apostolic Succession and the Problem of Unity

## I

### THE PROBLEM STATED

THERE can be little doubt that the matter of Church Unity is one of the most important of the many subjects under consideration of the Christian world. Not only are men of all denominations beginning to feel that the various controversies and disputes of christendom have been waged, for the most part, over matters which have been of far from vital importance to the cause of truth, but they are further beginning to realize that the maintenance of such divisions, except for reasons of inevitable necessity, where principles deemed absolutely essential to spiritual gowth and welfare are at stake, must be regarded as sinful and inexcusable. In short, they are beginning to realize that Unity is not merely a pleasing ideal, which is beautiful to contemplate and would for many reasons be a great boon to humanity, were it possible to be had, but they are further beginning to appreciate that it is an end for which each individual man, as well as each individual denomination is in duty bound to pray and hope and labor — that schism is absolutely inexcusable in the sight of God except for the most vital

principles of Christian faith, and that the paramount question with the members of each individual denomination should be, not are we right or wrong with respect to our contention as to the truth of Christ's teaching on this or that disputed point, but that even if right, does the correctness of our position justify us in our continued separation from our brethren in the great Body of Christ.

It is a demonstrable fact, and one that should be self-evident to every thoughtful man, that an entire unity of opinion upon all matters of faith is an absolute impossibility, so long as men are mentally, morally and physically constituted as they are. There are no two men in the world who can absolutely agree in their understanding or intellectual appreciation of any problem, however earnest each may be to ascertain the truth and nothing but the truth. Each is compelled by nature and education to view the same problem in a somewhat different light, and no matter how desirous each may be to agree with the other, they cannot declare their unanimity in every particular without being guilty of intellectual dishonesty. In short, the price of absolute intellectual unity upon all theological or other questions is moral turpitude and insincerity; the price of absolute mental conformity to a fixed formula of belief on all disputed matters of Christian Faith is infidelity to the voice of conscience, infidelity to the sense of right and duty, infidelity to The Spirit of Truth — The Holy Spirit — The Holy Ghost. Christ does not, therefore, expect that of us. He

does not ask absolute unity of opinion upon all theological questions, but what He does ask is unity of life and will and purpose in The Spirit, and through unity in The Spirit gradually to come more and more into a unity of mind and opinion. The latter, however, is an end, not a present state or condition either actual or possible, and an end, moreover, which will be attained and can be attained only through what is now and always an ever present possibility, viz.,—unity in The Spirit of Christ. Absolute agreement in all doctrinal matters, therefore, should not be expected in any proposed platform of organic unity. It will be a supreme blessing to know that we can be one on those matters generally regarded as vital, and as there is good reason to believe that such a consummation is not so irrevocably beyond the hope of realization (at least as regards the greater part of Christendom) as some would suppose, it certainly behooves the members of all denominations to look at the matter attentively, and see if there be not among the many doctrinal tenets of the various churches, some common ground in things essential.

It will, of course, be a difficult task, in view of the many and conflicting opinions held on all sides, and the natural denominational prejudices with which each tenet is encumbered, rightly to distinguish between what are essential and what are unessential matters, and for this we can only trust to the guidance of that one, supreme Spirit, in Whom happily we are already professedly one, and Whose still, small voice if duly

heeded, cannot but point the way to a final solution of all these and other merely intellectual difficulties, being, as He is, The Spirit of Truth Itself.

It is a foregone conclusion, therefore, that we must under any circumtsances expect to differ more or less widely upon many important points, but unless any of the points in question should be more than merely important — unless they should be esteemed by any of us to be vital to spiritual health and moral principle — they should in no case be allowed to justify the continuance of schism, as, excepting these, we should ever regard Unity as above all other considerations the supreme end and purpose of all outward and visible Christianity. It is manifest, then, that we must be willing to agree to disagree on all matters short of what conscience declares to be essential to individual spiritual safety, and that in examining the problem our first and highest endeavor should always be to discover what is false or erroneous in our own creed, rather than what is false or erroneous in the creed of others. The latter is always an easy task. It is the former that is so difficult of accomplishment, and that is the real obstacle — or at least the most serious obstacle — that ever stands in the way of ultimate Unity.

Now as a member of this branch of the Catholic Church, it is our purpose in the following pages to examine our own position carefully, and to inquire, in absolute disregard of what has been done by other churches, whether we ourselves have done everything

possible on our part to bring about the end desired. If we have so done, then we may feel assured that further responsibility rests with others; but if not, no stone should be left unturned in our endeavor to sacrifice all worldly or denominational interests for the one supreme ideal.

The exposure of denominational error, pride and prejudice, painful as indeed it is, cannot be shirked when the integrity of the Church Catholic is at stake, and once we have the courage nobly to admit our weaknesses, and manfully to right the wrong (regardless of the sins of others) the spectacle of such Christ-like heroism will rouse the Christian world, as nothing else will ever rouse it, to the sense of its duty and responsibility in the matter. Now we fully realize that this church, in connection with the mother church of England, has already taken a most commendable step towards the attainment of this end.

In the Lambeth Articles a proposed basis of union has been set forth which, were it rightly understood, would, we believe, be willingly entered into by at least a large number of Christian people. Unfortunately however, in spite of the broad and liberal wording of this platform, the end for which it was intended has had to suffer because of the interpretation which many of our churchmen both in public and in private, in the pulpit and in the press, have persisted in placing upon one of its clauses, and the general attitude assumed by them regarding many doctrinal

questions more or less directly associated therewith.

To be brief, the broad phrase —"the Historic Episcopate" — contained in the 4th Article of the Platform, and which appears to be the only clause that has met with serious objection, has been arbitrarily assumed to carry with it the so-called doctrine of Apostolic Succession as though the latter were a necessary corollary, and this interpretation of its meaning, together with a number of conclusions naturally consequent therefrom respecting the nature and extent of the Church Catholic have been so widely diffused among all classes of churchmen that the result has been that the true, official teachings of this church on all such matters have been obscured, and what might have been hoped for from the broad and catholic wording of the Lambeth Articles has necessarily been lost.

We propose in the following pages to discuss in detail some of these hindrances to Unity, and to show that the various principles underlying them have no justification either in reason or in the official teachings of this church. We shall begin by considering the matter of membership in the Church Catholic — particularly as that subject has been presented in the recent agitation to change the name of this church; and following this, we shall discuss at some length the real attitude of this church, assumed at the very beginning of her history and never surrendered at any time, upon the subject of the Apostolic Succession, in con-

tra-distinction to the views generally entertained to-day — both of which matters, intimately connected as they are, have in their popular representation, greatly militated against all proposals on the part of this church looking to the possible re-union of Christendom.

## II

### MEMBERSHIP IN THE CHURCH CATHOLIC

While the discussion regarding a change in the present title of the Church has now somewhat abated, because of the adverse report of the committee recently appointed by the General Convention to ascertain the mind of the people at large, yet because of the qualified character of the objections urged by many of the Diocesan Councils, and the evident popularity of the movement in many quarters — a popularity, moreover, which continues to increase rather than to diminish — it is impossible for any one to look upon the matter as definitely and finally settled. In fact, the advocates of the movement are far from discouraged. It is pointed out that if such a proposition had even been broached in the Convention a few years back, it would have been treated with scant courtesy, whereas so great a change in the sentiment of churchmen has come about within the past decade, that at the last meeting of the same body, the subject was not only allowed a hearing, but was deemed of sufficient importance to be brought to the attention of the various Dioceses and their opinions solicited. That the result of the investigation has been unfavorable to immediate action, is not surprising. It was not to be expected that so momentous a question should be decided in a day, and even if possible, the most sanguine would hardly have deemed it advisable. As it is, they

contend, much has been accomplished in the right direction. The very action of the Convention has made the question a matter of discussion throughout the entire Church, and the report of the committee has at least revealed the fact that the percentage of churchmen in favor of a change in the near future, is far greater than the majority of people were inclined to suspect. In view of all the circumstances, therefore, it appears to be true that the question is one which is, indeed, far from being disposed of by the committee's report, and will inevitably present itself again, and that at no distant day, for final solution. With this conviction in mind, and with the further belief that if such an end be attained along the particular lines upon which it is now being advocated it will prove disastrous to the welfare of this Church, and the hope of Christian Unity through her endeavors, it becomes necessary for us to speak at some length of the matter.

It is not the question of a change of name, in and by itself, that we regard as necessarily dangerous to the cause of Unity, but change, as we have said, along the particular lines upon which it is being advocated to-day. In short, we have no desire to insist upon the adequacy of the present title. The designation "Protestant Episcopal Church" may fail, perhaps, to some extent, in clearly defining our real position to the world, and it may very possibly be true that some other title would be more appropriate and desirable. But however this may be, adequate or inadequate, we

believe that the present name comes far nearer expressing the real truth of our position, and is more comprehensible to the world at large, than any that has yet been suggested — particularly more appropriate and satisfactory than the title "The American Catholic Church" — the designation that appeared to be the one most seriously contemplated by the late advocates of the change and which is to-day the title most commonly in mind whenever the subject is discussed. Not only do we believe that the adoption of such a title would prove a serious barrier to Unity, but we further believe that it would tend to place the Church in a most embarrassing position before the world because of its absolute indefensibility when examined in the light of her official utterances in the past. Let us look into the matter carefully and see if we are not fully justified in this opinion.

It will be evident from the perusal of a little work entitled "A Handbook of Information," published some time ago by The Young Churchman Co., of Milwaukee, in which arguments for the correction of the present title are advanced, that one point in favor of the proposed name "American Catholic Church" is that it suggests "historic identity with the Church of the ages." This, of course, refers to the word "Catholic," as there is no such significance in the word "American." By "Catholic" then, is signified "Historic identity with the Church of the ages," and by the prefix "American" such historic identity is further "localized" so "as to imply this particular

body in the United States and none other." The meaning of this is, of course, not difficult to discern, and the remainder of the article only confirms and illustrates it the more. To put it in plain terms, the entire argument for the adoption of this title rests upon the following assumptions.

Our Lord established in this world but one Church. This Church was known at the beginning as the Catholic Church. In the course of ages, because of internal disputes and dissensions, this holy, catholic and apostolic Church became divided. Each division, however, continued to preserve its corporate connection with the original Catholic Church, and hence continued to be a corporate branch of this Catholic Church. At the time of the Reformation, and subsequently, however, a large number of dissatisfied members left their respective branches and separated themselves from all further organic or corporate connection with the Catholic Church — organizing themselves into various bodies and societies patterned after their own ideas, but continuing to call themselves churches. In view of these palpable facts of history, it is evident that to retain the word "Protestant" in our official title is grievously to mis-state our position to the world, for the Protestant bodies are those which have separated themselves from all organic connection with the Church Catholic, whereas it is a matter of peculiar pride with us, that we have never severed such connection. If, therefore, the remaining legitimate branches of the Catholic Church continue

to uphold their Catholic lineage in their official titles, we should do the same. We are not a Protestant sect, but a Catholic branch, and if that Catholic branch that originated in Rome, be the Roman Catholic; that in the East, generally designated as Greek, be the Greek Catholic; that originating in England, the Anglican or Anglo-Catholic, why should we, the only legitimate branch originating in America, fear to assume our lawful title, the American Catholic?

Now we freely grant that with such assumptions before us, it is impossible logically to evade this result. The premises once accepted, the conclusion is irresistible. But is it necessary to accept the premises? In answer to this we unhesitatingly assert that not only is it unnecessary to accept the truth of such assumptions, but that it is impossible to do so consistently with other principles and teachings of this Church. What right have we to assume that these Protestant bodies are cut off from the Church Catholic? What grounds have we for maintaining that they are no longer "members incorporate in the Mystical Body" of Christ, "which is the blessed company of all faithful people?" If membership in the Catholic Church depends solely upon Baptism, and if Baptism again, is not a rite limited to the official acts of a valid Ministry, but is a rite which can be legitimately administered by any baptized person — a principle which this Church openly admits both by teaching and practice — then it follows inevitably that every duly baptized person, of whatever denomination in Christ-

endom, is a member of the Church Catholic, and it will not do to teach the validity of Lay Baptism, and further attest our belief in its validity by accepting converts from other Protestant bodies without requiring further baptism at the hands of our Ministers, and then, in the face of all this, deliberately assert that these self-same Protestants have no corporate connection with the Catholic Church. *Baptism is itself incorporation into the Catholic Church*, as the Prayer Book distinctly teaches, and furthermore, as it is the only means of incorporation that Christ has provided, it is for that very reason *the sole test of corporate connection* for any individual or *Body of individuals*.

This is a point that the editor of *The Living Church* seems to have overlooked, when replying to certain inquiries recently made regarding the word "Catholic." In answer to this very point, viz.,— that all duly baptized persons are members incorporate in the Body of Christ, i. e. the Church Catholic, he says, (*Living Church*, Feb. 14th, 1903, p. 548). . . . "it is quite true that in one sense every properly baptized Christian, whether among the sects or in any part of the historic Church, is a member of the Catholic Church, because such membership is obtained by Baptism; in a second sense, only those who accept the authority of some corporate branch of the Catholic Church are catholics, for the organization of even baptized men outside the Church are no parts of the Catholic Church, though individually the people are members of it." Here the editor confounds two very dis-

tinct ideas, for if he means anything at all by the phrase "the organization of even baptized men outside the Church," he means that the organization (and not the individual men) is outside the Church, and this again can only mean that the plan or pattern upon which the body is organized is a plan or pattern foreign to the plan or pattern of the Catholic Church. But whether this be true or not, this Catholic plan or pattern of organization, whether of bodies in or out of the Church, has nothing to do with the corporate, organic connection of such bodies with the Church. Christ never provided any plan or pattern of organization as a test of corporate connection with His Body. The only test of corporate connection which He ever authorized is not a plan or pattern of any kind, but a Rite — a rite, moreover, which pertains to individuals, not to bodies. Let us examine the matter carefully, and in order to do so, let us anticipate an illustration that will very likely be brought forward. Let us take any human society or organization, as for example, the Masons, or Knights of Pythias, and let us agree to suppose (which, of course, may not be the case) that one of these societies consists solely of baptized persons. Do we mean to assert that the individual membership of these persons in the Church constitutes the Masons, as a body, a corporate branch of the Church? We reply unhesitatingly, as much so as any body or organization of men can be a corporate branch of the Church, for whatever by the conventionalities of human speech *men* may refer to when speak-

ing of the members of Christ's Body, or the branches of the Vine, *Christ* refers only to individuals when using these expressions. He simply does not recognize bodies or organizations of any kind as the corporate *members* or *branches* of His Church.

The Roman Church as such, has never been incorporated into the Catholic Church; the Anglican Church as such, has never been so incorporated; and there is no denomination in Christendom which as a body or organization has ever been incorporated into the Body of Christ. Our Lord indeed intended that His Body should have many members, but these members were not to be organizations, but individuals, and the sole right by which these members were to be incorporated or grafted into the Body, was the rite of Baptism—a rite which was instituted for individuals, not for organizations. No organization ever underwent the rite of Baptism or incorporation into the Body of Christ, hence no organization as such, can claim to be a corporate branch or member of the Body. In short, our Lord does not recognize any organization in Christendom as a corporate branch of His Church; but only the baptized individual Christians in all lands and of all denominations. These so called branches or organizations are human distinctions, not divine. In His sight, there is not an organized body in Rome, for example, that as a body or organization is a corporate branch or member of His Church, or another in England, Russia or America, but in all these places He sees only the individual members of His

one, divine organization or Body — the Catholic Church. The truth of the whole matter, then, is simply this: — *There is no corporate connection of bodies or organizations, as such, with the Catholic Church, but only of individuals. The catholic organization of corporate individuals, is another matter altogether, which has no bearing on the problem.*

But we seem to hear the reply made, all this may be true, but nevertheless there is something else necessary to the being or existence of the Church than the mere incorporation of individuals by Baptism. Members may indeed incorporate other members, and so the priesthood of the people may be all that is necessary to insure initiation into the Church, but Baptism is not all. The Church exercises other functions than that of incorporation. These same incorporated individuals must be nourished and sustained. The spiritual life vouchsafed them in this new birth or regeneration, must be supported by proper spiritual food. Even as a child born into this lower world and possessing the same natural life that all others enjoy, must have this life sustained by constant natural food, if it is to continue in this world, so he who is regenerate, and born anew into the higher world, though possessing the same spiritual life that all others enjoy, must nevertheless have this life sustained by constant spiritual food, if he is to continue in this higher world. To be deprived of natural food in the lower world, means to forfeit natural life, and thus to be put out of the natural world; and so too, to be deprived

of spiritual food in this higher world means to forfeit spiritual life, and thus to be put out of the spiritual world. No number of Christian people then, even though all of them are duly baptized into the Catholic Body, can expect to live and grow therein, can expect to retain the privileges bestowed upon them in their Baptism, and continue corporate members, without receiving further Divine Gifts, and as the administration of these Divine Gifts is a power entrusted not to the people as a whole, but to certain specially appointed persons only, it follows that no set of individuals can continue to maintain their corporate connection with the Church that is deprived of spiritual sustenance through the absence of a legitimate Ministry. Whether, therefore, there is such a thing as the corporate connection of organizations with the Catholic Church or not, it is none the less true that in some real sense the people calling themselves Protestants, have through their own attitude, deprived themselves of the privileges of the Church, and are unquestionably cut off — in a literal sense, excommunicate — from the Body of Christ, and hence can not claim with the rest of Christendom, a living connection with the same. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." If the members are to continue in the Life of the Church, they must receive the spiritual food of the Church — they must receive the Holy Communion, and as the Holy Communion can be validly and effectually administered only by a lawfully ordained

Ministry,—that is to say, a Ministry that derives its authority from Christ, the Head of the Church, through the channel of the Historic Episcopate—it follows that those who do not receive this rite at the hands of such a Ministry, do not receive that spiritual food which alone can sustain them as members incorporate in the Body. For the members of the Body must partake of the Life of the Body, or else atrophy and decay.

This view, which was the one held by the Tractarians, and is still countenanced by a few High Churchmen, is the only alternative that can be resorted to in justification of such wholesale discrimination against our Protestant brethren. Let us now examine it carefully, and see to what consequences it leads us.

If it be true that the spiritual food necessary to the sustenance of those duly incorporated in the Catholic Church can not be administered at the hands of any Ministry that has not received its authority through the Historic Episcopate, then it follows, of course, that no Protestant body receives such sustenance—that all Protestant people are in a condition of spiritual starvation—are under the condemnation of spiritual death—in short, that all Protestants, even the saintliest, are as inevitably lost as the most hopelessly depraved and criminal of the race. Now whatever may be said in defense of such a view, it is quite safe to affirm that it has never been officially promulgated either by the Church of England, or by our own, and it is as repugnant to the vast majority of churchmen

as it is irreconcilable with the historic position of this church — an assertion which will be abundantly verified as we proceed. For the present, let us fully realize what it means. When we presume to assert that persons duly baptized into the Church of Christ — proud of their Christian heritage — many of them among the noblest types of manhood and womanhood the world has ever seen — devoting their lives to the service of the Master — searching the Scriptures diligently to discover and understand His ways — loving the Church — yea, the holy Catholic Church — into which they have been baptized, above all else in life — striving daily through earnest prayer and faith to lift themselves a little nearer to the heavenly goal — observing all God's ordinances and commandments to the very best of their knowledge and understanding of them, — in short, carrying out all of His injunctions as strictly and as consistently as they have the light and wisdom so to do — to say that these persons who grow in Grace and in the power of God all through this earthly life, are none the less cut off, excommunicate from that Church into which they have been lawfully baptized — deprived of the only food which can sustain their spiritual life — which can insure their eternal salvation in the world to come — in short, that these persons, in spite of all the evidences of God's Grace manifest in their lives, are in reality dying spiritually — in spite of all their faith that Jesus is sustaining, has sustained and ever will sustain them, are none the less damned already, though they know

it not, and all because of one most fearful error — the fatal mistake of not receiving the Bread of Life at the hands of a Minister commissioned through the Historic Episcopate — a mistake which was made, remember, under the full persuasion and conviction that they were responding to a call of duty — to the voice of The Saviour Himself which they dared not disobey — when we presume to take such a stand as this, as repugnant to the common sense of mankind as it is fearful to contemplate, we may well pause a moment and ask ourselves if our own spiritual condition is as secure as it might be.

But it will doubtless be argued that it is not necessary to infer all this as a consequence of the above position. God doubtless saves such people, but in some other way — by some special providence. If now, it is meant by this that the mode of the administration of the Sacrament is not lawful; is indeed, contrary to Christ's command and catholic custom, but that because of sincerity of purpose God overlooks the mistake, and gives them in reward for their faith, the true spiritual nourishment that their souls require — the true Bread of Heaven — the true Sacrament — well and good; but remember that in taking this stand, you are surrendering the view that these people are cut off or excommunicate from the Church, and you are granting us the very point for which we are contending. If you grant that in spite of their incorrect observance of the Sacrament, or for that matter, in spite of their neglect of it altogether (where they

do neglect it) they are none the less because of their absolute sincerity of purpose, allowed by some special providence to receive the spiritual food of His most blessed Body and Blood (and there is no other food capable of sustaining spiritual life) then you admit that these already baptized persons, in spite of their error, are none the less still nourished and sustained to-day by the same spiritual food of which you are a partaker, and hence are likewise sustained and retained in the Catholic Body.

In short, the worst that can be said of them is that they are not catholic in all their practices and observances, though they do indeed retain their vital connection with the Catholic Church. But when we begin to make mere catholic observances and practices a test of *corporate connection with the Body of Christ*, we are not only upon indefensible ground because of the reasons already assigned, but because of the further reason that such a test involves the integrity of the corporate connection of the members of nearly every so-called branch of the Catholic Church in Christendom. For the accusation of departure from catholic usage may be urged with equal effect against Rome, which denies the Cup to the laity, and therein and thereby not only departs from catholic custom, but from the express formula which Christ Himself instituted, as recorded by the Gospels. Moreover, if the communicants of Rome can sustain connection with the Catholic Body while openly departing from the explicit example, teaching and command of our

Lord Himself concerning the observance of the Sacrament, why should not the Protestants maintain their connection with the same, who have violated no explicit teaching of The Saviour on this point, but have merely departed from a catholic custom believed and inferred of men to have been intended of our Lord?

Surely when we consider the Divine authority behind both these matters, — the Divine authority which we *know* to be behind Communion in both kinds, and the Divine authority which we *infer* only to be behind Episcopal ordination, the illegitimate administration of the Sacrament by a legitimate Ministry, becomes fully as serious a matter as the legitimate administration of the same by an illegitimate Ministry. Hence the corporate connection of Romanists is, if conformity to catholic custom and the legitimacy of the Sacrament in question be a test, quite as debatable as that of Protestants. But in any case, the point which we are endeavoring to establish holds good, viz.,— that whether or not the mode of administration of the Sacrament of The Lord's Supper by such Protestants is valid or no — whether it be catholic or uncatholic — if it is admitted that by some special providence they do receive the spiritual sustenance necessary to salvation, their union with, and communion in the Divine Body is assured (as there is no such sustenance outside the Body) and they are therefore as much in the Catholic Church as any other body of Christian people.

But again, if it should be maintained that this is not

what is intended, but that by the assertion that they are not necessarily lost, and that God designs to save them in some other way, is meant that they are to be ultimately saved by some special providence *outside* the Church, our reply is simply, that will not do. There is no such thing as salvation outside the Church Catholic — outside the Body of Christ — nor anything in Holy Scripture to warrant such a theory. Salvation, by its very nature, is, and can be, only in Christ — i. e. in union and communion with Him, which means in His Body, the Church.

This is not to say that there may not be many persons now outside the *visible congregation of baptized souls*, who are none the less, because of the Spirit in their hearts, members of Christ's Body — members of the Church — for "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God" even though they have not received the authoritative seal or sign of sonship ordained of Christ — nor again is it to say on the other hand, that there may not be many persons now outside in very truth (because both unbaptized and rebellious against the Spirit) who may not yet be saved in time to come; but only is it to say that, in any case, salvation is, and can be, self-evidently, only in the Body of Christ — the Church — for to be saved apart from the Body, means to be saved apart from the Life of the Body — that is apart from the very thing which *is* salvation, which is a contradiction in terms. What we mean to say, therefore, is that no one can be saved *while outside* of the Church. Who-

ever is to be saved, must either now be in the Body or Church, or he must eventually come into it and be saved in it, as there is no salvation anywhere outside of it. He cannot remain outside, and be saved outside, by any special providence. There is but one hope of salvation — viz.,— participation in the Life of Christ, and the Life of Christ is only in the Body of Christ. In short, salvation can be only in the Church, in the Body, because it can be only where the Life is.

Now just how God expects to save those who, up to this time, have never entered the Church, and are without the knowledge of it, is a matter which, however interesting, does not concern us here. We are not here dealing with any such persons, but, on the contrary, with persons who have already been admitted — men and women who have already been duly grafted into the Vine — been made members of the Body — in short, have been duly baptized into the Catholic Church, and whose initiation therein we have formally recognized. They have already entered it, have known that they were in it, and have all along expected to be saved in it. It is not a question with them of finding the Church, or of entering into it, but having already found it, and having already entered into it, a question of retaining their position in it, of living and growing in it. To say that God is going to effect this in some other way outside the Church is manifestly meaningless. Now that they are already members of the Body, if by their present attitude they are denying themselves, either intent-

ionally or unintentionally, the Life of the Body, they are already in a state of spiritual starvation, a dying condition — are already under the condemnation of spiritual death, and there is obviously no hope of redemption from this condemnation outside the Church, or by any means other than the very one which they are rejecting. There is no escape, therefore, from the dilemma. Either those persons already baptized into the Church, are to-day partaking of the spiritual food of the Church in some way (whether our way or not) and are now growing and developing thereby, or else by denying themselves this food necessary to salvation, they are withering, decaying, perishing. There is no other alternative, for there is no other food in earth or heaven whereby their souls may live, grow and be saved. Christ has nothing else to give them than His own Life, and that Life is within His Body, not outside of it. There is no other spiritual sustenance than the Body and Blood of the Saviour. Unless they eat this Flesh and drink this Blood in some way (whether it be our way or some other way) they have no life in them.

Now this being the case, there are but two possible positions that can be taken by those who deny that Protestants are partakers of the Life of the Body, because of the defectiveness of their Ministry and Sacraments. Either in consequence of their attitude they are (1) now spiritually dying, or else they are (2) already spiritually dead. If the first be true, then however pitiable their condition, and whatever may be

said of their future prospects, they are nevertheless at this present moment still in the Body, and hence cannot be regarded by us now as other than legitimate members of the Catholic Church. If the second be true, then it is quite indisputable that they are no longer members of the Church Catholic — are indeed without the Body and this means that eternal judgment and condemnation have been already pronounced — that they have been cast out of the Kingdom of God into which they were once incorporated in Baptism — that they have already been rejected of the Saviour, because as dead and worthless branches they have been lopped off from the Vine and so have forfeited their baptismal heritage.

Now it is quite safe to affirm that there are few, if any persons, that would assent to such a view to-day. There are few, if any, who would be willing to venture the opinion, even respecting the most depraved of criminals now living, and with the prospect of further life before him, that the final and irrevocable judgment of Almighty God has been pronounced for all eternity; much less would any be willing to venture such an opinion regarding that vast number of spiritually minded and godly souls, who give evidence of God's life and presence in their characters quite as much as the saintliest of our own communion, or would further proceed to base a world-wide ecclesiastical polity upon the certainty of its truth. Such vain speculations belong to the infallible bigotry of a past age. With the impossibility of accepting this

last and only alternative clearly before us, it becomes evident that in every real sense, these Protestants are members incorporate in the Body Catholic, and are as much entitled to the adjective "catholic" as any body of Christian people.

We see, then, that the adoption of such a title as that which has been proposed inevitably involves consequences which are incompatible with other teachings of this church — in fact, any attempt to insist upon Episcopacy as essential to the validity of the Sacrament, and so to the very being of a church, must lead to such extremes, which are of course, disastrous to the cause of Christian Unity, and it is difficult to understand why such a view of the Episcopate should be insisted upon when we are both unprepared and unwilling to follow it to its logical consequences. For once admit that Protestants are all of them individually members of the Body of Christ, wherein lies the necessity of laying so great stress upon their corporate connection as bodies or organizations therewith? — assuming for the moment that there is such a thing. Either this corporate connection of their respective organizations with the Catholic Church is an essential to the being of the Church, and so inevitably to their individual salvation in it, or it is not. If it is not, then not only is it unnecessary to lay so much stress upon it, but it is positively sinful to do so when the unity of Christ's Body is at stake. For so long as it is unessential to the membership of any individual in the Catholic Church, and consequently to

the salvation of any human soul therein, it is *ipso facto* an unessential feature of the Catholic Church, and hence though perhaps important as a matter of practical, organic expediency, should never be insisted upon as a matter of Divine or spiritual necessity.

And on the other hand, if it is essential to individual salvation then it is preposterous to maintain that these persons are even as individuals living members of the Church, secure in the hope of salvation. We must either assume that Episcopacy, and the succession through it, are essential to the salvation of individual souls in the Church, and hence must insist upon it as a *sine qua non* in all our schemes of Unity; or else we must openly admit that they are unessential and cease henceforth to emphasize them as essentials, and must advocate the adoption of the Episcopate upon the grounds of expediency alone — as the only form of Church government possible for universal Christendom to agree upon. In short, there is no use for those who dwell so much upon the necessity of the Episcopate to the *being* of the Church, to attempt to take a middle course, endeavoring to reconcile such a view with a belief in the catholic membership and salvation of individuals who are associated with non-episcopal bodies. There is no possibility of holding to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession as essential to the *being* of a church, and simultaneously supposing that we can recognize our Protestant brethren as members of the Catholic Church; and so conversely, if we cannot consistently with our position in other matters, deny

that they have such membership individually in the Body of Christ, we cannot continue to insist upon the Apostolic Succession as essential. The Tractarians saw this long ago, and made no attempt to reconcile the contradiction. In their view of it, this thing was either essential or it was non-essential; it was something upon which the salvation of souls depended, and hence to be insisted upon at all hazards, or else it was only a matter of material welfare and expediency which could be dispensed with if necessary. Thus, Mr. Newman wrote: — "(1) That the *only way of salvation* is the partaking of the Body and Blood of our sacrificed Redeemer. (2) That the means expressly authorized by Him for that purpose, is the Holy Sacrament of His Supper. (3) That the security, by Him no less expressly authorized, for the continuance and due application of that Sacrament, is the Apostolic Commission of the Bishops, and, under them, the Presbyters of the Church," (Schmucker's "Hist. of All Religions," p. 291). That Mr. Newman, moreover, intended by these words to emphasize in the most literal manner the dependence of each individual soul upon the existence and continuity of the Episcopate is abundantly evident from the whole tenor of his life and teaching. It is the very essence of the Tractarian Theology with which he was identified, and of which he was one of the most conspicuous exponents. Thus the *British Critic*, one of the principal organs of the movement in England, sums up the entire problem as follows:—"A church is such only by that from

which it obtains its unity — and it obtains its unity only from that in which it centres, viz.,— the Bishop. . . . Therefore we declare that this hath ever been the doctrine of the Eastern Church" (whose position on this point he is defending) "that the Episcopal dignity is so necessary in the Church, that without a Bishop there cannot exist any Church, nor any Christian man, no, not so much as in name," ("Hist. of All Religions," p. 294). Dr. Pusey held precisely the same position. He declared that none but an episcopally ordained Minister could administer the Communion, and that the reception of the Communion was necessary to insure salvation; hence that Protestant bodies generally, were "non-episcopal societies" only, being no true part of the Catholic Church, and that their individual members could, in consequence, have no hope of salvation, other than that which "the uncovenanted heathen" possessed. We see, therefore, that whatever opinion may be entertained to-day by the more moderate advocates of the Tractarian view, the great leaders and founders of the movement themselves, saw only too clearly the inevitable consequences to which it led. There is and can be but one object in insisting so strenuously upon the necessity of the Episcopal Succession. If it is spiritually necessary at all, it is so because the validity of the Sacrament of The Lord's Supper depends upon it, and the salvation of individual human souls in turn depends upon the validity of that Sacrament. In short, it is essential to the very *being* of the Church, and to the existence

of every Christian man, and if it is not so essential, it should not be insisted upon in any proposed platform of Unity, as though it were, but should be proffered to the Christian world upon the grounds of *expediency* alone — as the only possible basis of organic unity which Christian people can hope to agree upon.

That this was, in truth, the attitude of the Lambeth Conference upon the matter, is clearly revealed by the significant expression — "the historic episcopate" — which they adopted in framing the 4th Article of their platform. Whatever may have been the opinion of individual members, the Bishops as a body declined to use the phrase "Apostolic Succession," realizing as they must have done that neither the Anglican Church nor the Protestant Episcopal Church had ever committed itself to such a doctrine. They fully realized, however, the *practical* necessity for a common form of government, in the event of organic reunion, and they further realized that the Episcopate, which for nearly sixteen centuries had been a characteristic of catholic Christianity, and which even since the Reformation has continued to be the rule of at least three-fourths of Christendom, was — irrespective of all theories and opinions as to its Divine institution and authority — the only possible form of government upon which they could unite, and hence must necessarily be incorporated in the platform.

In further vindication of these assertions, we propose in the following chapters to discuss at some

length the true attitude of this church upon the entire subject of Apostolic Succession.

We propose, in other words, to show that this doctrine which alone supports the Tractarian in his views — which alone discriminates against Protestant membership in the Catholic Church — which alone would justify us in adopting the title "American Catholic" as a fit designation for our church — we propose to show that such a doctrine — fraught as it is with incalculable evil to the cause of Christian Unity—is not to-day, and has never, at any time, been a doctrine either of the Church of England or of this Protestant Episcopal Church, and therefore is not lawfully to be taught as such, nor cited in any explanation or interpretation of the 4th Article of the Lambeth Platform.

## III

### THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON THE SUCCESSION

#### (A) ARTICLES AND FORMULARIES

BEFORE proceeding to the proof of the foregoing proposition, we desire that our meaning be perfectly clear. Let it be understood, first of all, that we distinguish between the Apostolic Succession and the Historic Episcopate. By the Historic Episcopate is meant merely the historic fact that Episcopacy, or the order of Bishops, has existed from the days of the Apostles. By the Apostolic Succession we mean the further alleged fact, that the prerogative of perpetuating the ministry through the Apostolic rite of the laying on of hands is *jure divino* a prerogative of the Episcopate exclusively, the Bishops being alone the successors of the Apostles in ministerial rank, and the power of ordination being conferred of Christ himself exclusively upon the Apostles and their successors.

In connection with this last definition, it must be borne in mind that such is the commonly accepted meaning of the phrase, and the only one with which we are here concerned. It is quite true that there have been in the past and there are, even now in the present, other interpretations placed upon it, but they are exceptional.

For the sake of perspicuity, we shall allude to any such view of the phrase, if occasion require, as *a*, rather than *the*, theory of Apostolic Succession, or

otherwise paraphrase or italicise the usual form. We may still further define our position as follows:—

(1) It is not denied that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is taught from our pulpits, appears in many of our Church Text Books, is ardently defended by many prominent clergymen, is commonly understood to be a doctrine of this Church, and is unquestionably popular with a large class of Episcopalians.

(2) It is not here asserted that a succession from the Apostles, perpetuated through and by the Episcopate alone, is not a fact, but only that such a proposition is doubtful, can never be demonstrated, and so can never be asserted as fact beyond all question; and even if capable of demonstration, the mere historic fact has nothing to do with the alleged Divine prerogative.

(3) Upon the assumption that such a succession through the Episcopate alone is a fact, it is not here denied that the Church of England, and, in consequence, this Protestant Episcopal Church possess such succession.

(4) It is not denied that the Church of England and this Protestant Episcopal Church officially assert the existence of an historic Episcopate when both declare that "from the Apostles' time, there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church — Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

Having clearly defined, therefore, what it is we do not propose to deny or assert, let us now examine the

positive side of our position. We may briefly summarize it as follows:—We positively assert that neither the Church of England nor this Protestant Episcopal Church has ever officially set forth the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in the sense in which that phrase is commonly understood to-day, hence that such a doctrine is not to be required of any clergyman or layman of either communion as an essential article of belief.

Let us begin first of all by considering the position of the Church of England. As a certain writer has well put the problem, "the sources from which we can judge of the theory of a church are: (1) Its articles and formularies; (2) In the case of a State church at least, any Acts of Parliament relating to it; and (3) The statements or writings of its accredited controversialists." With the exception of the last clause which we must qualify slightly so as to read, "the statements or writings of its accredited controversialists considered in connection with such articles, formularies and Acts of Parliament," we think that every one will agree that the above is a sufficient summary of the main sources of such information. When therefore we come to consider the first of these three, viz., —the articles and formularies of the Church of England, what do we find? The answer is briefly stated. There is not one line, either in the XXXIX Articles, or in the Prayer Book upon the subject of Apostolic Succession. So far as the Articles are concerned, even so prejudiced a writer as John Henry Newman has can-

didly admitted this to be a fact. The whole purpose of Tract XC was to give an interpretation of the Articles which should be consistent with the "catholic" theology of the Oxford leaders. Newman thought he had succeeded in this impossible task, yet in commenting upon Article XIX, where the "Visible Church of Christ" is defined, he is forced to allow that nothing is said of an Apostolic Ministry as necessary to the proper ministration of the Word and the Sacraments, affirming that "whether Episcopal Succession or whether intercommunion with the whole be necessary to each part of it — these are questions, most important, indeed, but of detail, and are not expressly treated of in the Articles." (*Vide* Tract XC, Art. XIX, p. 32). Indeed, that the XXXIX Articles are opposed in their entire spirit to the so-called "catholic" views of the Tractarians and their descendants in the Church to-day, should be further evident, even if there were no other reasons for so believing; first, from the fact that Newman's formal attempt at reconciliation was condemned by authority, and, according to Blunt, it was this, and attendant circumstances, that "ultimately led to the secession of Newman, and some of his more intimate friends and followers, from the Church of England" (See Blunt's "Dic., Sects, Heresies, etc.," Art. "High Churchmen," p. 197) and, secondly, to the fact that the so-called "catholic" party in the American church to-day candidly repudiates the XXXIX Articles as anti-catholic, and defends itself against the charge of dis-

loyalty upon the grounds that the Protestant Episcopal Church does not require any of her ministers to sign the same. Of the value of that argument we shall have occasion to speak later on. For the present, we are not dealing with the Church in America, but in England, and merely cite the views of American churchmen to show that, however "catholics" in England may argue, when face to face with the necessity of signing, "catholics" in America realize the difficulty only too well, and frankly decline to admit the authority of the Articles altogether. But whatever may be argued as to the consistency of signing the Articles and at the same time holding to so-called catholic views of the Church and the Ministry, one thing at least must be admitted by all "catholics," as it has been admitted by one of the ablest of their leaders, and is self-evident to everyone, viz.,—the XXXIX Articles have nothing whatever to say of Episcopal Succession, and this means that the Articles of Religion as established by the authorities of the Church of England and required to be subscribed to by all her Ministers, do not teach the doctrine of Apostolic Succession.

But it must not be inferred from this that the Articles merely fail to teach it. Not only is there no such doctrine found therein, but their wording and history reveal only too clearly that they were carefully framed to uphold a contrary doctrine. Not only does Article XIX, in defining the "visible Church of Christ," fail to make mention of the Apostolic Suc-

cession of Ministers as an essential characteristic of the Church, but Article XXIII in defining what is a lawful ministry *most significantly omits* any allusion to Episcopal ordination (an omission simply inexplicable upon the view that such ordination was deemed essential by the Reformers) and merely declares that "those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work *by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation*, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard." But what is thus absolutely inexplicable upon the hypothesis that the Church of England believed in the Apostolic Succession as essential to the existence of a church, and to a lawful Ministry, is easily understood upon the hypothesis that the church at the time held another and opposite view, viz.,— the validity of non-episcopal ordination, and that such was indeed the case is abundantly testified by numbers of authorities — notably Bishop Burnet, who distinctly asserts in commenting upon this very Article (Art. XXIII) that "they who drew it had the state of the several churches before their eyes, that had been differently reformed." (Burnet on XXXIX Articles, Art. XXIII).

Says another writer also, in speaking of the position of the Church of England upon this point: — "She (the Church of England) carefully abstains from making episcopacy an indispensable requisite in a Christian Church. Her cautious abstinence on this point cannot be ascribed to inadvertence, or the ab-

sence of occasion. When the Articles of the Church of England were drawn up, discussed, and finally settled, the question of episcopacy was one of the most prominent topics of discussion among theologians. In the neighboring kingdom of Scotland, and in several of the Protestant Churches of the continent, the government by Bishops had been discontinued. The English Church adopted a different course, and adhered to that form of church order. In forming her Articles or confession of faith, the question must needs have occurred, 'Whether episcopacy was to be regarded as essential, and therefore to be included in that formulary; or as merely expedient, and therefore passed over in silence?' This question we know *did* occur, was brought under the consideration of the framers of our confession, and was decided according to the latter of these two views. We learn from Bishop Burnet, that in framing the 23rd Article, which describes those Ministers to be 'lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to their work' — not by Bishops of the Apostolic Succession, but by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard, — we learn from Bishop Burnet that 'those who drew it had the state of the several churches before their eyes, that had been differently reformed from our own.' He adds, 'The general words in which this part of the Article is framed seem to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them.' And herein we can unreservedly approve the judgment of our

Reformers, inasmuch as it exactly coincides with that of Holy Writ. The Church leaves the question precisely where the Bible leaves it." ("Essays on the Church" By a Layman, p. 486. Seely and Burnside, London, 1840. Quoted in "Primitive Eirenicon," Rev. Mason Gallagher, pp. 218, 219). Bishop Hooper, also, who died in 1555, himself one of the Reformers and framers of the Articles, not only emphatically denounces the view of Apostolic Succession now so popular, but is quoted by Hardwick in connection with this very Article, as saying, by way of interpretation, that "The Church of God is not by God's Word taken for the multitude or company of men as bishops, priests, and such other, but that it is the company of all men hearing God's Word and obeying unto the same; *lest that any man should be seduced, believing* himself to be bound unto any ordinary *Succession of bishops and priests* but only unto the Word of God and to the right use of the Historic Sacraments." ("Hist. Articles of Religion," Hardwick, Appendix, p. 276, note.) He further emphasizes the same point as to the general view of the Reformers regarding what is a "lawful calling" in his comment on Article XXIII, (*ibid*, p. 280). These two Articles were never subsequently revised. Prof. Fisher, the well known historian, commenting on the attitude of the Reformers towards this question, alludes also to the Articles as evidence: "Until we approach the close of Elizabeth's reign there are no traces in the Anglican Church, of the *jure divino* idea of Episcopacy — the

doctrine that Bishops are neccessary to the being of a Church, and that without Episcopal ordination, the functions of the Ministry cannot be lawfully discharged. The Articles are obviously drawn up according to the prevalent idea that each national Church is to determine its own polity and ceremonies. Episcopacy is not among the notes of the Church, as it is defined in them." (Fisher's "History of the Christian Church," p. 373.) We might cite many other authorities were it necessary to do so, but the wording of the Articles themselves is evidence too obvious to admit of argument, and as one of the greatest champions of the exclusive view has, as we have seen, openly admitted that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is not to be found in them, and as the "catholic" party to-day generally admit that the Articles were the product of an "uncatholic age" and should not be regarded as authoritative, and as they have further declared that it is the duty of the church to correct "the mistakes of the Reformers," which "mistakes" we propose to give at some length, further on, in the words of the Reformers themselves, it is unnecessary to say more at present in this connection. We conclude this part of the argument, then, with the remark that it is admitted by advocates of both sides of the question, that the Church of England does not teach the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in her Articles of belief, and that the said Articles were purposely worded by their framers so as to countenance the validity of non-episcopal ordination. Further, it

must be borne in mind that however regarded by the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, these Articles are the officially established Articles of Religion for the English Church, and required to be signed by all her clergy. Even writers who are extremely partial to the doctrine in question, admit this fact candidly.[1]

Having disposed of the Articles, let us now inquire if there is anything to be found upon the subject of Apostolic Succession in any of the other formularies of the Church. The only passage in the entire Prayer Book that appears to suggest such a thought, is to be found in the Preface to the Ordinal, yet nothing could be more erroneous than to suppose that this Preface teaches or upholds such a theory. It would, indeed, be a most remarkable thing, if, as we are told, this Preface is the work of Cranmer, to find it emphasizing a doctrine to which no one was more opposed than the Archbishop himself. The man who insisted that between bishop and priest "there was at first no distinction" and who affirmed that "the ceremonies and solemnities used in admitting bishops and priests, are not of necessity, but only for good order and seeming fashion," and who further recognized, and negotiated with the non-episcopal churches on the con-

[1] That they are furthermore her official *definitions of doctrines* required of all her Clergy is evident from the following passage from the "Church Handy Dictionary," p. 9: *Articles, The Thirty-Nine, The Church of England's definition of Christian doctrine, and as such they have to be subscribed by all who seek Holy Orders.*"

tinent, and, according to Archbishop Parker, "that he might strengthen the Evangelical doctrine in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, from which an infinite number of teachers might go forth for the instruction of the whole Kingdom, called into England the most celebrated divines of foreign nations: Peter Martyr Vermellius, a Florentine, and Martin Bucer, a German," etc., the man that supported these men there while "most actively laboring in their ministry," and in every way upheld and recognized the validity of their orders — to find such a man as this prefacing the newly prepared Ordinal with a defence of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, would, indeed, be a most remarkable phenomenon. But it is hardly necessary to speculate upon the possibility of such a matter, as the Preface itself admits of no such construction, even in its present wording, after the alterations of 1662. Let us read it carefully. "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite to the same; and also by public Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority. And, therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued,

and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration or Ordination."

Now let it be borne in mind what it is we are trying to prove. We stated at the very beginning of this article that we proposed to show that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession had never been set forth by authority, and, in consequence, belief in such a doctrine could never be required of any clergyman. We also stated that we clearly distinguished between the belief in Apostolic Succession and the belief in the Historic Episcopate. With regard to the latter, we have nothing whatever to say, nor have we any remark to make upon the Church's custom, consistent with her belief in the Historic Episcopate, to perpetuate the order of Bishops, and to require that all *her* ministers should receive ordination at their hands. It is not the practice of Episcopal ordination in her own communion that we are finding fault with, nor is it the fact that she has officially authorized the observance of such a practice within her fold, that we would question — but it is the further alleged facts that she has officially pronounced such ordination *to be essential to the validity of the Christian Ministry — essential to the proper administration of the Sacraments,*

*and consequently essential to the very existence of a Church*, — it is these alleged facts with which we are concerned. In short, as we have before stated, it is the doctrine of Apostolic Succession that we would attack — it is the constantly reiterated assertion made in the pulpit and in the press that the Church (meaning both the Church of England and our own) officially declares that Bishops ordain *jure divino* — that to them, and to them only, did the Apostles, acting under the express commands of Christ, commit the function of ordination, — that through them, and through them *exclusively*, was the Ministry to be perpetuated, and that so *essential* is this fact to the existence of a valid ministry, to the existence of a valid Sacrament, to the existence of the Church herself, that where such a custom does not obtain, but Presbyterial or other ordination is substituted, there the Ministry, the Sacraments, the Church *cease to be*. In short, the doctrine that we object to is briefly and cogently stated in the famous dictum "*no Bishop, no Church.*"

Now what has the Preface of the Ordinal to say on this subject? We may read it as carefully as we please, but the most critical analysis will not justify the conclusion that it teaches such a theory.

There appear to be just three separate statements contained in that portion of the Preface which in any sense alludes to the matter in question, and it is these three only, therefore, that we need consider — the remaining portion, bearing upon the proper age of candidates and the testimony as to their character, learn-

ing and attainments, being obviously irrelevant to the subject. As to the first (1) of these statements, viz., — "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading the Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, — Bishops, Priests and Deacons" — it is obvious that we are merely confronted with the assertion of an historic fact — nothing more, nothing less. The Church merely declares that each of these three Orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, has been in existence from the days of the Apostles. There is nothing whatever said of the specific functions of any of these orders — nothing whatever of the exclusive prerogative of the Bishops to ordain — hence nothing whatever is affirmed as to the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession. So far as this statement goes, any one of the three Orders, or all of them, may have perpetuated the Succession. It is not concerned with any particular mode of succession, but merely with the broad fact of the continuity of the Christian Ministry in all three Orders from the beginning. So far therefore, as one of these Orders is herein affirmed to be the Episcopate, so far does the Church in this particular passage affirm the fact of an Historic Episcopate. We conclude, therefore, that although this section is absolutely silent upon the subject of the Apostolic Succession it does affirm the fact of an Historic Episcopate, in that it affirms an Historic Ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. When we come to the second (2) of these state-

ments, viz.,—"Which offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them except he were first called, tried, examined and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority," — what do we discover? First of all, then, we discover that in the opinion of the Church it was not lawful in ancient days for any man to take any of these Offices upon himself, unless he had been duly called, tried, and examined as to his qualifications, etc., by those already in authority. It is also significant that she declares that persons so approved were always admitted into office by public Prayer with Imposition of Hands, but most significant of all, is the statement that they were ever admitted thereto not by *Bishops*, but by "*lawful Authority.*" If the whole purpose of the Preface were to uphold the doctrine of Apostolic Succession — to show that in ancient times the Bishops were the sole Divinely constituted instruments for the perpetuation of the Ministry, why does it not say so in so many words? If a matter *essential to the very being of a Church and Ministry*, and if it was the purpose of the Reformers signally to protest against non-episcopal ordination on the Continent, why does it not say that whatever is the custom in the present time, "in ancient times" these "Offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation that no man might presume to execute any of them, except

he were first called, tried, examined, etc., etc., . . and admitted thereunto by Episcopal ordination, or by Episcopal authority"? Why weaken the whole point of the argument by using the vague term "lawful authority" when it is the very definition of this lawful authority that is the point at issue?

Upon the assumption that the Reformers regarded Episcopal ordination as indispensable to the existence of the Church and the Ministry, and to the valid administration of the Sacraments, and upon the assumption that they wished to emphasize that point in view of the practice of non-episcopal ordination going on about them, the wording of this clause is indeed utterly incomprehensible, but upon the contrary assumption that they recognized the validity of non-episcopal churches, and only regarded Episcopal ordination as the more *regular* mode, the matter is clear enough. And this is exactly what we find to be the case. That the Reformers did recognize the validity of non-episcopal churches and their ministries can be absolutely demonstrated, as we shall see further on, and they refrained from insisting upon Episcopacy (preferring the phrase "lawful authority" instead) for exactly the same reasons that they refrained from insisting upon the Episcopate as an essential feature of the Church when defining the nature of the same in Article XIX — in short, for the simple reason that they did not regard either Episcopacy or the Apostolic Succession as in any sense *essential* to the being of the Church and Ministry. We find, there-

fore, that so far as this second statement is concerned, the Preface has nothing to say upon the subject of the Apostolic Succession, for there are few indeed of any Protestant denomination who would dissent from the assertion that the Offices of the Ministry have always been held in such reverend estimation that no man might presume to execute any of them except he were admitted thereunto by *lawful authority*. It is a wide phrase, that no Protestant could possibly object to — hence its use by the Reformers. Nor when we come to the third and last statement, do we find any evidence for a belief in such a theory.

(3) This statement reads as follows:—"And, therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverendly esteemed in the Church of England, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination." That it was the intention of the Reformers to retain all three of the above named Orders in the Church of England is here stated, and is questioned by no one. That it was further their intention that the Bishops should continue to exercise those functions, Ordination among them, that they had been generally accustomed to exercise from the beginning, is likewise obvious, and is questioned by no one; hence as they expected to retain Episcopacy in the

Church of England, it was only natural and expedient that they should require Episcopal ordination of all Ministers *in the Church of England.* But because Episcopal government was chosen as *their* way, and because they naturally demanded that all those who wished to identify themselves with the Church of England, and to espouse their way in other things, should likewise submit to the requirements of that way in this particular, — it is by no means to be inferred merely from this fact alone that they regarded *their* way as the *only* way. Aside from all question of Ordination, it is the rule of this Church to-day that if any minister, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian or what not, wishes to become a regular Minister in her Communion, — it is the recognized rule that he must officiate while in the Church according to the rules of the Church — he must wear vestments, observe the Rubrics, and conduct all the Services according to the prescribed Form — the prescribed way — but this is by no means to assert that we declare our way in these matters to be the only way, and that no other Forms and Ceremonies, no other mode of worship in use among other bodies of Christians is valid, or acceptable with God. Such a theory is distinctly rejected both in the Articles and in the Preface to the Prayer Book, where each National Church is recognized as having authority to prescribe and alter what forms and ceremonies they please. In other words, it is obvious that if we expect to adopt any one way at all, either of Worship or of Government

— if we expect to have any system or order in our Church at all, it is obvious that we must insist and demand, that such ways and methods be observed by all the Ministers of this Church, and that no man who is unwilling to submit to these prescribed forms and methods shall be accounted a lawful Minister in *this* Church, or suffered to execute any of the functions thereof. This last statement of the Preface, therefore, has as little to say of the *necessity* of Apostolic Succession to the being of the Church and the Ministry as either of the others, and the most that can be argued from it is that, taken as it stands, and without any regard to the circumstances under which it was written, and the recorded opinions of those who adopted it, the wording is not necessarily antagonistic to such a theory. Such a conclusion, however, can give but scant comfort to those who contend that the Church has officially promulgated such a doctrine and commands her Ministers to teach it. Looking solely at the words of the Preface, then, as it stands, out of connection with all surrounding circumstances, we are forced to conclude that while affirming the existence of an Historic Episcopate, it does not affirm the truth, or in any sense teach the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, while upon the other hand, when read in the light of the circumstances under which it was written and adopted — its wording considered in connection with that of the original Preface, the Articles and other formularies of the Church, as well as in connection with the various writings of the

Reformers, certain Acts of Parliament, and the actual practice of the Church — there can be no room for any doubt whatever, that it was never intended to teach or uphold such a theory, but on the contrary was the product of an age and people distinctly adverse to this view. The Preface to the Ordinal in 1549, at the time that the first Prayer Book of Edward VI was set forth, read as follows: —"It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there hath been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons: which offices were evermore had in such reverent estimation, that no man by his own private authority might presume to execute any of them except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as were requisite for the same; and also, by public prayer, with imposition of hands, approved, and admitted thereunto. And therefore, to the intent these orders should be continued, and reverently used, and esteemed, in this Church of England, it is requisite, that no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest, nor Deacon) shall execute any of them except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following" ("First Prayer Book of Edward VI," James Parker & Co., London). Now whatever may be thought of the intent of the last paragraph as it stands in the present Ordinal, it is quite clear what meaning it conveyed in the Ordinal of 1549. First of all, it will be seen that it was not the purpose

of this Ordinal to say who were not to be regarded valid ministers in the Church of Christ, but only who were and who were not to "*execute*" *any of these ministerial functions* "*in the Church of England.*" In order that these offices "shall be continued and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England, it is requisite that no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest, nor Deacon) shall execute any of them except he be called, tried," etc., etc. It is directed at practice, not at doctrine. But it will further be observed that there is a clause here which does not occur in our present Preface, viz.,—"not being at this present Bishop, Priest, nor Deacon." What does this mean? Even if it is contended that this clause must be understood in connection with the foregoing phrase, "in the Church of England," so that it should be interpreted, "not being at this present Bishop, Priest, nor Deacon in the Church of England," not only is the force of the above argument in no wise diminished (for it is still a matter of executing the functions of the Ministry in the said Church, and not a matter of the validity of other ministries) but absolutely confirmed, for if it is contended that the above clause should be taken in this way, the very addition of the phrase, "in the Church of England," by way of definition implies the recognition of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons not in the Church of England. But, furthermore, if it is insisted that such is the correct understanding of the matter, and that directly or indirectly it was intended to have regard also to the validity of

such ministers, then it is obvious that the argument reverts upon the heads of those who use it, for it is clear that if it was intended that from that time on, none but those already Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in the Church of England should be recognized as valid ministers, and allowed to officiate in the Church of England, unless they should submit to the particular form of Ordination prescribed by the English Church — it is obvious that no Bishop, Priest, or Deacon of either the Roman or the Greek Church could be recognized as a legitimate minister of the Church of Christ Catholic, or allowed to execute any ministerial functions in the Church of England without submitting to the same, for it is well known that the particular Form of the Ordinal of Edward VI differed from the corresponding forms of both the Roman and Greek Churches and it was upon this very divergence in form that Leo XIII recently based his argument against the validity of Anglican Orders. In other words to sum up the whole matter, if the above mentioned portion of the Preface is to be understood to mean "no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest nor Deacon *in the Church of England*) shall execute," etc., then there are but two conclusions to be drawn. Either —

(1) The Church means that she does not recognize the validity of any Ministry, save that of her own, unless its members have been ordained according to the particular Form prescribed by the English Ordinal; or else —

(2) While not questioning their validity, she allows no Minister of any other denomination to "execute" the functions of a Minister within her borders, except he shall have first been admitted according to the particular form prescribed. If we take the first (1) view, then we must understand that not only are all other Protestant Orders denounced as invalid, but likewise the Orders of the Roman and Greek Churches; hence there is no legitimate Ministry in Christendom outside the Anglican communion. On the other hand, if we decide to take the second (2) view; while the point for which we are here contending, viz.,— the validity of non-episcopal ordination, is granted, we must conclude that the Church requires not only that all Protestant Ministers but likewise all Greek and Roman Ministers in coming to officiate at her altars must submit to re-ordination after the Anglican form.

We know that both conclusions are absolutely contrary to Anglican belief and practice — even the most ardent advocates of the "catholic " movement admitting the validity of Roman and Greek Orders and recognizing the fact that Ministers of neither communion are required to submit to re-ordination. If, therefore, there are no other conclusions to be drawn from this hypothetical addition of the phrase "in the Church of England," it follows that such a phrase is inadmissible, and that the clause, "not being at this present Bishop, Priest nor Deacon" must be taken in its plain English to mean not being at this present a recognized Bishop, Priest nor Deacon in the Church

Catholic. Taken in this sense the entire Preface is plain enough, and absolutely in accord with the wording of the Articles and the subsequent practice of the Church. The last paragraph becomes merely a simple declaration that no man except he be a recognized Bishop, Priest or Deacon of *some* church shall be allowed to execute the functions of a Minister in this Church unless he be duly called, tried, examined, and admitted in accordance with the Form of Ordination here set forth. This interpretation which is as we have said, so perfectly consonant with the Articles, and subsequent practice of the Church, as well as with the recorded views of the Reformers themselves (as we shall presently see) and which, as we have just shown, is the only logical conclusion possible, reveals in itself an explicit official recognition of non-episcopal Orders. So far, therefore, from admitting of an interpretation favorable to the more exclusive theory of the Ministry, the Preface to the Ordinal of 1549, plainly and distinctly recognizes the Ministry of the other Protestant bodies. Nor is there anything to be gained from an examination of any subsequent revision of the text. It must be remembered, first of all, that the above is the Ordinal of 1549, and at that time the extreme Protestant party in the Church of England had not attained its development. That the same view should be expressed in the Ordinal of 1552, is of course not surprising, but what is surprising in view of the general impression now prevalent, is the fact that the Reformers of 1559 seeking to establish a

more conservative standard, did not change the wording of the Preface in this particular. When Elizabeth gave to her people a form of worship that was to remain practically unaltered until 1662, we find a Preface to the Ordinal substantially the same as set forth by Edward. In order that our readers may see for themselves that the views implied by the Prefaces of Edward were changed in no essential particular in the Elizabethan revision, we will here give the exact wording of the latter. "It is euident vnto all men diligently readinge holy scripture and auncient autours, that from Thapostles tyme there hathe ben these orders of ministers in Christes churche, Bishoppes, Priestes, and Deacons: Whyche Offices, were euermore had in suche reuerente estimacion, that no man by his own pryuate Aucthorytye, mighte presume to execute any of theim, excepte he were fyrst called, tried, examined and knowen to haue suche qualities, as were requisite for the same: And also by Publique prayer, with imposition of handes, approued and admitted thereunto. And therefore to thentent, these orders should be continued, and reuerently vysed, and estemed in this Churche of Englande, it is requisite, that no man not beynge at this present, Bishop, Priest nor Deacon shall execute any of them, excepte he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, accordynge to the forme, hereafter folowinge." ("Queen Eliazbeth's Prayer Book," Anc. & Mod. Library of Theo. Lit., p. 158). Here is substantially the same Preface as that of 1549, containing the same exceptions regard-

ing those who are already Bishops, Priests and Deacons. It should be further observed also that the concluding portion of the Preface indirectly confirms the interpretation which we have just placed upon the former. For not only as we have just shown, is it logically impossible to hold that the former portion had reference to any but unordained persons desiring to be admitted as ministers in the Church of England, (all persons at this present Bishops, Priests or Deacons in some church not being included) but the latter going on as it does, to speak of the necessary ages of candidates for the respective offices, undoubtedly betrays the fact that unordained persons alone were in the minds of the writers. Granting that he was willing to submit to re-ordination according to the prescribed form, would the Church of England refuse to admit a Presbyter or Bishop of some other Christian body to her Ministry merely because he was not of the age here required? The very fact that the same paragraph that makes an exception of those already Bishops, Priests and Deacons, declares that none shall be admitted to any of these offices except he be of such and such an age, proves beyond all doubt that it was unordained men only that the writers were considering throughout the whole paragraph. It was not till 1662 that the above exception was dropped altogether from the Preface, and that the latter was printed in distinct and separate paragraphs. Whatever may be inferred from this as to the intention of the revisers of 1662, it is none the less indisputable

that all the above facts taken collectively prove that from 1549 to 1662— a period of 113 years — the Church of England through the wording of the Preface to her Ordinal, officially provided for the admission of Ministers of other churches into her ranks without re-ordination of any kind.

What then are we to gather from these changes introduced into the Ordinal of 1662? Were they intended as a repudiation of the position of the Church during all this former period? Let us see. As we have before affirmed, in the wording of the present Preface, (which is, of course, the Preface of 1662) the revisers never intended to pass judgment on the validity of non-episcopal ordination as such, but only intended to insist upon such ordination for all Ministers in the Church of England, so that the said Church, which was Episcopal *in theory*, might be Episcopal *in fact*. The wisdom of such a measure, we are not here considering. The question is, are we right or are we wrong in this our contention? Was such the intention of the revisers of 1662, or was it not? Did they intend by this alteration to condemn the validity of other Protestant bodies, and so repudiate the former position of their own church, or did they merely intend to demand Episcopal ordination of all persons entering the Ministry of their church, as a measure rendered expedient, if not actually necessary, for the preservation of the Episcopal form of government, which though established was even then opposed by a strong element in the Church?

Did they here insist upon Episcopal ordination because they believed it to be the only valid form, or because they regarded it as the more regular form; because they regarded it as essential to the being of the Church, or merely because they regarded it as essential to the well-being of the Church? Was it a measure taken because of absolute necessity or merely because of present expediency? We maintain that the latter, and only the latter, hypothesis will consistently fit in with all the facts of the case. In the first place, it must be remembered that the Church from 1549 to 1662 not only distinctly recognized the validity of the Ministry of other non-episcopal bodies by the wording of this Preface and the Articles, but furthermore allowed such Ministers to officiate in the Church of England without re-ordination, and that this continued to be the general custom throughout this period. That the Caroline revisers changed the wording of the Preface considerably, we freely admit. We have no desire whatever to shut our eyes to this fact. The question is: to what extent did they go in altering the Preface, and what is the significance of these changes? Did they go to the extent of changing an *expedient ruling* of the Church, or did they go to the extent of changing a *fundamental doctrine;* was it a change of *discipline* merely, or a change of *faith?* Did they by their action merely declare that the ruling of their fathers had been *inexpedient* to the welfare of the Church, in allowing Ministers of other Protestant bodies to come into the Church of England

without re-ordination, and that from now on it must be stopped; or did they mean to say yet further, that this action of their fathers had been a *sin* against a *fundamental doctrine* of the Church, viz.,— the doctrine of Apostolic Succession — that it had been a flagrant abuse of a principle deemed *absolutely essential* to the very *existence* of the Church, and that from now on no persons, save such as had received Episcopal ordination, should be regarded as valid Ministers of Christ's Church Catholic? Let the revisers answer that question for themselves. "And therefore of the sundry alterations proposed unto us, we have rejected all such as were either of dangerous consequence (as secretly striking at some *established doctrine*, or *laudable* practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole Catholic Church of Christ) or else of no consequence at all, but utterly frivolous and vain. But such alterations as were tendered us, (by persons, under what pretences, or to what purpose soever tendered) as seemed to us in any degree requisite or expedient, we have willingly and of our own accord assented unto: not enforced so to do by any strength of argument, convincing us of the necessity of making the said alterations: for we are fully persuaded in our own judgments (and we here profess it to the world) that the Book as it stood before established by law, *doth not contain in it anything contrary to the Word of God, or to sound doctrine*, or which a godly man may not with a good conscience use and submit unto, or which is not fairly defensible against any that shall

oppose the same; if it shall be allowed such just and favorable construction as in common equity ought to be allowed to all human writings, especially such as are set forth by Authority, and even to the very best translations of the Holy Scripture itself." (*Vide* Preface to "Prayer Book" of 1662).

It is obvious, therefore, that the striking out of the above mentioned exception, together with the other changes in the wording of this clause, particularly the addition, "or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration or ordination," by which all persons not episcopally ordained were forced to submit to such ordination when entering the Ministry of the Church of England — it is obvious, we say, from this official explanation, that all these changes were made for *practical expediency only*, and did not imply that "the Book, as it stood before established by law," and in which the Preface to the Ordinal accepted the validity of non-episcopal ordination, and did not require re-ordination — contained in it "anything contrary to the Word of God, or to sound doctrine." Moreover wherever in the entire Preface to the Prayer Book the object of the revisers is alluded to, it is explained that they were not making any changes which involved doctrine, or anything essential, but only in matters of discipline, rites and ceremonies, "things in their own nature indifferent, and alterable, and so acknowledged." They were doing nothing more than what had been done several times before, they explained, for "in the reigns of several Princes of

blessed memory since the Reformation, the Church, upon just and weighty considerations thereunto moving, hath yielded to make such alterations in some particulars, as in their respective times were thought convenient; yet so, as that *the main body and essentials of it* (as well in the chiefest materials, as in the frame and order thereof) have still continued the same unto this day, and do yet stand firm and unshaken," etc., etc.

The sum of the entire matter, then, amounts to this. The Preface to the Ordinal, even as it stands to-day, has nothing whatever to say upon the subject of the Apostolic Succession, or the validity or non-validity of non-episcopal ordination. The utmost that can be affirmed is that, taken as it stands and without regard to its history, the present Preface, while it does not teach such a doctrine, is not absolutely incompatible with such a view of the Ministry. But whatever constructions may be possible from the mere wording of the text as it stands to-day, there is but one that can be regarded as that which its framers intended. What that one is, becomes immediately apparent the moment we look into the history of the Preface. All the preceding Ordinals from 1549 to 1662, upon which our present is based, uphold a doctrine distinctly opposite and antagonistic to that which is commonly believed to have been intended to-day, and our present Ordinal being drawn up, according to the avowed purpose of its framers, with no intention of modifying or altering any essential or

doctrinal teaching which the former contained, must necessarily be interpreted after the manner of the former, and must not be regarded as upholding the doctrine of Apostolic Succession.

What we have now fully substantiated from a discussion of the Preface itself, we will soon see is abundantly corroborated from many other sources. Before we proceed to the discussion of these evidences, however, viz., — the various Acts of Parliament, the writings of the Reformers and others, we must briefly allude to two important corroborations of the position we have assumed. First of all, on page 479 of Procter's "History of the Book of Common Prayer," note 4, under the head of "The occasional Offices," the author, commenting upon the present Ordinal, has this to say: — "The Church of England requires Episcopal Ordination for the ministration of her Offices; but it does not follow from this that, in her judgment, the ordination of other Churches is invalid, because they have not bishops. Cf. Arts. XIX, XXIII, XXXIV, and XXXVI; Whitgift, Works (Ed. Park. Soc.), I. p. 184. In a Form of Prayer (1580) intercession is made 'for the Church of France, Flanders, and such other places,' as were then suffering persecution from 'the Princes of the earth who are become his (Antichrist's) slaves and butchers,' ("Elizabethan Liturgical Services," Park. Soc. p. 578).

Here, then, is the opinion of a recognized authority upon the attitude of the Church of England toward

this question, supported by a quotation from a "Form of Prayer" in use among the Reformers in the days of Elizabeth, in which the religious bodies upon the continent are distinctly called Churches, and the validity of their non-episcopal Orders, together with the efficacy of their Sacraments, fully recognized.

The second fact to which we must allude, affords indisputable evidence of the truth of our position. It is only *since the Reformation* that Bishops and Priests have been distinguished as separate Orders; that is to say, as differing from one another in ability to perform certain spiritual functions. From Cranmer down, nearly every prominent divine of the Church upheld the original *identity* of Bishops and Priests in actual rank, the distinction between them being one merely of *Office*, not of *Order* — a distinction not of *Divine* but of *human* appointment, for mere convenience and organic expediency. They noted but two Orders in the modern, restricted sense of the term, viz.,—(1) the Order of Priests *or* Bishops, and (2) the Order of Deacons. Thus "in 1537, twelve years before the Ordinal was framed, there was published 'A Declaration made of the Functions and Divine Institution of Bishops and Priests.' It reads: 'Christ and His Apostles did institute and ordain in the New Testament certain ministers or officers which should have spiritual power, authority, and commission under Christ, to preach, etc., and to *order and create others* in the same room and office whereunto they be called and admitted themselves, etc. This office, this

power and authority, was committed and given by Christ and His Apostles unto certain persons only, that is to say, unto Priests or Bishops . . . The truth is that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any degree, or distinction in order, but only of Deacons or Ministers, and of Presbyters or Bishops; nor is there any word of any other ceremony used in the conferring of this Sacrament, but only of prayer, and the imposition of the Bishop's hands.' This declaration is signed by Cromwell, the King's Vicar-General, Cranmer, and twelve other Bishops, and more than twenty other doctors of laws and of divinity, including the majority of the compilers of the Prayer Book. The same views are presented in a revision of this work, set forth by the King, in 1543, entitled: 'A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man.'

"'Of these two orders, that is to say, *Priests and Deacons*, Scripture maketh express mention, and how they were conferred by the Apostles by prayer and the imposition of their hands'" ("Returning to the Old Paths," Gallagher, pp. 11, 12).

In further evidence we quote Prof. G. P. Fisher: —"It had been the common view in the middle ages that the difference between bishop and priest is one of *office* and not of *order*, the defining characteristic of 'order' being power to perform a special act, involving a certain indelible character impressed on the soul. The priest, as capable of performing the miracle of the Eucharist, was in everything, except in office

or function, on a level with the bishop. This opinion was held even by Bellarmine. It prevailed among the Anglican reformers. It is taught in 'The Institute of a Christian Man,' published by authority in 1537. It is asserted by Bishop Jewel in his 'Apology' for the Church of England, and in his 'Defence' of the 'Apology.' The first of these works, translated into English by the wife of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Elizabeth ordered to be chained in every parish Church in England, that it might be freely read and consulted." ("Hist. Christian Church," pp. 373, 374).

It is obvious, therefore, that the Reformers did not use the term "Orders" in the specific and restricted sense in which we commonly use it to-day, without particularly explaining the fact, and that when so doing they recognized two Orders in the Church, viz., that of "Deacons or Ministers" and that of "Presbyters or Bishops." When not particularizing, therefore, they used the term synonymously with the term "Office" or "Degree" in the broad and general sense of grade or function.

Hence when they penned the opening lines of the Preface to the Ordinal — "It is evident to all men . . . that from the Apostles' time there have been these *orders* of Ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests and deacons," — they were not referring to divinely appointed distinctions of spiritual power and capacity (else they would have specified but two only) but merely to the broad distinction of office or function, as is proven by the very next sentence — "Which

*Offices* were evermore had in such reverend estimation," etc. It is obvious, therefore, that the meaning which the Reformers intended to convey in this passage was a very different one from that which most persons try to read into it to-day, and as the wording of the Preface in this particular was not changed in 1662, such must be the correct interpretation of the passage to-day. In other words, they were simply using the language of the Fathers and ancient authors[2] generally, who used all these words synonymously and were not referring to any specific distinction between Bishops and Priests, upon which the whole theory of the Apostolic Succession depends for its justification, and which distinction no less an authority than the Rev. John Henry Blunt has plainly and emphatically declared was not asserted till the end of the 16th century ("It was not till the close of the Sixteenth Century, that the distinction between the orders of Bishops and Priests was asserted." Blunt's "Annotated Book of Common Prayer." For further evidence of the Reformers' views on this point, see Burnet's "Hist. Reform.," Am. ed., vol. iv, p. 114).

[2] "The Reformers were thoroughly familiar with the language of ancient authors; and these authors were accustomed to use the words *order*, *degree*, and *office*, as synonymous words. Thus Jerome speaks of the '*five* orders of the Church: Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, the Faithful and Catechumens,' Op., vol. v, fol. 41. The learned Bingham writes: 'St. Jerome, who will be allowed to speak the sense of the Ancients, makes no difference in these words, *ordo*, *gradus*, *officium*.' Book II, chap. i, p. 17. Bishop Jeremy Taylor writes: 'It is evident that in antiquity *ordo* and *gradus* were used promiscuously.'" ("Returning to the Old Paths," p. 11).

If, therefore, it is clear that at the beginning of the Preface they were not asserting any God-given distinction between Bishop and Priest in point of spiritual capacity, it is likewise clear that they were not doing so at the end of the same. In other words, when they insisted that all Ministers "in the Church of England" should be episcopally ordained, they were not doing so to assert a God-given and exclusively Episcopal theory of Ordination, as opposed to Presbyterial Ordination, but rather to perpetuate an ancient and catholic custom, important because of its very age and catholicity — a common standard around which the scattered forces of a future Christendom might rally in united ranks. The evidence, then, is conclusive that it was never in the minds of the framers of this Preface to set forth a doctrine looking to any God-given spiritual power peculiar to, and characteristic of the Episcopate, or to teach any doctrine of Apostolic Succession consequent therefrom. So far were they from teaching such a doctrine that we know that they held to a directly opposite view, viz., the original identity of Bishops and Priests, and hence the innate capacity of Presbyters to ordain, when necessity so requires; and that the Church to this day tacitly admits such a latent power in the presbyterate is manifest from the fact that the Presbyters always unite with the Bishop in the laying on of hands at the Ordination of a Priest — a custom absolutely meaningless and impotent, if some such capacity be not recognized.

It is hardly necessary to observe that this is not a practice which has accidentally crept into the Church, but one which is set forth by authority (*vide* Prayer Book, The Ordering of Priests, Rubric) and by only another evidence of the fact that in making the alterations of 1662 the Church had no idea of denying the *power* of Presbyters to ordain, but continued to hold that they were of essentially the same order as Bishops. Observe also that at the Ordination of a Priest the Bishop is required to say:—"Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of *our* [not *my*] hands." So also in the form immediately following, the word is "*our*," not "*my*." It is simply a fact, therefore, that the Presbyters, in conjunction with the Bishop, *do* ordain to-day in this Church.

### (B) ACTS OF PARLIAMENT

Whatever skepticism may linger in the minds of our readers respecting the attitude of the Reformers and compilers of the Book of Common Prayer with regard to the theory in question, it must certainly be dissipated when confronted with the Acts of Parliament, the recorded practice of the Church, and the various writings of her most distinguished divines, for the evidence to be accumulated from these three sources affords a practical demonstration of our contention. That the last clause in the foregoing Preface was never intended to affirm the necessity of Episcopal

ordination to a valid Ministry, but only the expediency of requiring all Ministers in, or coming into the Church of England to submit to it, so that the Church might be in practice as well as in constitution an Episcopal Church, is fully evidenced not alone from the wording of the original Preface, but also from Acts of Parliament, special provision being made by Act XIII, Elizabeth, for admission of foreign clergy not episcopally ordained, and such provision, in spite of Act XIV, Charles II, not having since been withdrawn under any Parliamentary ruling and in the further fact that numbers of such Ministers were admitted as legitimate clergy of the Church of England from the very beginning of the Reformation till the year 1820 at the least, if not later. If the Preface to the Ordinal had been written with the intention of maintaining the absolute necessity of Episcopal ordination to the existence of a valid Ministry, and consequently to the administration of a valid Sacrament, then not only has the Church of England through Acts of Parliament, and through her actual practice for nearly three hundred years flatly contradicted this essential teaching but because it is essential, she has placed herself in an utterly indefensible position before the world, and nothing which she has since done through Acts of Parliament or cessation of such practice can amend the fault. That she is guilty of any such inconsistency, we by no means assert, but on the contrary maintain that all such Acts and practices are fully explicable and consistent when the

Preface is interpreted in the light of its framers' meaning and intent. Upon investigation it will be discovered that at the time of the Reformation the English Church found herself in a peculiar position with regard to her sister churches on the Continent. One with them in general aim and purpose, she differed with them as to the extent to which the re-formation or remodelling of the Church should go. In breaking away from the power of Rome, not only was it not her intention to give up anything essential, but even non-essential matters which were none the less strongly advisable, she likewise desired to retain. Episcopacy, though not essential to the existence of the Church, had none the less become so general throughout Christendom, that to do away with it, when it was within her power to retain it was simply to break with universal custom, and uselessly and needlessly to offend. She decided, therefore, to retain it. Doubtless, a large proportion of the Reformers on the Continent would have done the same, had their circumstances allowed it. But in adhering to Episcopacy and other matters, which the others did not retain, she necessarily experienced some embarrassment when greater intercourse between them was desired. She recognized the validity of their Ministry, Sacraments, and forms of worship, even when she regarded them as irregular and in many cases defective, and when certain of their Ministers desired to be admitted into her ranks, although she permitted it without question at first, yet in course of time, it ap-

peared to her to be evident that she must require them to conform to all her customs, or else must herself become irregular and defective in organization. For it seemed to many to be obvious that she could not continue to adhere to any one system of organization, and yet allow Ministers of churches organized after a totally different pattern to come into her ranks without submission to her methods of government.

The question, then, was what should be required of such persons? As was to be expected, it was at first deemed necessary only that they should sign the Articles of Religion, publicly announce their consent to abide by the Canons and formularies of the Church, but not that they should submit themselves to Episcopal ordination.

For that reason, therefore, before the apparent necessity arose for Episcopal ordination, and in perfect accord with the original Preface to the Ordinal, and the opinions of practically all the Reformers, Parliament passed the XIII Act of Elizabeth, requiring conformity and consent to the Articles of Religion, but not requiring re-ordination. Here are the exact words of the Act itself: — "Anno XIII, Regina Elizabetha: A. D. 1570; Chap. 12. — An Act for the Ministers of Churches to be of sound religion. Be it enacted by the authority of this present parliament that any person, under the degree of a bishop, which doth or shall pretend to be a priest or minister of God's holy word and sacraments, by reason of any form of institution, consecration, or ordering, than

the form set forth by parliament in the time of the late King of most worthy memory, King Edward VI, or now used in the reign of our most gracious sovereign lady, before the feast of the nativity of Christ next following, shall, in the presence of the bishop, or guardian of the spiritualities of some one diocese where he hath or shall have Ecclesiastical living, declare his assent, and subscribe to all the articles of religion which only concerns the confession of the true Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments, comprised in a book imprinted and intituled, Articles, whereupon it was agreed by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole Clergy in Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God one thousand five hundred and sixty-two, according to the computation of the Church of England, for the avoiding of the diversities of opinions, and for the establishing consent touching true religion put forth by the queen's authority; and shall bring from such bishop or guardian of spiritualities, in writing, under his seal authentick, a testimonial of such assent and subscription; and openly on some Sunday, in time of public service before noon, in every church where by reason of any Ecclesiastical living he ought to attend, read both the said testimonial, and the said Articles; upon pain that every such person which shall not before the said feast, do as above appointed, shall be *ipso facto* deprived, and all his ecclesiastical promotion shall be void, as if he then were naturally dead." Here, then, we see an Act of Parliament

specially providing for those who had not been ordained after the manner of the English Church, and demanding their subscription to the book "entituled Articles" together with their public declaration of conformity, but not requiring re-ordination, and we know on unimpeachable authority that in accordance with this Act, numbers were admitted not only into the Ministry, but to benefices and preferments in the Church of England with nothing better than Presbyterian ordination. Even Keble, high churchman as he is, does not hesitate to acknowledge this fact, bearing further testimony that this was the ordinary interpretation of the above Act, when he says (Preface to Hooker's Works, p. 38):—"For nearly up to the time when he (Hooker) wrote, numbers had been admitted to the Ministry of the Church of England, with no better than Presbyterian ordination; and it appears by Traver's supplication to the Council, that such was the construction not uncommonly put upon the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth, permitting those who had received orders in any other form than that of the English Service Book, on giving certain securities, to exercise their calling in England."

So also Prof. Geo. P. Fisher, in commenting upon the significance of this act, declares that "the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth made room for Ministers ordained abroad, according to other forms than those prescribed in the Prayer Book, to be admitted to parishes in England. Such Ministers, as is shown by numerous incontrovertible proofs, were thus admitted

in considerable numbers through Elizabeth's reign and, even far into the next century," ("Hist. Christian Church," p. 374). We have further abundant evidence of these facts which we shall adduce later on under the heading of "Statements of Accredited Writers and Controversialists;" but for the present we wish to confine ourselves to the Acts of Parliament alone. So far we have demonstrated that (1) the Articles (2) the Preface to the Ordinal and (3) the Act XIII of Elizabeth are all agreed in admitting the validity of non-episcopal Ordination — in short that all the official utterances of the Church from 1549 to 1662 are against the theory of Apostolic Succession. Are we then to infer that the Church changed her entire front on this matter at the time of the Restoration? Such indeed appears to be the ordinary assumption, but the Act XIV of Charles II no more changes the essential ruling of the Act XIII of Elizabeth on this point than the Preface to the Ordinal of 1662 changed the essential doctrine[3] contained in the Preface to the former Ordinal. Let us see what the Act in question has to say on the subject. Act XIV, Carol. II, Sections 14, 15: "And be it further enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That no person whatsoever shall thenceforth be capable to be admitted to any Parsonage, Vicarage,

[3] We speak of the Preface as containing a *doctrine*, for those who cite it, imagining they can prove the truth of the Church's belief in the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, self-evidently assume it; and if it does not contain a *doctrine*, then it plays no part whatever in this question, and whatever changes have been made in it, and for whatever purpose, matter nothing.

Benefice or other Ecclesiastical Promotion or Dignity whatsoever nor shall presume to Consecrate and Administer the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper before such time as he shall be ordained Priest according to the form and manner in and by the said Book prescribed unless he have formerly been made Priest by Episcopal Ordination; upon pain to forfeit for every offense the sum of one hundred pounds; one moiety thereof to the King's Majesty; the other moiety thereof to be equally divided between the poor of the Parish where the offence shall be committed; and such person or persons as shall sue for the same by Action of Debt, Bill, Plaint or Information in any of his Majesty's Courts of Record, wherein no Essoin, Protection or Wager of Law shall be allowed, and to be disabled from taking or being admitted into the Order of Priest by the space of one whole year then next following. *Provided that the penalties in this Act shall not extend to the Foreigners or Aliens of the Foreign Reformed Churches allowed or to be allowed by the King's Majesty, His Heirs and Successors in England.*" This proviso is too often lost sight of. That the Act is far more stringent in its requirements than the Act of Elizabeth is quite true, and for the same reason that the Preface to the Ordinal of 1662 is far more stringent than the Preface to the former Ordinal. In fact this Act, in this particular, is nothing more than the civil enforcement of the ecclesiastical requirements of the Preface of 1662, and thus its very wording proves the correctness of our interpretation of that Preface. It

was the opinion of many that the too free allowance of presbyterially ordained Ministers to execute the functions of Ministers in the Church of England, was in its practical effect militating against Episcopal government. It was necessary to suppress it, if possible, or, at least, put some further restriction upon it, not because of any feeling that it was contrary to fundamental Church doctrine, but because it was inexpedient. Heretofore, any foreign Minister who wished to enter the Ministry of the Church of England could do so, and could be promoted to all the ecclesiastical benefices and dignities accruing therefrom, by merely subscribing the Articles and publicly declaring conformity. Now all this was deemed inadvisable. From henceforth, no foreign Minister should be allowed to enter the Ministry of the Church of England, and obtain ecclesiastical preferment, unless he had been episcopally ordained, *except those to whom the King himself, by royal decree, gave his personal permission.* This naturally, made the undertaking a much more difficult matter than it had been heretofore, and its practical effect was to diminish the number of such admissions to a marked extent; but while the result was indeed adverse to the former practice, it reflected in no wise upon the views of the earlier Reformers that such Presbyterial Ordination was valid — the very proviso that the King might, at his discretion, allow the custom to continue in special instances, in itself proving that no essential doctrine was involved, and that the attitude of the Church on

the question of the validity of such Orders was precisely the same as it had ever been — that indeed the former "Book" as it had "stood before established by law," did "not contain in it anything contrary to the Word of God, or to sound Doctrine" and, in short, the entire set of changes and alterations, adopted by the revisers of 1662, did not affect the Church of England in any vital or essential point of doctrine or principle, — the exact reverse of that which has always been maintained by the extreme Churchmen of England and America. In further proof of the correctness of our position, we quote again from Prof. Fisher's "History of the Christian Church." On page 374, immediately succeeding the passage from which we have already quoted, wherein he declared that in consequence of the permission granted by the statute of XIII of Elizabeth, such Ministers were admitted "*in considerable numbers* through Elizabeth's reign, and even far into the next century," he goes on to say that, "down to the era of Laud and Charles I, when the sacerdotal theory of Episcopacy had taken root, the validity of the ordination received by the Ministry of foreign Churches was not seriously impugned, nor was there an interruption of ecclesiastical fellowship between them and the Church of England. Even in the great reaction after the restoration of the Stuarts, the Act of Uniformity, in 1661, which required Episcopal ordination of all incumbents of benefices, added the proviso 'that the penalties in this Act shall not extend to the foreigners or aliens of the

foreign Reformed Churches allowed, or to be allowed, by the King's Majesty, his heirs and successors in England.'"[4] Again, in a little work entitled, "Romanism, Protestantism, Anglicanism," (pub. by The Prot. Epis. Soc. for Promotion of Evangelical Knowledge, New York, 1883), in which the writer assumes the same attitude towards the doctrine of Apostolic Succession that we are here defending, we find the following: — "But perhaps the most conclusive of all considerations as to the position which the English Church occupies in regard to this question is to be found in the facts that (1) up to the year 1820, i. e., the end of George III's reign, a large proportion of the clergy in the Channel Islands were not Episcopally ordained, although they ministered according to the formularies of the Church of England, and formed a part of the clergy of the Diocese of Winchester; (2) that the Kings of England up to the same date constantly had attached to their households a Presbyterian chaplain; (3) that the Queen to this day has the same in Scotland; and (4) that the Act of Uniformity of Charles II — the very Act and the first and only Act which made it necessary as a rule that all persons thereafter to be admitted to the cure of souls in England should have been episcopally ordained — contains also a clause" (here is appended in a foot-note

[4] Indeed from the references to this Act in the writings of many persons, it would appear that the matter of benefices and preferments had quite as much to do with this proposition as any supposed danger threatening Episcopal government. *Vide* writings of Bps. Hall and Burnet.

the proviso which we have quoted from the Act) "specially permitting the King to admit persons not so ordained, who were foreigners and ordained in the foreign Protestant Churches, to preferments in the English Church without re-ordination. This permissive was acted upon by King Charles II within a very few years after it was passed, and it would doubtless be within the power of her present Majesty to act upon it again if she should see fit to do so. This being the actual position of the English Church from the reign of Elizabeth to the present time, it is nothing less than an absurdity to talk of it as holding the 'doctrine of the Apostolic Succession,'" (pp. 44, 45).

Whether the writer is correct in his statement that the proviso holds good at the present time, we are unable at this moment to affirm, as certain amendments were introduced under the late Queen Victoria, the precise bearing of which on this point we have been unable to ascertain. It would appear, however, from a passage in the little work of Rev. Dr. Stevens on the "Genesis of the American Prayer Book," that the Act of Uniformity has in no wise touched the matter. He says:—"The revision of 1662 may be justly called the last, because no changes of any moment have been made since by the orders-in-council which have necessarily been issued, on the accession of successive sovereigns — and by *the amendment to the Act of Uniformity passed in the reign of Queen Victoria.* The Church of 1662, therefore, has

been from that date and is to-day the *Ecclesia docens* of England," (p. 67).

In conclusion, therefore, we would say that while it is indisputable that the year 1662 marks the beginning of an era of churchmanship far more exclusive than that which obtained during the previous period, the fact in no wise affects our contention that *the official teaching of the Church* has remained the same from the beginning — the Preface to the Prayer Book openly declaring the fact, and all subsequent Acts bearing witness to the same. There can be no question that the tendency of many churchmen at the time of the Restoration was to change the teachings of the Reformers on many points — notably their teaching regarding the importance of Episcopal ordination — but what the High Church party was aiming to do, and attempted to accomplish, and what it succeeded in doing, are two very different things.

All these more stringent measures were proposed, no doubt, in the hope of gaining certain material and essential changes, but they nevertheless failed of their ultimate object — so far failed, that when the revised Prayer Book was set forth as the full embodiment of the Church's final and official decision in the matter, it was seen to contain no changes or amendments of vital importance, and was officially declared by the Revisers in the Preface to be in full accord with all the doctrines and essentials of "the Book, as it stood before established by law." What many of the churchmen of Charles' time attempted to do, there-

fore, and what they actually accomplished, — that is, what the Church officially did, are two very distinct matters which must not be confused in this argument.

### (c) TESTIMONY OF ACCREDITED WRITERS

Having demonstrated what is the actual official teaching of the Church on this subject, as contained in her Articles and other formularies, and as enforced by Acts of Parliament, we shall now offer the testimony of many accredited writers as to her actual practice, as well as to the prevailing sentiments of her churchmen during, and subsequent to, the period of the Reformation.

(*a*) As regards the actual practice of the Church of England, we submit the following passages, extracted from a collection of quotations made by the Rev. Mason Gallagher in his little work, entitled "The Primitive Eirenicon," (New York: Hind & Houghton, 1868, p. 3 *et seq.*)

#### *Strype* (died 1737)

Strype, the historian, on the Act of Elizabeth: "By this the ordinations of the foreign reformed churches were made valid, and those that had no other orders were made the same capacity with others, *to enjoy any place within England*, merely on their subscribing to the Articles," (vol. ii, p. 514).

#### *Keble*

Keble, one of the founders of the Oxford movement, admits, in his preface to "Hooker's Works,"

(p. 76) that "nearly up to the time that Hooker wrote (1594) numbers had been admitted to the Ministry of the Church of England with no better than Presbyterian ordination."

*Bishop Hall* (died 1656)

Bishop Hall (vol. x, p. 341) writes:—"The sticking at the admission of our brethren, returning from foreign reformed churches was not in the case of ordination, but of institution; they had been acknowledged Ministers of Christ without any other hands laid on them; but according to the laws of our land, they were not capable of institution to benefice, unless they were so qualified as the statutes of this realm doth require. And, secondly, I know those, more than one, that by virtue of that ordination, which they have brought with them from other reformed churches, have enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings without any exceptions against the lawfulness of their callings." [5]

[5] It will be noticed that this testimony of Bishop Hall directly confirms our contention that the disputes which ultimately led to the strictures of 1662, had no reference to the validity of non-episcopal ordination, but were disputes regarding the *expediency* of allowing presbyterally ordained clergy to be instituted to benefices and publicly supported out of the pockets of a people who desired Episcopal Government and episcopally ordained Ministers. Our Church to-day does not regard vestments as *essential* to the rendering of a service acceptable to God, but none the less if any number of our legimately ordained clergy were suddenly to discard their vestments and insist upon conducting their services in citizen's dress, there would be a cry of indignation, and Canons would doubtless be passed requiring that henceforth no unvested minister should be allow-

*Bishop Cosin* (died 1672)

Bishop Cosin, in his letter to Cordel, states:—"If at any time, a Minister so ordained in these French Churches came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us, in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have done of late, and can instance in many others before my time), our Bishops did not re-ordain him to his charge, as they must have done if his former ordination in France had been void; nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received among us, and subscribe the Articles established," (p. 231, Am. Ed.).

*Bishop Burnet* (died 1714)

Bishop Burnet, in the "History of His Own Times," (vol. i, p. 332) testifies that to the year 1662, "those who came to England from the foreign Churches had not been required to be re-ordained among us." In his "Vindication" (p. 84) he says:—"No bishop in Scotland, during my stay in that Kingdom, did so much as desire any of the Presbyterians to be ordained."

*Bishop Fleetwood* (died 1723)

Bishop Fleetwood, in his works (p. 552) writes of the Church of England:—"Certainly it was her prac-

---

ed to officiate in this Church. This would be both natural and right, but it would be very erroneous to suppose, simply because such a law had been passed, that this Church did not regard any service rendered by an un-vested minister acceptable to God, or any sacrament efficacious.

tice during the reigns of King James and Charles I; and to the year 1661 we had many Ministers from Scotland, from France, and the Low Countries, who were ordained by Presbyters only, and not by bishops, and they were instituted into benefices with cure; and yet were never re-ordained, but only subscribed the Articles."

*Hallam and Macaulay*

Hallam, in his "Contsitutional History" (p. 224), writes:—"It had not been unusual from the very beginning of the Reformation, to admit Ministers, ordained in foreign Churches, to benefices in England; no re-ordination had ever been practiced with respect to those who had received imposition of hands in a regular Church; and hence it appears that the Church of England, whatever tenet might have been broached in controversy, did not consider the ordination of Presbyters invalid."

Macaulay, in his "History," (vol. i, p. 132), states:—"Episcopal ordination was now (1662) for the first time, made an indispensable qualification for *preferment.*"

Macaulay, again, in another passage, not cited by the writer from whom we are quoting, speaks with even greater emphasis. In vol. i, chap. 1, he says:—"The Church of Rome held that episcopacy was of divine institution, and that certain supernatural graces of a high order had been transmitted by the imposition of hands through fifty generations, from the

eleven who received their commission on the Galilean Mount to the bishops who met in Trent. A large body of Protestants, on the other hand, regarded prelacy as positively unlawful, and persuaded themselves that they found a very different form of ecclesiastical government prescribed in Scripture. The founders of the Anglican Church took a middle course. They retained episcopacy, *but they did not declare it to be an institution essential to the welfare of a Christian society, or to the efficacy of the sacraments.*"

Bishop Chas. E. Cheney, of the Reformed Episcopal Church, has also collected valuable testimony on this point. In his little work, entitled "What Do Reformed Episcopalians Believe?" we find the following (Appendix, p. 175 *st seq.*):—"Strype's 'Life of Archbishop Grindal' (quoted in Goode on 'Orders'), bears the most unequivocal evidence on this point. It gives the exact language of the commission given by Grindal to John Morrison, a Minister ordained by Presbyterial hands in Scotland, permitting him to exercise his office in the English Church. It runs as follows: 'Since you, the aforesaid John Morrison, about five years past, in the town of Garvet, in the county of Lothian, and kingdom of Scotland, were admitted and ordained to sacred orders and the holy ministry, by the imposition of hands, according to the laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland . . . we therefore as much as lies in us, and as by right we may, approving and ratifying the form of your ordination and preferment done in such

manner as aforesaid, grant to you a license and faculty, with the consent and express command of the most Reverend Father in Christ, the Lord Edmund, by the Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, to celebrate divine offices, to administer the Sacraments," etc. On page 178, we read:—"The range within which ordination was considered valid in the Church of England in the age succeeding the Reformation, is shown more strongly in the case of Travers, Hooker's celebrated Coadjutor at the Temple. It is uncertain whether Travers had received Deacon's orders according to the Church of England (for he had a divinity degree from Cambridge), but he was a member from the first of the Presbyterian Church at Wandsworth. Going abroad, he was certainly ordained a Presbyter at Antwerp, by the synod there in 1578. Yet we find him associated with Hooker as preacher at the Temple, 1592. During this long interval then, of fourteen years, his Presbyterian orders had been allowed. He was also private tutor in the family of Lord Treasurer Cecil. When at length silenced by Whitgift, it was objected to him first, that he was not a lawfully ordained Minister of the Church of England; secondly, that he preached without a license; thirdly, that he had violated discipline and decency by his public refutation of what Hooker, his superior in the Church, had advanced from the same pulpit upon the same day. Had the first ground been felt by his opponents to be impregnable, the other charges would probably have been omitted, and Travers would have been dismissed,

no doubt, in a summary way. But it would seem that the stress was laid chiefly on the two latter articles; and, indeed, Travers was prepared with an answer to the first, and with an answer that he did not fail to use. An Act had been passed in the thirteenth year of Queen Elizabeth, under which he was securely sheltered. It recognizes the validity of foreign orders; and conveys to us historical evidence that Ministers ordained by Presbyterian Synods were at that time beneficed in the Church of England. It was sufficient that the conforming Minister should declare his assent, and subscribe to the Articles of the Church of England. Travers in his petition to the privy council pleads the force of this statute, and declares that many Scottish Ministers were then holding benefices in England beneath its sanction."

We may also call attention to the fact that many, if not all, of the celebrated scholars whom Archbishop Cranmer invited to England to assist him in the work of reform, were Ministers of foreign reformed churches, and appear to have continued in the performance of their ministerial functions in the Church of England. This has been disputed but there appears to be indubitable evidence in its favor. To quote the author of the "Primitive Eirenicon" again: —"In the 'Zurich Letters' we find Peter of Perugia writing to Bullinger thus from Cambridge:—'Martin Bucer, Bernadine, and Peter Martyr are most actively laboring in their Ministry.' The martyr Bradford,—whom of all the Reformers, the Romanists sought

most earnestly to pervert to their creed,—in his farewell to Cambridge, exclaims, 'Remember the readings and preachings of God's true prophet and preacher, Martin Bucer,' " ("Prim. Ei.," p. 8).

However this may be, it must be apparent from the number of the witnesses and the clear and emphatic manner in which they allude to the "many" or the "numbers" of persons who were admitted into the Ministry of the Church of England during all this period —from the Reformation to 1662 — with no better than Presbyterian ordination; to say nothing of the definite instances mentioned, and even the form of the commission issued by Grindal upon one occasion — that this was not only no uncommon occurrence, but a practice; a practice, moreover, which, as we have shown, had been officially sanctioned by the Articles and other formularies, as well as by legislative enactment, and was only discouraged, and in the main discontinued at the time of the Restoration upon the grounds of expediency — not of doctrine. In short, the actual extent and significance of the practice cannot be better summarized than in the words of that most learned historian, Prof. George P. Fisher, whom we have already had occasion to quote. "The statute of the 13th of Elizabeth made room for Ministers ordained abroad, according to other forms than those prescribed in the Prayer Book, to be admitted to Parishes in England. Such Ministers, as is shown by numerous incontrovertible proofs, were thus admitted in considerable numbers, through Elizabeth's reign,

and even far into the next century. Down to the era of Laud and Charles I, when the sacerdotal theory of the Ministry had taken root, the validity of the ordination received by the Ministry of foreign churches was not seriously impugned, nor was there an interruption of Ecclesiastical fellowship between them and the Church of England. Even in the great re-action after the restoration of the Stuarts, the Act of Uniformity, in 1661, which required Episcopal ordination of all incumbents of benefices, added the proviso 'that the penalties of this Act shall not extend to the foreigners or aliens of the foreign Reformed Churches, allowed or to be allowed, by the King's Majesty, his heirs and successors in England.'" That this proviso was acted upon by Charles II a short time after, has also been testified to by another witness, viz., — the author of "Romanism, Protestantism, Anglicanism," previously quoted, who also cites several instances in confirmation of the fact that the proviso has been recognized down to the present day — notably in the case of the clergy of the Church of England officiating in the Channel Islands.

We shall now address ourselves to a series of quotations of a more general nature, but all tending to show the trend of opinion among the great divines of the Church of England from the Reformation downward upon the general subject of the necessity of Episcopal ordination.

## Apostolic Succession

### *Opinions of the Reformers and Others*

That the general opinion of the Reformers was adverse to the view of the necessity of Episcopal government and ordination is admitted even by those who are firm believers in the necessity of the Apostolic Succession. "The whole history of the times, the lives of Parker and Jewell and their contemporaries and immediate successors, and the nature of their relations with the leading men of the Reformed Churches on the Continent, serve to show that while some of them valued Episcopacy highly as the best authenticated and most convenient form of Church government, and others looked upon it as little better than a necessary evil, all alike viewed it as a matter of government and discipline only. They do not appear to have troubled themselves with the consideration of whether they had the succession as a matter of fact, but simply gave it up as a matter of doctrine. Mr. Keble somewhat naïvely remarks in regard to these writers, 'it is enough with them, to show that the government by Archbishops and Bishops is ancient and allowable; they never venture to urge its exclusive claim or to connect the succession with the validity of the Holy Sacraments, and yet it is obvious that such a course of argument alone (supposing it borne out by facts) could meet all the exigencies of the case,' " ("Prim. Ei.," p. 41).[6] To the same

[6]A fuller quotation of the above passage to which our author refers, reads as follows:—"Now since Episcopal Succession had been so carefully retained in the Church of England,

effect, Prof. Fisher declares that "these (referring to the defenders of Episcopacy) including Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, the principal opponent of Cartwright's doctrines, even then were far from asserting the *jure divino* theory, or the necessity of bishops, in the sense that a church cannot exist without them. They went no further than to maintain the antiquity and expediency of the Episcopal organization," ("Hist. Christian Church," p. 378). A few lines further on he says:—"At the consecration, in 1610, of the Scottish bishops, who had received only Presbyterian ordination, he (Bancroft) met a 'scruple' or inquiry of Bishop Andrewes, with the remark that ordination by Presbyters where bishops could not be had, was sufficient. The bishops then created were sent to preside over Presbyterian clergy."

It is to be noted that any supposition that the Reformers did not actually recognize the Presbyterian ordination of these men, but considered their subsequent lawful consecration to the bishopric by duly ordained bishops of the Church of England, as in itself covering all defects, inasmuch as the order of a Bishop includes the lower orders of Presbyter and Deacon, will not here fit the facts, Bancroft himself declaring that "ordination by presbyters where bishops could

---

. . . it might have been expected that the defenders of English Hierarchy against the first Puritans should take the highest ground. . . . It is notorious, however, that such was not in general the line preferred by Jewell, Whitgift, Bishop Hooper and others. . . . It is enough," etc.

not be had was sufficient." As we shall presently see, the language of the Reformers on the subject of the validity of Presbyterian ordination is too clear and outspoken to admit of such explanations.

The following quotations have been gathered from various sources:—

Bishop Latimer (died 1555): "One man having the Scripture and good reason for him, is more to be esteemed himself alone, than a thousand such as are either gathered together, or *succeeding one another*," (quoted in "Prim. Ei.," p. 173).

Bishop Hooper (died 1555): "Such as teach the people to know the Church by these signs, namely, the traditions of men, and the succession of bishops, teach wrong," ("Declaration of Christ and His Office."

Bradford (died 1555), when the Papal examiner said to him, "The Church hath also succession of Bishops," replied:—"You shall not find in all the Scripture this your essential point, of succession of Bishops. . . The truth was not then tied to any Succession, but the Word of God," ("Works," p. 415).

Archdeacon Philpot (died 1555), when the Archbishop of York urged "Rome hath known succession of bishops which your church hath not; *ergo*, that is the Catholic Church, and yours is not, because there is no such succession can be proved in your church," replied:—"I deny, my lord, that succession of bishops is an infallible point to know the Church by; for there may be a succession of bishops known in a

place, and yet there be no Church, as at Antioch and Jerusalem, and in other places, where the Apostles abode as well as at Rome. But if you put to the succession of bishops, succession of doctrine withal (as St. Augustine doth), I will grant it be a good proof for the Catholic Church; but a local succession is nothing available. . . . Although you can prove the succession of bishops from Peter, yet this is not sufficient to prove Rome the Catholic Church, unless you can prove the succession of Peter's faith, whereupon the Catholic Church is builded, to have continued in his successors at Rome, and at this present time," ("Examinations," pp. 37, 137). In the Preface to "The Confutation of Unwritten Verities" by Cranmer (died 1556), penned by a contemporary and prefixed to his works, we read:—"Such gross ignorance (I would to God it were but ignorance indeed) is entered into their heads, and such arrogant boldness possesseth their hearts, that they are bold to affirm no church to be the true Church of God but that which standeth in ordinary succession of bishops in such points and glorious sorts as now is seen," (p. 13) "If we shall allow them for the true Church of God that appear to be the visible and outward church, consisting of the outward succession of bishops, then shall we make Christ, which is an innocent Lamb, without spot, and in whom is found no guile, to be the head of ungodly and disobedient members. For as sweet agreeth with sour, black with white, darkness with light, and

evil with good, even so this outward, seen, and visible Church, consisting of the ordinary succession of bishops, agreeth with Christ," (quoted in "Prim. Ei.," p. 176).

Bishop Jewell (died 1571): "God's grace is promised to a good mind, and to any one that feareth Him, not to sees and successions, ("Apology"). Again, "Lawful succession standeth not only in succession of place, but also and much rather, in doctrine and diligence," ("Defence of his Apology," p. 201).

Bishop Pilkington (died 1575), one of the Revisers, says ("Works," p. 600):—"Succession in doctrine makes them the sons of the prophets and apostles, and not sitting in the same seat nor being bishops of the same place. . . . There cannot be proved a succession of their bishops in any one place of this realm since the apostles. . . . So stands the succession of the Church not in mitres, palaces, lands, or lordship, but in teaching some religion, and sorting out the contrary. . . . He that does these things is the true successor of the apostles."

Dr. Whittaker (died 1595) in reply to Bellarmine's "Disputation of Scripture" (p. 570) says:—"Though we should concede the succession of that Church unbroken and entire, yet that succession would be a matter of no weight, because we regard not the external succession of place and persons, but the internal one of faith and doctrine."

Dr. Fulke (died 1589): "The Scripture requireth no succcession of names, persons, or places, but of

faith and doctrine; and that we prove when we affirm our faith and doctrine of the Apostles. Neither had the Fathers any other meaning, in calling upon new upstart heresies for their succession, but by a succession of doctrine as well as of persons," ("Answer to Stapleton," p. 74). Again, "The same authority of preaching and of ministering the sacraments, of binding and loosing, which the Apostles had, is perpetual in the Church in the Bishops and Elders, which are all successors of the Apostles," ("Against Sanders," p. 26).

Archbishop Whitgift (died 1604): "The bishops of the realm do not (so far as I ever yet heard) nor must not claim for themselves any greater authority than is given to them by the statute of the 25th of King Henry VIII, revived in the first year of Her Majesty's reign, or by other statutes of the land, neither is it reasonable that they should make other claims. For if it had pleased Her Majesty with the wisdom of the realm, to have used no bishops at all, we could not have complained justly of any defect in our Church." And again, "For if it had pleased Her Majesty to have assigned the imposition of hands to the Deans of every Cathedral Church or some other number of Ministers which in no sort were bishops, but as they be pastors, there had been no wrong done to their persons that I can conceive," (quoted in "Rom. Prot. Anglic.," from Strype's "Life of Whitgift," vol. iii, pp. 222–223).

Dr. Sutcliffe (died 1629): "Stapleton asserts that

we (the Protestant Churches) are destitute of the succession. And he thinks that we are terribly pressed by this argument; but without reason. For the external succession, which both heretics often have and the orthodox have not, is of no moment. Not even our adversaries themselves, indeed, are certain respecting their own succession. But we are certain, that our doctors have succeeded to the Apostles and Prophets and most ancient Fathers. And moreover, if there is any weight in external succession, they have succeeded to the bishops and presbyters throughout Germany, France, England, and other countries, and were ordanied by them," ("De Vera Eccles.," pp. 37, 38).

Archdeacon Mason (died 1621): "That assertion of Stapleton's, to wit, that 'wheresoever the succession is, there is also a true Catholic Church,' cannot be defended; but Bellarmine saith, far more truly: 'It is not necessarily gathered that the Church is always where there is succession.' For, besides this outward succession, there must be likewise the inward succession of doctrine to make a true Church." (On the Consecration of Bishops, etc., in "Ch. of Eng.," book ii, ch. 1). Again, elsewhere he says:—"Seeing a Priest is equal to a Bishop in the power of order, he hath equally intrinsical power to give orders," (Tract, p. 160).

Bishop Babington (died 1610), of the Commission of 1604, declares:— "They are true successors of the Apostles that succeed in virtue, truth, etc. . . .

not that sit on the same stool. Faith cometh by hearing, saith St. Paul (not by succession) and hearing cometh (not by legacy or inheritance from bishop to bishop) but by the Word of God," (*vide* "Prim. Ei.," p. 186).

Dr. Thomas White (died 1604), in reply to a Jesuit's objection,—"The Protestant Church is not Apostolic because they cannot derive their pedigree lineally without interruption from the Apostles, as the Roman Church can from St. Peter, but are forced to acknowledge some other, as Calvin, Luther, or some such,"—replies: "Our answer is, that the succession required to make a Church Apostolic, must be defined by the doctrine and not by the place or person. Wheresoever the true faith contained in the Scriptures is properly embraced, there is the whole and full nature of the Apostolic Church. For the external succession we care not," (*vide* "Prim. Ei.," p. 187).

Dean Field (died 1616): "Thus still we see that truth of doctrine is a necessary note whereby the Church must be known and discovered, and not Ministry, or Succession, or anything else without it," (bk. ii, chap. 30). Again, "It is most evident that that wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter is not a distinct power and order, but an eminence and dignity only, specially yielded to one above all the rest of the same rank for order's sake, and to preserve the peace and unity of the Church.

"If bishops become enemies to God and true relig-

ion, in case of such necessity, as the care and government of the Church is devolved to the Presbyters remaining Catholic and being of a better spirit, so the duty of ordaining such as are to assist or succeed them in the Ministry pertains to them likewise," (bk. iii, chap. 39; quoted from "Prim. Ei.," p. 186).

Finally, we particularly desire to call attention to the words of Archbishop Laud (died 1645), because he was one who can hardly be accused of being partial to presbyterial ordination. In fact, it is generally conceded that the exclusive view of Episcopacy that obtains so largely to-day has been due in great measure to his personal work and influence. We shall see that with all his effort to emphasize the importance of Episcopal ordination, he does not absolutely deny the validity of presbyterial ordination, or unchurch those bodies that believe in it. In reply to Fisher, the Jesuit, he writes:—"Besides for succession in general, I shall say this: It is a great happiness where it may be had visible and continued, and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find any one of the ancient Fathers that makes local, personal, visible, and continued succession a necessary sign or mark of the Church in any one place. . . . Most evident it is, that the succession which the Fathers meant is not tied to place or person, but it is tied to purity of doctrine." Elsewhere he says: "I have endeavored to unite the Calvinists and Lutherans; nor have I absolutely unchurched them. I say indeed in my book against Fisher, according to St.

Jerome, 'no bishop, no church;' and that none but a bishop can ordain, except in cases of inevitable necessity; and whether that may be the case in the foreign churches the world may judge." We might further add there is no arbiter of such judgment other than the individual conscience.

We might continue to make quotations from other great divines, such as Calfhill, Bishop Bilson, Archbishop Bancroft, Bishop Stillingfleet, Archbishop Usher and others, but we think that the foregoing afford sufficient evidence of the general trend of opinion from the days of Henry to the Restoration. After that period, the more exclusive view steadily gains ground, although, as we have shown, it was never sufficiently powerful to obtain an official alteration of any of the established formularies of the Church or Acts of Parliament, and has been continually opposed by some of the greatest divines of the Church.

In proof of this we submit the following quotations. Fisher's "Hist. Chr. Ch.," p. 379:—"Long after the Restoration and the great Episcopal reaction that attended it, even until now, like principles have been maintained by many divines of high distinction in the English Church. Archbishop Wake in 1724 wrote to Courayer: 'I should be sorry to affirm that, when the government is not Episcopal, there is no Church nor any true administration of the Sacraments;' and in 1719, he wrote to Le Clerc, concerning the continental Protestant Churches: 'Far be it from me to have such an iron heart, that on account of this defect'—

the absence of Episcopal government —'I should think that any of them ought to be cut off from our communion; or, with some mad writers among us'—*furiosis inter nos scriptoribus* —'I should affirm that they have no true and valid Sacraments, and even that they are hardly to be called Christians.' "

Dean Pearson, of Salisbury, writing in 1842, just at the beginning of the Oxford Movement, objects to "this assertion of the absolute necessity of the Apostolic Succession of Episcopacy to the existence of a Christian Church, or to the validity and efficacy of the Christian Sacrament; a position which, however countenanced by the opinions, whether of ancient or modern writers, and consistent as it is with the spirit of Romanism, I venture to affirm, without fear of successful contradiction, has never been assumed by the Church of England; which, while asserting in the preface to her offices of Consecration and Ordination, the apostolic origin of the third order of ministers in Christ's Church, and while lamenting by her accredited writers, as an imperfection and defect, the want of the episcopal order in some of the Reformed churches on the Continent, does not excommunicate, or on that account refuse to acknowledge them, while adhering to the orthodox faith as to all that is essential, as true and living branches of Christ's Universal Church," ("Prim. Ei.," p. 189).

Bishop O'Brien, of Ossory, writing also in the same year, says:—"All our great divines, who maintain the reality and advantages of a succession 'from

the Apostles' time,' of episcopally consecrated bishops and episcopally ordained ministers to the Church, and who rejoice in the possession of it by our own Church, as a signal blessing and privilege, not only do not maintain that this is absolutely essential to the being of a Church, but are at pains to make it clear that they do not hold that it is," ("Prim. Ei.," p. 190).

Finally, Archbishops Musgrave and Sumner have both left testimony to the same effect, the former publicly charging his clergy as follows:—"You will exceed all just bounds, if you are continually insisting upon the necessity of a belief in, and the certainty of, the apostolical succession in the bishops and presbyters of our Church, as the only security for the efficacy of the sacraments, so that those who do not receive them from men so accredited, and appointed to minister, cannot partake of the promises and consolations of the gospel; and are, therefore, in peril of their salvation, and left to the uncovenanted mercies of God, which may be, in the end, no mercies at all to them. . . . This would be to overstep the limits of prudence and humility, and arrogantly to set up a claim, which neither Scripture, nor the formularies and various offices of the Church, nor the writings of her best divines, nor the common sense of mankind will allow.

"To spread abroad this notion, would be to make ourselves the derision of the world; it would be contrary to the mind of St. Paul. . . . With respect to this, and to some other of the questions now

brought into prominence, our Reformers appear to have been of the same mind as a pious prelate of former times, who distinguished between what is essential to the being and what is essential to the well-being of the Church,—a wise distinction, which good sense and Christian charity should lead us all ever to keep in sight," ("Prim. Ei.," p. 192).

## IV

### THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH ON THE SUCCESSION

HAVING now concluded our argument with regard to the Church of England, we next proceed to consider the position of the Protestant Episcopal Church upon the subject. Strictly speaking, there is no necessity for a detailed investigation of the formularies of this Church inasmuch as she has officially declared in the Preface to the Prayer Book that although circumstances of a purely local and civil nature have necessitated certain alterations in forms and ceremonies (things admitted to be alterable) yet "this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship; or further than local circumstances require." The matter that we are discussing, viz.,— the Apostolic Succession, is either an essential doctrine, or it is not. If it is not, then our contention is already granted, and the clergy of this communion must cease preaching the same as a *sine qua non* of the very existence of a Church and must refrain, in consequence, from unchurching those denominations which happen to be without it. If it is, then we hold it or do not hold it, just in so far as the Church of England does. As we have just shown that the Church of England does not hold such a doctrine, it follows inevitably that the

Protestant Episcopal Church does not hold it. But while the evidence is conclusive, and our argument is in truth ended, so far as the requirements of logic are concerned, it is none the less advisable that we look somewhat further into the official declarations of this Church, as there are some matters that appear to require explanation. In investigating the subject, we will proceed in strict accordancce with the plan already followed in our discussion of the Church of England, only omitting the second heading (Acts of Parliament) which in this case is obviously inapplicable. The problem is properly presented, then, under two heads, viz.,— (a) The Articles and other formularies; (b) Statements of accredited writers in relation thereto.

### (A) THE ARTICLES AND FORMULARIES

The Articles which this Church has appended to her Book of Common Prayer being the same as those adopted by the Church of England in all essential matters, and those relating to the Church and Ministry in particular, being identical with the corresponding Articles of the Mother Church, it follows that the Protestant Episcopal Church in her Articles of Religion has nothing whatever to say upon the subject of the Apostolical Succession, but on the contrary implies an opposite view of the Ministry, as was the case with the English Church. It is sometimes contended, however, that this Church assumes a totally different attitude towards the Articles than that as-

sumed by the Church of England. Unlike the Church of England in placing these Articles in her Prayer Book, she did not intend that either her clergy or her laymen should be required to believe in them. No clergyman is required to subscribe them here in America, as is the case in England, and they are merely to be regarded as a valuable historic document of the status of belief at the time of the Reformation. Thus Dr. McConnell tells us ("Hist. Epis. Church," pp. 275, 276): "They were ordered to be bound up with the Prayer Book in all future editions. No formal subscription to them was prescribed. There they have stood since. What binding force upon belief they may carry, each decides for himself. They are a section of Sixteenth Century thought transferred to the Nineteenth. They have never exercised any appreciable influence upon the life or belief of this Church. Like all contemporary Confessions, they have largely ceased to be intelligible. They are a water-mark of a previous tide. The current of the Church has flowed on unmindful of them. The last revision of the Prayer Book provides for their being bound up next its cover; the next will probably bind them outside." That this expresses the general opinion in regard to the Articles, we believe to be true, and with certain qualifications, we would readily accept it as embodying our own. The Church has never ordered that they be subscribed, which means that she has never ordered that her clergy should avow their individual belief in all the definitions and ex-

planations which they contain. In adopting them, she evidently regarded them as very different in importance from the articles of the Creeds, and doubtless looked forward to the day when they would undergo revision. That she ever set them forth, however, solely as an historical memento of the status of belief in Reformation days (it is to be noted that Dr. McConnell does not make this statement, and we are not here charging him with such a view) for that purpose, and for that purpose only, is preposterous. All the circumstances connected with their adoption repudiate such an hypothesis. For in the first place, when the subject was brought up for the first time in the Convention, if it had been intended to preserve them merely as an historical memorial, aside from all question of the importance or object of such an undertaking (something by no means clear) the proposition would hardly have precipitated the lengthy debate which followed. But in the second place, it was very obvious that such was not the purpose of the Convention in that the historic XXXIX Articles was not the document contemplated by all the members of the Convention. It is quite true that the first suggestion regarding the subject at all, was made by Bishops Seabury and White, and had reference to the established XXXIX Articles of the Church of England. But that they did not intend in their communication to the house to suggest that the same be preserved in the Prayer Book as an historical memorial is quite evident from the fact that they suggested that the

Articles XXXVI and XXXVII be stricken out, and that the Articles as amended should be ratified by the Convention. Moreover, the whole debate which followed through several meetings of the Convention was not as to the advisability of preserving the XXXIX Articles as a valuable memento of a past formula of Faith, but of adopting them as an expression of the belief of this Church, either in whole or in part, or even of adopting any Articles at all. Thus, "at the special General Convention held in Philadelphia, 1799 A.D., on Thursday, June 13th, the Rev. Ashbel Baldwin, from Connecticut, moved in the House of Deputies, that 'the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole to take into consideration the propriety of framing Articles of Religion.' This was agreed to, and when the Committee rose, 'the chairman of the committee, Wm. Walter, D.D., of Massachusetts, reported the following resolution, viz.,— Resolved, that the Articles of our Faith and Religion, as founded on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, are sufficiently declared in our Creeds and Liturgy as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer established for the use of this Church, and that further articles do not appear necessary.' This resolution was disagreed to by the House," ("The Church Cyclopedia," ed. by the Rev. A. A. Benton, M.A., Art. "Articles," p. 76).

This shows conclusively three things — (1) the Articles proposed for adoption were to be a further exposition of the faith of this Church; (2) that the Com-

mittee considered such "further Articles" as unnecessary in that the "Creeds and Liturgy as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer established for the use of this Church". . . . "sufficiently declared" the position of the Church; and (3) that the House did not agree with the Committee that the Creeds and Liturgy were so sufficient.

Moreover, the entire proceeding annihilates the argument that the Convention was contemplating merely the preservation of the old XXXIX Articles as an historical memento. Again, on Saturday, June 15th, the subject was resumed and "A resolution was proposed by Mr. Bisset,— Rev. John Bisset, of New York,— that the Convention now proceed to the framing of Articles of Religion for this Church," (*ibid.* p. 76). This resolution was carried, and on Tuesday, June 18th, "the chairman of the Committee on the Articles, reported *seventeen* articles of religion which were read," but on account of the "advanced period" of the session and "the thinness of the Convention," further action was postponed.

It will thus be seen that at this session of the Convention the XXXIX Articles were ignored, and seventeen Articles, decidedly different in wording, were proposed. It was not until the Convention of 1801 that the matter was finally settled, and the adoption of the original XXXIX Articles of the Church of England, with the exception of Article XXXVII, together with certain omissions and amendments, were finally authorized. It is obvious, there-

fore, from these very alterations in the original Articles, that it was never intended merely to preserve them as a valuable historic record of the belief of a former age. It is also obvious from the whole history of these proceedings of the Convention that the Articles adopted were intended officially to express the views of this Protestant Episcopal Church upon all the Theological questions alluded to therein, and in proof of their official and representative character as the duly embodied opinions of this church, officially set forth by her highest legislative authority, the following was printed upon the title page:—"Articles of Religion; as established by the Bishops, the Clergy, and the Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in Convention, on the Twelfth Day of September, in the Year of our Lord 1801."

It is to be further noted on this point that Bishop Perry remarks that "The publication by the House of Deputies in 1799, of the draft of seventeen Articles of Religion reported by a Committee of that House, is styled by Bishop White as 'an injudicious measure.' It was so from the fact that it rendered this draft liable '*to be easily mistaken for the sense of at least one of the Houses of the Convention!*' Still, as the Bishop proceeds to state, 'it proved beneficial in its unexpected consequences,' by showing the impossibility of agreement on any new draft of the Articles, and thus preparing the way for the formal acceptance of those of the Mother Church of England. Bishop

White is careful to state, in accordance with the principles which governed his course with reference to the many "vexed questions" arising at this period of reorganizing the American Church, that, with the exception of the political portions, the XXXIX Articles were all along '*the acknowledged faith of the Church.*' Though 'the opposite doctrine was held by many' it 'threatened unhappy consequences,' and the only precedent was 'the very exceptionable manner of doing business, adopted by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies in the year 1789. That House, in regard to every part of the Prayer Book on which they acted, brought the office forward as a matter originating with them, and not their alterations as affecting an office already known and of obligation. It was answered that this was an assumption of but one of the Houses of a single Convention; that the other House had even then adopted a contrary course; that the same had been done in all the preceding Conventions, and that in the only subsequent Convention in which there had been any alterations of a former standard — meaning of the Ordinal, altered in 1792 — it had been so acted on as to acknowledge the obligation of the old forms, with the exception of the political parts until altered. This seems conclusive reasoning.' The Articles, to quote Bishop White, 'were therefore adopted by the two Houses of Convention, without their altering of even the obsolete diction in them; but with notices of such changes as change of situation had rendered neces-

sary,'" ("Handbook of the General Conventions," Perry, pp. 98, 99).

It is quite obvious, therefore, from these words of Bishop White, as well as from all the attendant circumstances, that these Articles were all along the "acknowledged faith of the Church," and were adopted to stand as such, and this being the case, the rejection of the proposed Seventeen Articles, which contained passages advocating much more exclusive views becomes significant. Thus, it is noteworthy that among other things, the IXth Article of the proposed Seventeen Articles, which treats of the nature of the Church, unlike the XIXth Article of the adopted standard, specifies the recognition of "the order of the priesthood. . . . according to Christ's ordinance and appointment;" and in place of the words "those we ought to judge lawfully called. . . . which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation" of the XXIIIrd Article, is substituted in Article XI "who are ordained by Bishops of the Church." Thus it is apparent that a view opposite to that expressed in the XXXIX Articles was proposed, but rejected by the Convention, such a view, in the opinion of that body, not being a correct expression of the faith of the Church.

There can be no shadow of doubt, therefore, that the Articles of Religion as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer stand to-day, as they have always stood, the official expression of the

teachings of this Church on all the subjects treated of therein.

Why then, are the clergy not required to subscribe them? The answer is plain. All teachings of the Church are not of the same importance. The Church has never placed the Articles on a level with the Creeds, any more than she has placed the rulings and decisions of her own Conventions on a par with the rulings and decisions of the Ecumenical Councils. Where the Universal Church has spoken in the Creeds, she demands individual *belief*, where she alone has spoken in the Articles, she demands individual *conformity* only — not individual belief. She recognizes perfectly that her definitions and her explanations of disputed matters — of matters upon which the Church Universal has not rendered an unqualified opinion — are necessarily subject to reconsideration and correction, and may, and doubtless will be revised in time. She does not set forth her individual decisions, interpretations, and expositions of these disputed subjects as final and infallible, but she does set them forth as her official decisions (right or wrong) as far as she has been divinely enlightened to understand the truth. The XXXIX Articles invented by man, are certainly subject to revision by man. Even in the Church of England, the Articles were revised again and again. The present XXXIX Articles are only the latest and maturest (not necessarily the final) judgment of the English Church — but still her judgment — her official opinion. Be-

cause of the fallible and human nature of the Articles, therefore, we believe it to be a serious error to compel individual, personal subscription of belief, as the English Church requires, and our clergy are, therefore, not compelled to do so. But while it is not required that any minister of this Church shall personally assent to these Articles as absolutely and infallibly correct in every statement — while it is allowed him personally to agree or disagree with this or that particular clause — and while it is further his privilege, if dissatisfied with any or all of them, to urge upon the Convention the importance of revising them or abolishing them altogether, yet, until the Convention as a Convention — the Church as a Church, does listen to his voice, and does so officially annul or abolish them, they are still the latest official utterance of this Church on the subjects of which they treat, and must be recognized as such. They are opinions only, but nevertheless, official opinions of this Church herself, and however you and I may disagree with them, yet in expressing our individual beliefs in the pulpit or anywhere else, we must be careful to distinguish between what are our opinions only, and what are the official opinions of the Church, although in citing them as official declarations of this Church, we are further permitted to assert that they are her opinions only, not her final and absolute decrees.

In short, they are the fullest and maturest expression of her judgment upon matters recognized as debatable. We say, therefore, to each individual clergy-

man, while you are not bound individually to believe in each position which the Church has taken in her Articles, yet that the Church has taken it, you are bound to admit.

The Articles, therefore, stand in relation to doctrine very much as the Canons stand in relation to discipline. No one is required to believe in the justice or wisdom of all the Canons of the Church. Not a General Convention passes that some one does not find fault with some enactment and advocate its amendment or repeal, and alterations in the Digest are continually taking place. But while men can and do differ materially oftentimes with certain of these laws of the Church, yet no one questions the fact that they are, none the less, laws of the Church, and must be recognized and obeyed accordingly, until amended or repealed by the same body that adopted them. There is at this very moment a Canon that is being much discussed, and will probably be considerably amended in the near future, but however much individual clergymen may differ with the Church's present law on the subject of Marriage and Divorce, and wish to have it altered, until it is altered, it is absurd to say that it is not the official attitude of the Church on the subject. In precisely the same way, there are many persons who most emphatically disagree with certain declarations of this Protestant Episcopal Church contained in her Articles, but until they succeed in getting the same body that adopted these Articles to annul or repeal them in accordance with

their views, it is absurd to say that the Articles as they stand to-day are not the official expression of the views of this Church upon the subjects of which they treat.

We conclude, therefore, that until such action is taken, the official position of this Church on the subject of the Ministry, as authoritatively set forth in her Articles, is, like the same position expressed in the Articles of the Church of England, one not only indifferent to the theory of the Apostolic Succession, but distinctly adverse to such a view. We might indeed cite other instances in which both the Houses of the General Convention have appealed to the authority of the Articles, but as the above appear to be amply sufficient for our purposes, and as certain other official utterances will come up in the course of the next few pages, which throw further light upon another point as well, we defer doing so for the present.

With the Articles out of the question, and the preface to the Ordinal remaining the same to all intents and purposes as that of the Church of England, and with the declaration of the Prayer Book, and of the Convention of 1814 to the effect that this Church "is the same body heretofore known in these States by the name of 'The Church of England;' the change of name, although not of religious principle, in doctrine, or in worship, or in discipline" being a matter of political necessity alone; it would seem that we might be at liberty to conclude our argument, were it not that there is one sentence, which occurs but once only

in a single Office of the American Prayer Book, that to many persons appears to afford conclusive evidence that this Church teaches the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession. We refer to the Prayer in the Office of Institution, beginning "O Holy Jesus, who has purchased to Thyself an Universal Church, and hast promised to be with the Ministers of Apostolic Succession to the end of the world," etc. We grant very freely that in this instance, appearances are against us, and in favor of the popular view, but so also in the famous sentence, "I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church" (where the word 'Peter' means 'a rock') appearances are unquestionably against Protestantism and in favor of the Roman theory. Let us look below appearances. There is no declaration of the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession made in this sentence — no evidence to show that such a doctrine was intended to be understood — and much evidence to show that it was not. We must again caution our readers to bear in mind what we said at the very beginning, and what we have continued to say throughout this essay. The phrase Apostolic Succession is a very convenient one, and can be made and has been made to mean a number of different things by different people and parties. We are finding fault with but one use of the phrase, viz.,— that which is now the generally accepted use — the one that is nearly always understood. It is a particular understanding of the phrase that we are attacking, and which we say this Church has never sanc-

tioned. The question is not what do we, but what did the Convention that adopted this prayer, understand by this phrase? We maintain that there were at the time of the adoption of this Office other interpretations of the phrase "Apostolic Succession" very commonly understood, which now, alas, have well nigh been lost sight of in the rapid growth of exclusive churchmanship within the past century (particularly since the beginning of the Oxford Movement) and that the prayer in question was not opposed by those who had set themselves on record as against the narrower and now generally accepted view (as for example Bishop White) only because the phrase was harmless, and was in fact commonly used to express a broader fact that all believed in. Every student of our American Church history knows that at the time of the introduction of this Office the Low Church party, if not actually dominant, was none the less exceedingly strong — every such churchman knows likewise that the prejudice against Connecticut churchmanship came very near being a serious barrier to the union of the Episcopal Church in the United States, and that only the good sense and forbearance of Bishops Seabury and White, who were ready to sacrifice every thing short of principle itself for the unity of the Church, finally won the day. We know that there was hardly a suggestion offered by the Seabury school regarding a more extreme standard of churchmanship than was then generally prevalent throughout the country, that if not actually defeated, was not, at

least, strongly debated in Convention, and yet here if we regard this phrase as expressing the popular, modern view of Apostolic Succession, we are expected to believe that men like White and Smith and Wharton not only accepted this Office of Institution with its obnoxious doctrine, but accepted it without a murmur of protest, so that except for a few alterations of a trivial nature, the Office proposed in 1804 was adopted with little opposition at the succeeding Convention of 1808. It is quite true that there was considerable opposition to the observance of the Office even at that time — so much so that from being obligatory at first upon the entire Church, its use has now become optional, but the objections proffered do not appear to have been founded upon any doctrinal point involved in the Office itself. It is worthy of note, however, that the Office of Institution is the only Office in the entire Prayer Book that by Canon of the General Convention (*vide* Canon XXIX of Con. 1808) is to be recognized as each Diocese sees fit, and hence it is very questionable if any doctrinal points asserted or implied therein, can be cited as an authoritative statement or explanation of the position of this Protestant Episcopal Church. This in itself, therefore, would make the authoritative teaching of the prayer in question debatable in any case, were it necessary for us to investigate the matter along these lines. But it is not necessary. It is sufficient for us to observe that the prayer itself only refers to "the Ministers of Apostolical Succession" and does not attempt to de-

fine who are to be regarded as such, and as it was a commonly received opinion at that time, an opinion inherited from the Reformers themselves, who freely asserted that Presbyters were equally with Bishops, successors of the Apostles, and as they furthermore commonly used the phrase with reference to all ministers who, aside from the question of Episcopal ordination, were successors to the true faith and practice of the Apostles, (as numbers of the foregoing quotations we have cited absolutely show) and as it is again further known that Bishop White and other of the framers of the Prayer Book likewise used the phrase in this sense, it is obviously an unwarranted assumption that would contend that the present generally accepted sense of the phrase is the only one applicable in the present instance. To come down to the meat of the whole matter, there are hardly any persons of any denomination that would dispute the fact that the ministers of their own respective churches are successors to the Apostles. All of us believe in Apostolic Succession in some sense. The question is, what sense? The Presbyterian believes quite as firmly as the strictest "catholic" churchman in an Apostolic Succession, for he contends that Elders, or Presbyters, or Bishops were the one and the only order of ministers that the Apostles appointed, that the Apostles themselves, according to their own assertions were really presbyters (e. g. "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder," etc., I Peter v: 1) though from their peculiar position,

necessarily chief presbyters, i. e., Presiding Elders, and that to the elders in general was consigned the power of ordaining other elders, and that this power has been historically transmitted down to the present day — to their own ministers as well as to others — at times, by general Presbyterial ordination, but for the most part by ordination performed by the Presiding Elders alone — that is, by what is commonly called Episcopal ordination. It is quite true he does not lay any particular stress upon the historical succession (though admitting it to be a fact, in this sense) but prefers rather to maintain with the Anglican Reformers, that mere external succession is nothing, if it be not accompanied by doctrinal succession, declaring that it was this kind of succession alone that the Fathers regarded as essential. Now whatever may be the general understanding of the phrase to-day, it is practically certain that such was the understanding of it by the Reformers, and that in consequence it was the Anglican view of Apostolic Succession (i. e., doctrinal Succession) as opposed to the Roman view, that was understood by the majority of the members of the Convention that adopted this service of Institution — the now popular Roman view not having gained general recognition in this Church until after the Oxford Movement in 1833. It is this that explains the silence of Bishop White and others (who had already given abundant evidence of their opposition to the Roman view) when the office in question was submitted to the Convention. There was not a

man in the Convention that did not uphold the truth of an Apostolic Succession, but it was the Apostolic Succession of the Fathers and of the Anglican Reformers, and not that of the Roman Church, that the vast majority of the members believed in, and which the Convention ratified.

In proof of our contention that such was the understanding of the Reformers and of the English Church generally when defending the phrase, we submit a few quotations, some of which we have cited elsewhere. "The true visible Church is named Apostolical," declares Bishop Francis White, of Ely (died 1624) "not because of local and personal succession of bishops, (only or principally), but because it retaineth the faith and doctrine of the Apostles. Personal and local succession only, and in itself, maketh not the Church Apostolical." Dr. Thomas White, Prebendery of St. Paul's, in reply to the usual charge of the Jesuits says:—"Our answer is, that the Succession required to make a Church Apostolical, must be defined by the doctrine, and not by the place or person. Wheresoever the true faith contained in the Scripture is properly embraced, there is the whole and full nature of the Apostolic Church. For the external succession we care not." Bishop Davenant says:—"All boast about local succession is empty, unless a succession of true doctrine be also proved." Again, "They are the successors of the Apostles," declares Bishop Babington, "that succeed in virtue, holiness, truth, etc. . . . not that sit on the same stool."

Archdeacon Mason (died 1621) declares:—"So Gregory Nazianzen, having said 'that Athanasius succeeded St. Mark in godliness,' addeth, that 'this succession in godliness is properly to be accounted succession; for he that holdeth the same doctrine is also partaker of the same throne; but he that is against the doctrine must be reported an adversary, even while he sitteth on the throne, for the latter hath the name of Succession, but the former hath the thing itself, and the truth.' Therefore you must prove your Succession in doctrine," etc. ("On Consecration of Bishops in Church of England," Bk. II, Ch. i, pp. 41-43.)

Dr. Fulke declares ("Answer to Stapleton," p. 74):—"The Scripture requireth no succession of names, persons, or places, but of faith and doctrine; and that we prove when we affirm our faith and doctrine by the doctrine of the Apostles. Neither had the Fathers any other meaning, in calling upon new upstart heresies for their succession, but by a succession of doctrine as well as of persons." Elsewhere, ("Against Sanders," p. 26), he says:—"The same authority of preaching and ministering the Sacraments, of binding and loosing, which the Apostles had, is perpetual in the Church, *in the Bishop and Elders, which are all Successors of the Apostles.*"

And so we might quote on indefinitely, so universally was this the meaning of the phrase when used by Church of England clergy, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. That it was again the common

interpretation of the phrase by all Anglicans in the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth centuries is likewise evident from the writings of churchmen of this period. Thus Archbishop Sumner says:—"To 'preach the Word, to be instant in season and out of season; to testify, both publicly and from house to house, repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ,'—this is to be a Successor to the Apostles." So also we read from a work entitled "Essays on the Church," by a Layman. (Seeley & Burnside, London, 1840, quoted in "Prim. Ei." p. 217). . . . "Many firm supporters of an unbroken Apostolical Succession are also staunch maintainers of the Presbyterian scheme of government. They tell us that the Apostles constituted the Christian Church, ordaining Elders (or Presbyters) in every place, and that each local Church was governed by these Elders or Presbyters. The existence in some cases of an overseer, or delegate of an Apostle, as in the cases of Timothy and Titus, they do not admit to establish a general rule. But still, while they adhere to Presbyterianism, they maintain, as firmly as the highest Episcopalian, the necessity of a *commission handed down in regular and unbroken Succession from the Apostles*, to enable any man lawfully to exercise the ministerial office. *The number, then, of those that contend for the Succession, is much larger than those who consider that such Succession can only exist in the line of the Episcopacy.*" The Author then goes on to show at length that such was the idea of the Apostolic

Succession entertained generally by the Reformers and later divines—"*that it was the opinion of Jewel, Hooker and Field* 'that a mere Presbyter might confer every order except the Episcopate;' in other words, that *the Apostolic Succession of the presbyters* might be continued by presbyters, the Episcopate being laid aside or lost." It will be noticed that this author wrote in 1840,—subsequently to the adoption of the Office of Institution, and speaks of this view of the Apostolic Succession as a common one in his day—that "*many* firm supporters (at the time he writes) of an unbroken Apostolic Succession *are* also staunch maintainers of the Presbyterian scheme of government," and that "the number of those who contend for the Succession, *is* (at the present moment) *much larger than those who consider that such Succession can only exist in the line of Episcopacy.*" When we take this explicit and unqualified statement into consideration, together with the number of others that we have already quoted—when we remember that the phrase adopted was "*the Ministers*" of Apostolic Succession," not *the Bishops*;—when we further remember that the proposition to change the wording of Article XXIII, which declared those to be "lawfully called and sent" which were chosen and ordained merely by men who had "public authority given unto them in the congregation," to the more exclusive wording—"those . . . who are ordained by the Bishops of the Church" (*vide* Proposed Seventeen Articles, Con. 1799)—was *rejected* by the Church

in Convention assembled — when again, it is further remembered that Bishop White himself, who had more to do with the formation of our Prayer Book and the organization of our Church than any other one man, put himself on record as believing in the validity of Presbyterial ordination (*vide* "Case of the Episcopal Churches Considered") and asserted that such was "the course taken by the Church of England" ("Memoir of Bp. White," pp. 86, 87) and when finally we recollect that this broader view of Apostolic Succession was unquestionably entertained by many others prominent in these first Conventions of the Church,— that Dr. Wharton (who was said to be "the most distinguished scholar of the Committee on the Revision of the American Prayer Book") distinctly asserted that "the pretence of tracing up the Roman Church to the times of the Apostles, is grounded on mere sophistry. The Succession which Roman Catholics thus unfairly ascribe to their Church, *belongs to every other and exclusively to none.* But that portion of the Christian Church is surely best entitled to this claim, which *teaches in the greatest purity the doctrine of the Apostles*" . . . . that according to Ambrose, "They have not the inheritance of Peter who have not Peter's faith"— and that Dr. Smith, another member of the same committee, entertained like opinions — when we remember all these things, it is manifestly impossible to imagine that these very men who adopted this phrase without question, were doing so with the clear understanding that it necessari-

ly implied a view of the Christian Ministry which they had publicly and in print repudiated. The truth of the matter is that an exclusive churchmanship has grown up with such rapidity within the past few years, and so many expositions of a particular view of Apostolic Succession have flooded the theological press, that the vast majority of people have long ago forgotten, if indeed they have ever known, that other interpretations were common a century ago, and that only in 1840, while the present view was beginning to gain recognition as a result of the Oxford Movement, the number of those who contended for the older, broader Reformation view was much the larger of the two. We say that it was the Oxford Movement, beginning for all practical purposes in 1833, but not gaining momentum till some years later, that was the real source and mother of the present wide spread interpretation of the phrase among members of the Anglican communion. The author from whom we have quoted, living in 1840, writes, evidently under the impression that this new, but at that time not generally acknowledged view, is beginning to assert itself and must be condemned.

The utmost that can be asserted, therefore, in view of all these facts, amounts simply to this: — The English Church has nowhere in any of her Articles or formularies officially recognized or set forth any doctrine of Apostolic Succession, while the Protestant Episcopal Church has only in a semi-official manner recognized that view of the Succession that was com-

mon among the Reformers — which view is utterly at variance with the one in question. While we are not disposed to admit, therefore, because of the peculiar nature of the service in which it occurs, that this Church has ever done more than admit the phrase in a semi-official manner, yet if the point be insisted upon, we shall not dispute it, as the sense in which the Conventions of 1804 and 1808 used the phrase, and allowed it in the service, was unquestionably that sense in which the Reformers used it, together with the vast majority of the English divines of that period, and not in the modern popular acceptation of it. In short, there is no question whatever that the Reformers did recognize an Apostolic Succession in their Ministry — there is no question whatever that they claimed to have such Succession and always maintained that claim against the attacks of the Romanists — there is no question whatever but that they claimed their Succession to be the same as that which was maintained and believed in by the Fathers, and openly appealed to the writings of the Fathers to justify their assertions — but there is likewise no question whatever that the Succession which they upheld and believed in *as essential* was a Succession of faith and doctrine, not of place and position, and that the latter view maintained by the Romanists, and now held by so many in our Church to-day, was the very kind of Succession which they repudiated. Of course it is not intended here to assert that they did not in some instances claim a Succession of place and posi-

tion as well, but only that they never in any case laid stress upon such a Succession as important. The Succession of place and position might be true or untrue, it made no difference, for the Succession *essential* to the existence of a Church, was the Succession which the Fathers, they claimed, always insisted upon — the Succession of faith and doctrine, not of place and position.

It was such a Succession, therefore, that the Conventions of 1804 and 1808 assented to when they admitted the Office of Induction or Institution to a place in the Prayer Book. In short, it was a view fully in harmony with the Articles which they had officially and simultaneously set forth as the authoritative formulary of the Church's teaching — fully in harmony with their official recognition in the Preface to the Prayer Book of all the non-episcopal bodies as "churches" — in short, a view fully in harmony with all the doctrinal teachings of the Church of England, as well as of their own — and not that other and later view which is directly opposed to the official utterances of both communions and which in order to appear justifiable and consistent, must explain away the Preface to the Ordinal, and must attempt to undermine the authority of the Articles, and insist that they were never intended to be an authoritative declaration of the doctrinal views of the Church.

(B) STATEMENTS OF ACCREDITED WRITERS

The position of Bishop White on the legitimacy of Presbyterial ordination, and his public advocacy of

the same, when the prospect of receiving the Episcopate from England appeared well nigh hopeless, because of the political difficulties arising at the close of the Revolution, is so well known that we need not go into any great detail in the matter. "The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered" is the title of the pamphlet in which his views were set forth at length. That the criticisms which this work called forth from the Seabury churchmen[7] did not in any way convince him of error in his position is apparent from the following note "added, with the date of 21st of December 1830, to the letter of Bishop Hobart giving an account of the incidents of his early life." Referring to the pamphlet in question (viz., "Case of Epis. Ch. Considered") he says:— "In agreement with the sentiments expressed in that pamphlet, I am still of opinion, that in an exigency in which a duly authorized Ministry cannot be obtained, the paramount duty of preaching the Gospel, and the worshipping of God on the terms of the Christian Covenant, should go on, in the best manner which circumstances permit. In regard to the Episcopacy, I think that it should be sustained, as the government of the Church from the time of the Apostles, *but without criminating the ministry of other Churches;*

[7] These criticisms will be found in a copy of the original letter sent to Dr. White by the clergy of Connecticut in Beardsley's "Life and Correspondence of Bp. Seabury," p. 98. From these criticisms alone it will be abundantly evident that Bp. White advocated and justified Presbyterial Ordination under the circunstances.

*as is the course taken by the Church of England* (Wilson's "Memoir of Bp. White," pp. 86, 87.)

That the sentiments regarding Episcopacy expressed in the above named pamphlet were opposed by an evident minority only, and were not in conflict with the general views of churchmen either in the United States or in England, is apparent from the fact that it no way told against Dr. White in his influence with his brother churchmen, or in his subsequent elevation to the Episcopate by the approbation of practically the entire American Church. His biographer continues:—"Before his visit to England for consecration, he knew that his pamphlet had been in the hands of the Archbishop of York, a predecessor of the prelate who assisted at his consecration. It had been enclosed also to Mr. Adams, the American Minister, when the address of the Convention of 1785 to the Archbishops and Bishops of England, was officially sent to him, and was delivered by him to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Moore. *The latter did not express any dissatisfaction with the pamphlet, or with the Author on its account; nor has any other prelate, so far as known.* After the publication of it, a copy was sent to Dr. (afterwards Bishop) Provoost, at Dr. White's desire, by Mr. Duane, then in Congress. This produced a letter from that gentleman to Mr. Duane, *approbatory of the pamphlet*, and mentioning some facts which the author thought much to the purpose of the main object of it," (p. 87).

These facts are important as they bear witness to

two things. First of all, they show plainly that the views advocated in this pamphlet were not regarded as peculiar either in England or in America; that they met with no expressions of disapproval from the highest officials of the Church of England — the Archbishops and Bishops — and this in spite of the fact that Dr. White urged in his pamphlet that his position *was the position of the Church of England;* and secondly, the very reception that was given the pamphlet, considered in connection with the fact that there were many obstacles from the English point of view, both of a political and an ecclesiastical nature, to the consecration of Dr. White, proves our contention that the changes in the Preface to the Ordinal, as well as the Act of the Parliament of 1662, were never intended as an official denial of the validity of non-episcopal ordination, but were adopted as measures of *expediency* altogether for the protection of the Episcopal form of government and organization of the Church of England. The request of the American Churchmen for the Episcopate was by no means readily acceded to on the part of the people of England. There were too many prejudices, as well as apparently reasonable obstacles to be overcome, and it was this very hopelessness of the situation that induced Seabury, even after he had been in England a year, to give up the attempt and to go to Scotland for consecration. It is true that by the time White and Provoost were elected some of these difficulties were removed, but even then it was by no means an easy

matter to convince the Archbishops and Bishops of England of the advisability of such a course. They urged all manner of objections, even after the oath of allegiance to the Crown ( a supposed objection) had been finally disposed of. It was against all precedent to consecrate a Bishop who was not to be received as a Lord and supported at the nation's expense — there was something extremely grotesque in having a Bishop for "the plantations." But over and above all these traditional prejudices and civil impediments there were ecclesiastical difficulties of a serious type. This same Dr. White had been instrumental in drawing up the "proposed" book of Common Prayer, and in that book were liturgical alterations so menacing in their opinion to the essential principles and faith of the Church of England that they courteously, but firmly demanded a revision of certain parts of it before they committed themselves. All these doctrinal questions were duly weighed and considered, remember, yet while the said pamphlet defending the legitimacy of Presbyterial ordination and written by this same Dr. White was also duly forwarded to their lordships for inspection, it was the doctrinal teaching of the new Prayer Book that was called in question, not the doctrinal teaching of the pamphlet. If the Prayer Book had not been revised, the request for the Episcopate would, in all probability have been refused, and if Dr. White himself had not personally consented to admit these changes, the already reluctant Bishops would have in all probability declined to con-

secrate him, but as he had freely assented to these alterations, there were no objections to him on that or any other score, as the views expressed in the pamphlet called for no criticism whatever. Here then we have unquestionable evidence that a man professing openly to believe in the validity of Presbyterial ordination, was, without protest on this point, duly consecrated bishop at the hands of the two Archbishops of England, Moore and Markham, assisted by Bishops Moss and Hinchcliffe, in spite of the fact that a supposed law of the Church required belief in Episcopal ordination as an *essential* doctrine (one in fact necessary to the very *being* of a Church) and that the service of Consecration itself required that the Consecrators should examine the candidate thoroughly as to his soundness in *faith and doctrine*;—in spite of the fact that the Archbishop sitting in his chair *did* say to the candidate:—"Brother, forasmuch as the Holy Scripture and the Ancient Canons command that we should not be hasty in laying on hands, and admitting any person to Government in the Church of Christ, which He hath purchased with no less price than the effusion of His own blood; before I admit you to this Administration, I will examine you in certain Articles, to the end that the Congregation present may have a trial, and bear witness, how you be minded to behave yourself in the Church of God;"—in spite of the fact that the said Archbishop in presuance of these words did further ask the following direct questions:—"Are you persuaded that you be truly called to this

Ministration, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, *and the order of this realm?*"—and again, "Are you ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away *all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word;* and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same?"—in spite of the fact that to both these questions the candidate gave his unqualified assent in the prescribed words of the Consecration Service—knowing, and his consecrators knowing, full well that he did not believe in the supposed essential doctrine of the exclusive validity of Episcopal ordination, but on the contrary had both publicly and to them expressed his belief in what we are now told is an "erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word." Say what we will of the matter, one thing stands out as absolutely certain from these facts, viz., —the Archbishops and Bishop of England who officiated at this ceremony did not regard the belief of the candidate in the validity of Presbyterial ordination a matter of *false doctrine*, or as a tenet contradicting any *essential* principle or teaching of the Church of England, and this alone shatters forever the contention that the theory of the Apostolic Succession as commonly understood and received to-day was ever understood in their day to be an official teaching of the Church of England.

But we must return to the evidence of other accredited writers of the Protestant Episcopal Church. We have shown that Bishop Provoost was of a like mind

in this matter as he wrote a letter of approbation in regard to Bishop White's pamphlet, adding yet further arguments. We have also quoted elsewhere the words of Dr. Wharton, one of the revisers of our Prayer Book, and we might further allude to Dr. Smith of the same Committee, as well as to Bishops Meade of Virginia, Lee of Delaware, Lee of Iowa, and others. Bishop Hopkins of Vermont, for example, for many years the Presiding Bishop of this Church, is very pronounced in his testimony. He says, in his "Reply to Milner," Vol. II, p. 3:—"Dr. Milner asserts that the Church of England unchurches all other Protestant Communions which are without the Apostolical Succession of bishops. Whereas, on the contrary, not only does Hooker, whom he quotes on the previous page, but all the Reformers, together with Jewell, Andrew, Usher, Bramhall, and in a word, the whole of our standard divines, agree in maintaining that Episcopacy is not necessary to the *being*, but only to the *well-being* of the Church; and hence they grant the names of Churches to all denominations of Christians who hold *the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel*, notwithstanding the imperfection and irregularity of their Ministry. . . . This allegation of Dr. Milner, therefore, is founded on anything but truth. And it is not easy to believe that he was ignorant of his error, because the contrary is apparent in the Thirty-nine Articles of our Church, and in the whole strain of her acts and history." So also, coming down to the present time and well within the at-

mosphere of the Oxford Movement, we find the names of a number of persons prominent in the Church who have not forgotten the principles of the Reformation, and who stoutly maintain that the present view of the Apostolic Succession is one that has never been officially recognized either by the Church of England or our own. Bishop Brooks of Massachusetts, as is well known, could never be induced to assent to such a theory, and Dean Hodges of the Episcopal Theological School of Cambridge, Mass., has made such emphatic denial of its official character that we cannot refrain from citing his remarks. "It might have been asserted in our formularies that our way is the only way. Some teachers in the Church hold that the Ministry is not an institution but a Succession; that is, that the Church is like a close corporation which depends for its existence upon an unbroken continuity. A violation of the rules governing the appointment of men into this corporation would invalidate their standing. Thus, if ordination by a bishop were the ancient and regular method of appointment of the officers of an ecclesaistical corporation, then a failure in that respect would make a man no officer at all. In order to be a valid minister one must be commissioned by a bishop whose authority can be traced back step by step to the day when twelve disciples became twelve Apostles. *Concerning this theory of the Ministry, however, the Episcopal Church is silent.* The various religious denominations of the country are dignified in the Preface to

the Prayer Book by the name of 'Churches.' It is indeed affirmed in the Preface to the Ordinal that in 'this Church' none shall minister unless he has had Episcopal ordination. But nothing is affirmed or denied as to Ministries which from our point of view are *irregular*.

"No; the Episcopal Church, in organization as in doctrine, keeps wisely clear of theories and is blessedly content with facts. The Bishops at Chicago and at Lambeth spoke of the 'historic episcopate.' That phrase has room enough in it for all varieties of opinion. It is the assertion of a fact. There is such a form of ecclesiastical government, which exists to-day, and has existed from the beginning of the Christian Church, as the historic episcopate. There is an institutional *theory* about it, which they may hold who will. There is also a Successional *theory* about it, which they may hold who will. Each of these theories can quote texts out of the Bible and out of the Prayer Book. *But neither the doctrine of Apostolic Evolution nor the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is set forth by authority.* The Church, instead of asserting that our way is either the best way or the only way, is content to affirm the simple fact, easily tested by history, that our way is the old way," ("The Epis. Church," pp. 34, 35).

These words of Dean Hodges, in our opinion, afford a clear and true epitome of the entire matter. The doctrine of Apostolic Succession has never been officially set forth either by the Church of England or by

our own. The "historic episcopate" is another matter altogether. That the Church has officially recognized this fact there can be no doubt, and it is one that no churchman can or would dispute. But the very fact that it was belief in the Historic Episcopate, and not in the Apostolic Succession that the Bishops at Chicago and at Lambeth officially called upon Christians of all denominations to recognize is in itself conclusive evidence that the former and not the latter is the thing that both the Church of England and this Protestant Episcopal Church deem important. If the present view of Apostolic Succession were a doctrine of either body, and one that was deemed *essential* to the very *being* of a Church, then the Bishops of the Chicago-Lambeth Conference, by omitting it in the Quadrilateral, have surrendered a fundamental principle of the faith, and the famous formula along with other blunders of the past, should either be quickly rectified, or else buried in oblivion.

## V

### CONCLUSION

In closing our argument, we must again reiterate what we have already affirmed more than once, that it is not our intention to inveigh against Episcopacy or Episcopal Government. Belief in the Episcopate may be, and we hold that it is, a very important matter, even though there be no exclusive virtue in Episcopacy itself. It is to-day, and has always been, if not from the very days of the Apostles, at least from a very short period subsequent thereto, the form of ecclesiastical government observed by a large majority of Christian people, and if Christian unity of organization is at all desirable, it appears well nigh hopeless to expect it to be brought about upon any other basis. Certainly, if three fourths of Christendom to-day adhere to this form of Church government, and if a large majority practically from the beginning of the Church's existence have adhered to it, certainly it would appear very strange and unreasonable to expect that such an overwhelming proportion should yield their wishes and opinions to so small a minority. But on the other hand, we must remember that we are, in a sense, more or less responsible for the opposition of such a minority. For just so long as we insist upon making Episcopacy an absolute essential to the being of a Church — just so long as we maintain that it is *undeniably* a *Divine* rather than a *human* institution, incapable of being abolished by any mor-

tal authority — just so long do we make its acceptance by non-episcopal bodies a matter of the surrender of a moral principle — just so long do we compel them in accepting it to surrender their own sincere and conscientious convictions. No wonder that under such conditions they refuse to listen to us. When we ourselves are broad enough, catholic enough, to admit that the theory of the Divine right of Episcopacy is a *theory* only — when we are willing to own, as we must, that while fitting in very well with historical facts, it can never be absolutely *demonstrated* — when we further are willing to recognize the fact that the Reformers did not believe in such a theory themselves, and that the Church, in spite of all the influences brought to bear upon her, has carefully refrained from officially promulgating such a doctrine — when, in other words, we cease to unchurch our Protestant brethren by insisting upon a principle logically indefensible and never officially set forth — we will then be in a position to expect some concessions upon their part, and — we venture the further prediction — we shall then begin to hear some solid discussion, and see some valid signs of the approaching union of Christendom.

We say we must be broad enough to recognize that after all is said and done, this view of the Episcopate as a Divine and therefore essential institution, must be accepted at best, if accepted at all, merely as a plausible *theory*. *It can never be demonstrated as an incontestable fact*, and just as long as such is the case,

*it can never be demanded of any Christian body as an absolute essential to the existence of a Church.* It appears to be true indeed, that although Bishops and Elders were at the beginning one and the self-same order, and besides this order the Apostles appointed but one other, that of Deacons, — yet the Apostles themselves constituted the third and highest order. It *may* be also true, that the Apostles *intended* to perpetuate this third or Apostolic Order, and to constitute it the *one* and *exclusive* channel through which the entire Ministry of the Church were to be ordained — but because after historic facts agree quite well with this view in the main — what man is prepared to *swear* that such *was and could only be* the intention of the Apostles, or further *swear*, upon the hypothesis that it was their intention, that they did this because of a solemn command of Christ Himself (recorded no where) which they were not at liberty to disobey, and did not rather, on the other hand, adopt it merely as an expedient and useful arrangement? No man can absolutely and unqualifiedly commit himself to such a theory as the *only possible view* of the case, for there are too many other hypotheses that are also plausible. Moreover, whatever position we may take upon the actual practice of the Church in Alexandria, and however we may explain the words of Jerome, Eutychius, Severus and others upon the subject of Presbyterial ordination — it still remains a matter of great uncertainty at best, and no man can be so sure of his interpretation, however well it may appear to

fit, that he can undertake to *swear* that such ordination never has been, and because of the Divine decree (assumed again) never can be recognized of the Church or of God. And so, too, as long as the origin of Episcopacy remains obscure — as long as it remains a question whether it were an Apostolic Institution, or an historic development, so long will there be uncertainty after all is said and done, of an unbroken tactual Succession through the Episcopate alone. It would be as rash to swear to it as a fact as it would be to deny it. It is perfectly possible — it *may* be probable but it can *never be certain.* Yet if the validity of the Christian Ministry — if the validity of the Sacraments "generally necessary to salvation" — if the validity of the Church herself depends upon such an unbroken tactual succession — *it must be certain.* If this thing is to be regarded as a *sine qua non*, think what a slender thread salvation rests upon! Think of the number of "ifs" and assumptions that must first be made before one can take this position! Is it any wonder that the Church has refrained from committing herself to such a theory? It is said that the Fathers in several instances give us an unbroken line of Bishops extending from the days of the Apostles to their own. We are told that Linus succeeded Peter, that Clement succeeded Linus, that Anacletus succeeded Clement, and so on, but who is to tell us *in what sense* Eusebius, Irenaeus or Turtullian used the word "succeeded" in recording the fact? Historians likewise tell us that Edward succeeded Henry, Mary

succeeded Edward, Elizabeth succeeded Mary on the throne of England; so also has there been a succession of Presidents in the United States from George Washington to Theodore Roosevelt. What has such an assertion to do with a theory that each sovereign or president, or some ruler of equal rank, crowned or inaugurated their successors in office? — in short, what has the mere assertion of the fact of such succession to do with defining the *mode* of it? Granting that there has been an unbroken Succession of Bishops in the Roman See from the days of the Apostle downward — granting that Linus succeeded Peter, that Clement succeeded Linus, that Anacletus succeeded Clement, the assertion of this fact does not prove that any one of these Bishops ordained his successor, or that any one of them was ordained by another Bishop, and not rather *elevated* to his position by his fellow Presbyters, any more than the fact that Leo XIII succeeded Pius IX and Pius X succeeded Leo XIII proves that any one of these Popes ordained his successor, or that any one of them was placed in office by another Pope, and was not rather (as we know to be the case) elevated to his position by his fellow Cardinals. In other words, the mere succession of names in these long lists gives no clue whatever to the *manner* in which these persons were individually installed in office, and hence is of no value whatever in supporting a theory whose essence is *Episcopal* rather than *Presbyterial* ordination or elevation. Moreover, it may be remarked in passing that even the reliabil-

ity of the lists themselves is open to dispute, as they are not always in agreement.

And so, too, to revert once more to the New Testament narrative, who can say with infallible assurance that the Apostles themselves were, in relation to the Elders whom they ordained, not so much Bishops as Presiding Elders, with whom these very Elders joined in the laying on of hands? It is well known that the Apostle Paul tells the supposed Apostle, i. e., Bishop Timothy, to stir up the gift that is in him by the laying on of his (i. e., Paul's) hands, but that Paul did not alone lay hands upon him is evidenced in another passage where we are told that the gift was bestowed through the laying on of the hands of the *Presbytery*. To avoid the inevitable conclusion that here is an instance of Presbyters at least joining with the Bishops (i. e., Apostles) in the consecration of a Bishop, it has been suggested that the Presbytery here referred to is the college of the Apostles themselves, it being pointed out that the Apostles elsewhere speak of themselves at times as Presbyters or Elders. But if we assume this hypothesis to be true, it suggests too much. For if the Apostles ordained Elders, and yet at the same time declared themselves to be Elders, the most natural conclusion is that they regarded those whom they ordained as of the same rank with themselves — they being merely Presiding or Directing Elders because of their unique position as the first Elders instructed and sent forth of Christ to ordain others like themselves, and so necessarily to

direct and superintend. Nor, if this be so, is it the least surprising that they expected these brother Elders after them to exercise a like superintendence and instruction over their fellow, though newly ordained, Elders, and yet again like them (the Apostles) when ordaining others, to have their fellow Elders unite with them in the laying on of hands. That the Presbyters in our own Church to this day unite with the Bishop in the laying on of hands whenever a brother Elder is ordained is proof sufficient that we believe that the Elders in the Primitive Church did so unite with the Apostles at the ordination of an Elder — and if the Apostles called themselves Elders, and St. Paul distinctly asserts that Elders joined with him in laying hands on Timothy when the latter was ordained to the office of Apostle or Bishop, what warrant have we for insisting that these Elders were not the same Elders as those who assisted the Apostles in ordaining other Elders? If there is any evidence at all, it is in favor of this view, particularly as in I Peter v: 1, it is practically certain that the Elders with whom St. Peter is identifying himself are not his brother Apostles, but those who through the Apostles have been ordained Elders, and thus the testimony of the New Testament becomes absolutely one with the testimony of Jerome, Eutychius and others respecting the method of ordaining Bishops at Alexandria, and if so, it appears that the more exclusive custom of the Presiding Elders of different cities meeting together and consecrating other Presiding Elders without the

co-operation of the Elders, was a subsequent development altogether. But, whatever be the truth of the matter, we know that the Elders at least united with the Apostles or Bishops in ancient times to ordain other Elders, and the custom still obtains to-day in this Church, and he must be bold indeed who is prepared to stake his salvation upon the further alleged fact that no Presbyter or Elder ever united with the Apostles in consecrating another Apostle or Bishop, or who, in view of the obscurity of the whole matter in the New Testament, would positively maintain that Bishops alone have the authority of God to ordain, and that Presbyters can lay claim to no such divine prerogative.

But it is not here our purpose to enter into a discussion of these matters, or to defend either view as final, and we allude to the question merely in a general way to emphasize the fact that the whole subject is too obscure to admit of that absolute certitude necessary to an *essential* doctrine of the Church. Whether right or wrong in our solution of the question, we maintain that there is not sufficient data at hand to *demonstrate* the truth or falsity of either side, nor if there was, and we could prove with mathematical exactness that Bishops were consecrated to their office by the Apostles alone and exclusively — the Elders assisting them only in the ordination of other Elders — even then we could not define with certainty the limits of the Presbyterate's power validly to ordain other Presbyters without the co-operation of the Episcopate — to say

nothing of the still deeper uncertainty lying beyond all this again, as to whether the entire arrangement adopted by the Apostles was not after all prompted by a human and temporal expediency rather than by an explicit command of Christ.

There is not one line of evidence to be found anywhere in the New Testament that affords clear and incontrovertible evidence that our Lord commanded that the Church's Ministry should be threefold and that the function of perpetuating the same should be confined to its highest order. All such arguments are based upon a series of more or less questionable assumptions. It is only clear that our Lord did commission *two* classes of Ministers — the Apostles and the Seventy, but without laying any stress upon this particular number of their continuation, and what became of the Seventy in the subsequent Apostolic arrangement is still a matter of speculation.

That the oft-quoted passage of Matt. xxviii: 16, 20, "Go ye therefore and teach . . . and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," contains any specific and exclusive promise to the Apostles and their successors *as an individual order of Ministers*, is a baseless assumption which Dean Alford long ago showed to have no support in the language of the text, nor if it could be proved to be correct, would it any way decide the vexed question as to who these successors were — the Bishops alone, or the entire Presbyterate, seeing that the Apostles were, according to their own statements, Presbyters themselves.

The utmost that can be said is that we have our Lord's express declaration that He came not to destroy, but to fulfill the ancient Jewish Covenant, and it is a logical inference that since He desired the same general pattern to be observed, except where His own Messianic work had necessarily introduced changes, that He expected the same threefold order that obtained in the Jewish Ministry to be perpetuated in His own. In our opinion, this expressed desire of our Lord to stand by the old Mosaic pattern wherever it was possible, together with the actual fact of the appearance of such a threefold order immediately upon the death of the Apostles, is the strongest ground which we possess for believing that this particular form of organization was divinely intended. But even after the point is granted, there is no analogy to show that the function of perpetuating this Ministry was also divinely intended to be restricted to the Episcopate, or that the last was in any sense a distinct *order* from the Presbyterate, but, on the contrary, there is much to confirm the theory before mentioned that Apostles and Bishops were in truth Presiding Elders only — differing in *office* but not in *order* from their fellow Elders.

But, after all, when the last word has been said, when all the possibilities have been ventilated, and all the *pros and cons* discussed, when we have finally settled it to our satisfaction just what particular order and arrangement our Lord had in view, and the Apostles intended to carry out — how will the non-observ-

ance of this arrangement by any particular body of Christians justify us in asserting that they are not within the fold of Christ? The *importance* of any matter is one thing, its *necessity* quite another. Even could it be proved (which as we have just said cannot be done) that our Lord did intend fashioning His Church after our present outward and visible pattern, who is to say that each and every particular of this Divine pattern is of the same importance — or that the feature in question is one so weighty as to be deemed *essential* to the very *being* of a Church — yea, to the very existence of a Christian man? In view of the number of assumptions that must successively be made before we are in a position to assume that the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession is absolutely necessary to the existence of the Church and even of truly Christian men, we believe that it is a far more grievous and dangerous thing in *us* to denounce our fellow Christians who are without the Episcopate as outside of the Church or Body of Christ itself, than it is in them, under the same circumstances to denounce the Episcopate as a human rather than a Divine institution, unnecessary to the perpetuation of the Ministry and the inner life of the Church. Of the two, we would rather be with those whose errors are intellectual rather than spiritual; — in short, we would rather find ourselves intellectually in error regarding the truth of Christ's teaching upon certain points, while still remaining true to His Spirit of love and toleration, than to find ourselves intellectually correct, but spiritually

at fault. It is a very serious thing *for us* to condemn and excommunicate those of our brethren who happen to differ with us merely in their *understanding* of the Word of God, while remaining absolutely one with us in *heart* and devotion to His cause, and yet for us to declare openly to the world that we and we alone who happen to have the Episcopate are the legitimate branches of the Vine, and that all other bodies of Christians, however pure in heart and godly in life, are without the pale of the Catholic Church — a position which we shall assume when we adopt the name of the American Catholic Church — all such procedures mean nothing more or less than this. Let the Lord of the Vine do the cutting off of the branches. After all, it is indeed quite true that only He can do it. It is indeed quite true that our noisy anathemas can do our fellow creatures little harm. It is not they, but we who must consider the consequences, for often those very deeds which are impotent and harmless enough in their effects upon others, are fraught with potent and eternal consequences to ourselves. Let us beware, therefore, lest by our own attitude a worse thing happen unto us. Let us beware lest we, professing in this Twentieth Century a degree of breadth and toleration unknown to former ages, do wake to find ourselves, despite our protestions of horror at the mere mention of the Inquisition or the Interdict, to be none the less the children of them that killed the prophets. One of the hardest lessons that Christianity has had to learn is centered in the great truth that forms and

systems, as well of government as of worship, important though they be (and God forbid the thought that they are not important) are none the less *important*, not *essential*. Christ believed in forms and ordinances indeed, but beyond all, in the *weightier matters* of the Law — righteousness, mercy, truth. The one is *essential*, the other only *important;* the one is vital to salvation itself, the other is but a useful means or auxiliary thereto. To the men who would have reversed this order, however, to the Pharisees of old who emphasized the letter at the expense of the spirit, who imagined themselves true Israelites simply because of the seed of Abraham *after the flesh*, rather than *after the spirit* — to those that believed that the promise was to the circumcision of the flesh, rather than to the circumcision of the heart — to these men having all the formal requirements of the outward Covenant, but lacking the inward and spiritual — to these our Lord declares in no uncertain tones that the Kingdom shall be taken from them altogether, and given to men, who, although they are utterly and altogether without the visible ordinances, are none the less, because of the Spirit, the true heirs of the promise — the true successors of Moses — the true branches of the Church of Jehovah and of Christ. We say, let us beware lest we to-day, in vainly boasting of a mere outward succession from the Apostles, are not, like the Jews of old, losing the true inward succession that is alone of permanent value, and while so boasting of this formal lineage as the *only infallible sign* of the

Church of Christ on earth, and condemning all those about us who have it not as cut off from the Body of Christ — outside the true seed of the spiritual Abraham — are in truth condemning ourselves, not realizing that God's promises to-day, even as God's promises of old, are not made to the fleshly or physical succession as such, but to the spiritual — not to the fleshly succession of the laying on of hands but to the spiritual succession of Faith, Doctrine and Charity in the Spirit of Christ, which is in truth the Life, and the only Life of the Body of Christ — i.e. the only Life of the Church. That this was unquestionably the view of the Reformers, and that no other succession than the succession of faith and sound doctrine has ever been recognized by this Church as essential, has been the object of these pages to prove.

We cannot do better than conclude our argument on this point with the words of one of the most celebrated divines of the Church of England. In his reply to Harding, the Romanist, the learned Bishop Jewell has this to say:—"If it were certain that the religion and truth of God passeth ever more orderly by succession, and none otherwise, then were succession whereof he hath told us so long a tale, a very good, substantial argument of the truth. But Christ saith, by order of succession, 'The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' Chair.' Annas and Caiaphas, touching succession, were as well bishops as Aaron and Eliezer. Of succession, St. Paul saith unto the faithful at Ephesus: 'I know that after my departure

hence, ravening wolves shall succeed me. And out of yourselves there shall (by succession) spring up men speaking perversely.' Therefore St. Hierome saith: 'They be not always the children of holy men that (by succession) have the place of holy men.' As the Scribes and Pharisees succeeded Moses, perverting and breaking the laws of Moses, even so do the Bishops of Rome this day succeed Christ, perverting and breaking the laws of Christ. . . . Such affiance some time had the Scribes and Pharisees in their succession. Therefore they said: 'We are the children of Abraham;' unto us hath God given His promises: 'Art Thou greater than our father Abraham?' As for Christ, 'we know not from whence He came,' or what can He show for His succession. And when Christ began to reform their abuses and errors, they said unto Him, 'By what power doest Thou these things, and who gave Thee this authority?' Where is Thy Succession? Thus to maintain themselves in credit, for that they had continuance and succession from Aaron and sat in Moses' Chair, they kept Christ quite out of possession, and said unto Him, even as Mr. Harding saith now unto us: 'Whoever taught us these things before thee? What ordinary succession and vocation had thou? What Bishop admitted thee? Who confirmed thee? Who allowed thee? . . . All other things failing, they must hold only by succession; and only because they sit in Moses' Chair they must claim the possession of the whole.

"This is the right and virtue of their succession.

. . . We neither have bishops without Church or Church without bishops. Neither doth the Church of England this day depend of them whom you often call apostates as if our Church were no Church without them. . . . They are for a great part learned and grave and godly men, and are ashamed to see your follies. Notwithstanding, if there were not one, neither of them nor of us left alive, yet would not therefore the whole Church of England flee to Loraine. . . . Whosoever is a member of Christ's Body, whosoever is a child of the Church, whosoever is baptized in Christ and beareth His Name, is fully invested with their priesthood, and therefore may justly be called a priest. And wheresoever there be three such together, as Tertullian saith, 'yea, though they be only laymen, yet have they a Church!' . . God's Name be blessed forever! We want neither Church nor priesthood, nor any kind of Sacrifice that Christ hath left unto His faithful. Faith cometh (not by succession, but) by hearing; and hearing cometh (not by legacy or inheritance from bishop to bishop, but) of the Word of God. 'Succession is the chief way for any Christian man to avoid Antichrist.' I grant you, *If you mean the Succession of doctrine.* It is not sufficient to claim Succession of place, it behoveth us rather to have regard to *Succession of doctrine.*" (Works, III, 320, 338, 348).

Having now pointed out what, in our opinion, are the most serious obstacles in the way of any immedi-

ate steps towards the attainment of Church unity, and having proven that the popular theories relating to the Church and the Episcopate are utterly indefensible upon the hypothesis that they are in any sense the official teachings of this church, it follows that there is but one course left open to us. It is our parts and duties, as we love the Church Catholic before any one human branch or division of it, and hold the welfare of the entire Body of Christ to be dearer and more sacred to us than all mere denominational ends and interests, that we should in the manliness of true Christian strength, have the courage to abandon these popular, but narrow and unchristian views, which are, in truth, no part of the teachings of this church, but are merely the unofficial theories of certain of her members, and openly and bravely proffer to the world a platform of unity, which in its true interpretation is broad and tolerant enough to admit into one communion and fellowship at least a very large, if not the greater part of the Christian world. We say a very large, if not the greater part, for it may be true, indeed, that even with a correct understanding of its last and most disputed clause, there will be yet certain branches of the Christian Church which will not consider the formula sufficiently adequate for their needs. This, of course, can hardly be obviated, and indeed it would be unreasonable to expect the unity of entire Christendom as the result of this or any other single effort.

But however inadequate the formula may be as re-

spects the perfect realization of our hopes, the fact that it is logically fitted to accomplish so much in the right direction, proves it to be invaluable, and this alone should urge upon all who can accept its principles, the moral necessity of making use of it as far as possible.

We venture to assert that when once it is clearly understood that this formula proposes to recognize the Catholic membership of all baptized persons, together with the validity of the ministries of all non-episcopal bodies, neither condemning their official acts nor discriminating in any way against them or their respective denominations, and that the proposition for the adoption of the historic Episcopate is made solely in the interests of expediency — the Episcopal form of government having been for fifteen hundred years the practically universal rule, and being at this present the rule of well nigh three-fourths of the entire Church Catholic, thus making it beyond question the only form of government whose adoption could reasonably be expected — we venture to assert, we say, that when this is the clear and unequivocal understanding of the matter, the prospect of unity will be a thousand-fold increased.

The Scriptures as containing all things necessary to salvation, and being the ultimate rule of faith; the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds — the first as the baptismal symbol, the second as a sufficient statement of the Faith; the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself, and administered with the unfailing use of

His words — these things can meet with but little real opposition from the vast majority of Christian people. It is only the 4th Article that can in any way call forth serious objections, and with a corrected view of its supposed meaning and intent, these too must fail.

For after all, what are the facts in the case? What would be the general attitude of the main bodies of the Christian world towards such a platform? It is quite true that so far as Rome is concerned our proposition cannot hope for success. But what proposition can? Rome will not indeed consent to the recognition of the Ministries of non-episcopal bodies, but neither will she allow the validity of Anglican orders, and furthermore, by her insistence upon the recognition of the supremacy of the Pope, she has imposed another condition that no church in Christendom will allow. So far, therefore, as Rome is concerned, neither the Lambeth Articles, nor any other platform that could possibly be devised by any other Christian body can, under existing conditions, hope for success. Objections, therefore, to our particular proposition merely because of the attitude of Rome, are out of order. Our object here is not to defend this or any other proposition as a perfect basis of universal union, for, in our view of it, neither the Lambeth Articles nor any other platform as yet proposed or possible of serious consideration, can under existing conditions, meet with the full assent of Christendom. Our object is only to hit upon a platform, con-

sistent with our own essential beliefs and principles, which will simultaneously, and at this present time, appeal to the largest possible number of Christians, and we believe that the position here advocated is of such a nature. For even if we should maintain the necessity of the prevailing theory of Apostolic Succession as the Catholic party would advocate, nothing would be gained, and much would be lost. Protestantism would, of course, be lost to us; Rome would still continue indifferent, and the only possible gain would be fellowship with the Eastern Church. Moreover, on the basis of such an agreement, there would be no further prospect, even in the remote future, of winning either Rome or the Protestant Churches. On the other hand, if the Lambeth platform, interpreted as to its 4th Article as herein indicated, and shown to be the only interpretation consistent with the official position of this Church, were urged, not only would there be hope of reunion with the Protestant bodies, but there would *ultimately* be hope of union with the Eastern Church. For whatever attitude the Greek Church might at present assume towards the admission of the validity of non-episcopal orders, when once Protestantism and Anglicanism were united upon this basis, and Episcopal government a fact, the whole question would in a few generations cease to be a question, and there would, therefore, be no excuse for further organic separation. It would then result that practically the entire Church, exclusive of Rome, would be reunited. While, therefore, it is

true that absolute unity cannot be hoped for upon the basis of this proposition, it is likewise true that it cannot be hoped for upon the basis of any other, and as it is further true that this proposition offers a reasonable hope of reunion with a very considerable part of Christendom in the relatively near future (a part, moreover, which from a racial, political and social as well as religious standpoint is much nearer to us than any other) and in the more remote future with practically all the remaining portion, with the one exception of Rome, it seems only right that we should take advantage of it. From a purely utilitarian point of view, therefore, such a proposition would appear most advisable, and it is difficult to see how we can afford to shut our eyes to its importance. But this is by no means all. Were it merely a matter of utility, the writer would gladly have spared himself the writing of these pages. Unfortunately it is a far more serious matter that the Church is called upon to consider, for whatever we may think of the problem from the standpoint of mere expediency— whatever we may think of the utility or practicability of such a measure, there is a *moral side* of the question that reveals our duty all too clearly, and whose imperative demands will admit of no hesitancy or debate whatever. We most solemnly assert that if the Church *as a Church* (apart from the opinions of individual churchmen) has in all her official acts and utterances ever stood for the recognition of the validity of non-episcopal orders, then unless this Church *as a Church* is

ready *publicly* and *officially* to repudiate this her historic position to the world, she is *morally bound* to stand to her professed principles, and seek for the unity of God's people along those lines, and along those lines only, wherein her own conscience has ever declared to her lay the pathway of reason and of duty — in short she is *morally bound*, irrespective of any present prospect of success or failure, of the practicability or non-practicability of such a measure, to begin her work for the uniting of Christendom by making a frank and fearless acknowledgment of the validity of non-episcopal orders, and the corporate membership of all baptized persons in the Mystical Body of Christ. Will she seize the opportunity, or will she not? Will she have the Christ-like courage to admit the error and redeem the wrong which many of her sincere, but all too zealous, children have committed in her name; or will she in a narrow, worldly spirit stick, reasonably or unreasonably, right or wrong, to the infallibility of their present attitude, regardless of the living witness of her own authoritative and historic utterances? Is her present doctrinal position, in other words, to be interpreted by the mere unofficial theories and opinions of certain of her members, shifting with every wind of popular churchmanship, and so presenting no one, consistent and defensible front to the world, or is she to be regarded as authoritatively teaching only those old principles, and their inevitable corollaries, which she has ever officially maintained, or else such

new ones only (either additional or corrective) which she shall at this present, or any future time, see fit likewise *officially and authoritatively* to declare? These are the alternatives before her. Let her speak.

# Note

In continuation of the footnote on page 42, the reader will kindly add the following observation:

If it should be contended that the mere *failure* of the Articles to mention the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is no argument that the Church does not recognize such a doctrine, we reply that it *is* none the less an argument that she does not regard it as an *essential* doctrine or one that her clergy *must* subscribe. *Essentials* of belief can never be ignored or omitted from those official statements of belief which the Church requires her clergy to subscribe. Official failure to mention a doctrine, alleged to be *essential to the very being* of a church, is in itself official affirmation that such a doctrine is not essential thereto. Essentials must be positively affirmed. It is only non-essentials that can be ignored, and so left to speculation and debate.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Sept. 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 673 522 8
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 029 557 539 6