





BV 600 .M23

McElhinney, John J. 1811 or  
12-1895.

The doctrine of the church









THE  
DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.



THE  
DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH:

A HISTORICAL MONOGRAPH.

WITH A

FULL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE SUBJECT.

BY

JOHN J. McELHINNEY, D.D.,

MILNOR PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC DIVINITY IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE  
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE DIOCESE OF OHIO.

---

*Ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ ζῶντος, στίλος καὶ ἐδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας.*

---

PHILADELPHIA:  
CLAXTON, REMSEN & HAFFELFINGER,  
819 AND 821 MARKET STREET.  
1871.

---

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1871, by  
JOHN J. McELHINNEY, D.D.,  
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington.

---

STEREOTYPED BY J. FAGAN & SON.

PRINTED BY MOORE BROS.

## PREFACE.

---

WHILE controversial treatises on the Church, of every variety of merit and representing every shade of opinion, abound, a special History of the Doctrine of the Church has not, hitherto, it is believed, appeared in any language. In attempting to supply this deficiency, the author has recorded facts and opinions as he found them, without regard to their bearing upon controverted questions of our own time. Compiled with no polemical purpose, the present work simply aims to embrace, in a single volume of moderate size, the whole body of authority, patristic, mediæval, Romanist, and Protestant—Lutheran, Reformed, and particularly Anglican—touching the nature, constitution, and powers of the Christian Church.

Partiality, or one-sidedness of quotation, as exemplified in numerous *catenæ* and counter-*catenæ* of controversial writers, is a well-known standing ground of complaint, going far to render the argument from authority practically worthless. Hence the compiler esteems it especially important to assure the reader that the following record contains all that has come to the writer's knowledge, after prolonged research, that can be considered necessary to a correct and adequate view of opinions respecting the nature and constitution of the Church, which are regarded as authoritative by the chief parties to the inquiry.

Citations in the direct line of this work might, indeed, have been made on all sides to a much greater extent; but, as the author believes, greater fulness of quotation would in no degree alter or modify the conclusion upon any one of the questions involved, to which the reader will be naturally led from what is here submitted.

Absolute impartiality is indeed scarcely attainable save at the cost of absolute indifference, and the writer cannot pretend to be indifferent to the momentous issues involved in the controversy which, for so many ages, has divided the Church on the great question of the constitution of the body of Christ in its earthly being. He confidently trusts, however, that the following pages will be found to give evidence throughout of a painstaking endeavor to maintain the utmost fairness in the exposition of so multitudinous a body of diverse opinions and discordant theories. As a means of securing to his record the largest attainable measure of fidelity, he has made it a point to report the opinions of individual writers in their own words. The translations which occupy so considerable a portion of the volume, have been made, for much the greater part, directly from the originals by the compiler himself; and in every instance reference to the original is so given as to render the labor of verification as light as possible. Of the few passages which involve any disputed question of construction, the original text is given in the notes subjoined to the several chapters.

The copious Bibliography which is added to the work as an Appendix will be found, it is hoped, a valuable aid to further and independent investigation. The numerals enclosed within brackets in the body of the work refer to corresponding numbers prefixed, severally, to the titles of books arranged, with occasional exceptions, in chronological order, in the Appendix.

\* \* The inappropriateness of the term by which the Fathers of the age immediately succeeding that of the Apostles are usually designated is now generally acknowledged, and attempts have been made to substitute other words (sub-apostolic, ep-apostolic, etc.) in correction of the long-standing abuse. The author, it will be observed, has ventured to depart from general usage in employing the term *post-apostolic*, as more accurately descriptive than any other yet suggested.

The following passage, inadvertently omitted in its proper place, is to be added to the quotation from Cyprian, on the *Headship of the Church of Rome*, p. 54:

In another letter, written shortly after, to the same Cornelius, Cyprian designates the Church of Rome *the root and womb of the Catholic Church*, (*ecclesiæ catholicæ radicem at matricem*), declaring, at the same time, that the maintenance of communion with the Bishop of Rome was itself the maintenance alike of the unity and the charity of the Catholic Church. *Nos enim singulis navigantibus, ne cum scandalo ullo navigarent, rationem reddentes scimus, nos hortatos eos esse, ut ecclesiæ catholicæ radicem at matricem agnoscerent ac tenerent.* (As in the former letter, Cyprian here accounts for his hesitation and that of his colleagues in acknowledging the legitimacy of Cornelius's ordination.) *Sed quoniam latius fusa est nostra provincia, etc.* — "But since our province is wide-spread, having Numidia and Mauritania attached to it; (and fearing) lest a schism made in the city (of Rome) should confuse the minds of the absent with uncertain reports, we decided — having received through the bishops a true account of the matter, and being fully persuaded on the best authority of the lawfulness of your ordination, every scruple being thus at length removed from every one's mind — that letters (acknowledging your ordination) should be sent to you by all (bishops) wherever placed in the whole province. This has accordingly been done, in order that all our colleagues might firmly stand by you and maintain communion with you, that is to say, (main-

tain) the unity of the Catholic Church, and equally also its charity." Ut te universi collegæ nostri et communicationem tuam, id est catholicæ ecclesiæ unitatem pariter at caritatem probarent firmiter ac tenerent. (*Ep.* xlv. 3, *ed. Migne; Goldhorn*, xlvi.) The references in the text to the *Epistles* are conformed to the numbering in Migne's edition. The following are to be noted as exceptions: — P. 52, for *Ep.* lv. 14, read *Ep.* liv. 14, *ed. Migne*, (lix. 20, *edd. Goldhorn and Oxford*;) p. 53, for *Ep.* lii., read *Ep.* li. 8, *ed. Migne*, (lv. 7, *edd. Goldh. and Oxf.*;) *ibid.*, for *Ep.* lxxv., (*edd. Goldh. and Oxf.*) read *Ep.* lxxiv. 17, *ed. Migne*; p. 56, for *Ep.* lxxiii., (*Goldh. and Oxf.*) read lxxii. 11, *Migne*; *ib.*, for *Ep.* lxx., (*Goldh. and Oxf.*) read lxix. 1, *Migne*; p. 382, for *Ep.* lxxvi. 6, read lxix. 2, *ed. Migne*, (lxx. 2, *Goldh. and Oxf.*)

# CONTENTS.

---

## DIVISIONS OF THE HISTORY.

	PAGE
FOUR MAIN PERIODS — The Patristic, Papal, Mediæval, Reformed . . .	17

---

## FIRST PERIOD.

FROM CLEMENT OF ROME TO LEO THE GREAT.

A. D. 100-460.

### CHAPTER I.

Early Patristic Definitions — Clement of Rome — Definition of the Church — Unity — Ministry — Threefold Order — Episcopacy — Ignatius — Definition — Theory of Unity — Ministry — Three Orders — Catholicity of the Church . . . . .	19
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

### CHAPTER II.

Irenæus — Definition of the Church — Exclusiveness — Unity — Apostolicity — Of the Church of Rome — Tertullian — Apostolicity of the Church — Succession of Doctrine — Of the Church of Rome — Agreement with Irenæus — The Universal Priesthood — Of the Bishop of Rome . . . . .	30
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

### CHAPTER III.

Justin Martyr — Unity of the Church — Universal Priesthood — Church Officers — Order of Sunday Service — Clement of Alexandria, Definition of the Church — Exclusiveness — Unity — Origen — Definition — Oneness — Apostolicity — Holiness — Recognitions of Clement — Episcopacy — Apostolical Constitutions — The Baptismal Symbol . . . . .	41
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

### CHAPTER IV.

Cyprian — Of the Exclusiveness of the Church — Unity of the Church — Equality in the Episcopate — Cyprianic Theory — The Petri Cathedra —	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

The Pre-eminence of the Church of Rome—The Primacy of Peter—The Powers of the Church—The Christian Priesthood—The Fundamental Defect of the Cyprianic Theory—The Montanist Theory of the Church—The Novatianist Theory, in conflict with the Cyprianic—Triumph of the Cyprianic—Firmilian at one with Cyprian—Apostolical Constitutions—Optatus of Milevis in Agreement with Cyprian—Lactantius—Notes . . . . . 50

CHAPTER V.

Augustine—Of the Exclusiveness of the Church—Unity—Holiness—Donatistic View—Catholic View—Settled by Augustine—In the Church, not Of the Church—Not Two Churches—Modification of the Primitive View—Augustinian View of the True Church not Identical with the Protestant Doctrine of the Invisible Church—Theory of Tichonius—“The Communion of Saints” first inserted in the African Symbol—Lord King’s Explanation . . . . . 63

CHAPTER VI.

Statements of Jerome in regard to the Origin of the Episcopate—Bishops Successors of the Apostles—Other Apostles besides “the Twelve”—Origin of the Episcopate—Equality of Bishops—Original Identity of Bishops and Presbyters—Jerome Interpreted (a) by the Advocates of Ministerial Parity; (b) by the Upholders of a Threefold Order—The “Testimony” of Euty chius (A. D. 933) worthless—Œcumenical Councils; Authority of; Augustine’s Theory—Vincent of Lerins—Utility of Councils—Judgment of Gregory Nazianzen—Canons and Decrees of General Councils . . . . . 73

---

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM LEO I. TO GREGORY VII.

A. D. 460-1080.

CHAPTER VII.

Primacy of the Church of Rome early asserted—Primacy of the Bishop of Rome—Supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, first asserted by Leo I.—Law of Valentinian—Canon of the Council of Chalcedon—Repudiated by Leo—Grounds of the Claim—Peter’s Relation to Christ—Relation to the other Apostles—Relation of the Roman Pontiff to other Bishops—Relation of the Church to the State—The Papal System—Gelasius—

	PAGE
His Advanced Position — Gregory the Great Repudiates the Title of Universal Bishop as Profane — Isidore of Seville, of Ecclesiastical Degrees . . . . .	85

---

### THIRD PERIOD.

#### FROM GREGORY VII. TO THE REFORMATION.

A. D. 1080—1530.

#### CHAPTER VIII.

The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals — Object of the Compilation — Sample of their Teaching — Gregory VII. — Supremacy of the Church over the State — Dictates of Gregory — Leading Features of the Papal System — New Relation of the Papacy to the Church — Development of Papal Power under Innocent III. — Pope now named <i>Vicar of Christ</i> — Less than God — Greater than Man — The Source of all Law — Hugo of St. Victor . . . . .	98
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

#### CHAPTER IX.

Papal Infallibility — Statements of Leo IX. respecting Indefectibility of Faith in the Papal See; of Innocent III.; of Ivo, Bishop of Chartres — Thomas Aquinas affirms the Infallibility of the Pope — Relation of the Church to the State — The Two Swords — Plenitude of Papal Power asserted by Boniface VIII. — The Bull <i>Unam Sanctam</i> — Decree of the Council of Constance; of Basle — The University of Paris — The Episcopal System in the Church of Rome . . . . .	108
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

#### CHAPTER X.

John Gerson — Distinction between the Catholic Church, which is Infallible, and the Apostolic Church, which is Fallible — A Council superior to the Pope; bound to restrain the Papal Usurpations, and to reform the Church — Enormity of the Papal Claims — Account of Prevailing Theories of Church Power — Two Extreme Views — The Third Theory — The Independence of the Secular Power — Sovereignty of General Councils — Infallibility of General Councils defended by Gerson — Definition of the Papal Supremacy by the Council of Florence . . . . .	117
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

#### CHAPTER XI.

Harbingers of the Reformation — Doctrine of Wycliffe; of Matthias of Janow; of John Huss; of John of Goch; of John of Wesel; of John Wessel . . . . .	127
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## FOURTH PERIOD.

FROM THE PUBLICATION OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION, TO  
THE PUBLICATION OF THE "TRACTS FOR THE TIMES."

1530-1840.

## CHAPTER XII.

	PAGE
Statements of the Augsburg Confession—Altered Phraseology of the Variata—The Papal Confutation fully Answered in the Apology for the Augsburg Confession—Loci Theologici—Views of Melancthon on Church Order—The Episcopal System in the Evangelical Lutheran Church—The Territorial System—The Collegial System . . . . .	136

## CHAPTER XIII.

Views of Luther— <u>Harmony of the Protestant Confessions</u> —The <u>Confessio Helvetica</u> —The <u>Confessio Saxonica</u> —The <u>Confessio Anglicana</u> —The <u>Confessio Belgica</u> — <u>The Heidelberg Catechism</u> —Statements of Calvin—Belief in the Church—Two Senses of the Word—The Ministry—The Church of Rome—Grades of Ministers—Form of Ordination—Ulrich Zwingli— <u>Distinction between Church Visible and Invisible</u> . . . . .	147
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XIV.

The Anglican Church—Abrogation of the Papal Supremacy—Papal Aggressions—Independence of Rome Declared—Ground of the Declaration—The XIII. Articles of 1538—The XLII. Articles—The Ordinal of 1549-1552—No Distinction in Order between Bishop and Presbyter—Cranmer's, etc., Declaration of the Functions, etc., of Bishops and Priests—Resolutions on the Sacrament of Orders—Cranmer's Mature Views, as expressed in Sermon on the Power of the Keys. . . . .	157
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XV.

Catena Martyrum de Ecclesia: Tyndale; Latimer; Ridley; Bradford; Hooper; Philpot—Catechism of 1553 . . . . .	172
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XVI.

The XI. Articles of 1559—Jewel's Apology—Defence of the Apology—Nowell's Catechism . . . . .	179
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XVII.

	PAGE
The Tridentine Doctrine of the Church — Creed of Pius IV. — Catechism of the Council — The Church Triumphant and the Church Militant Defined — The Four Notes of the Church — “The Communion of Saints” — Sacrament of Order — Order Defined — The Priesthood — Priestly Functions — Degrees in the Priesthood — The Minister of the Sacrament — Effects of the Sacrament . . . . .	186

## CHAPTER XVIII.

The Greek and Greek-Russian Church — Definition of the Church — Though Visible, an Object of Faith — The Unity of the Church — Communion of Saints — Invocation of Saints — Holiness of the Church — Catholicity — Indefectibility — Exclusiveness — Peculiar Privileges of the Eastern Church — Apostolicity — The Hierarchy — Authority of Œcumenical Councils — Sacrament of Orders . . . . .	196
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XIX.

Rise of the Puritan Controversy — Admonition to the Parliament — Cartwright and Whitgift — Points in Controversy — Sir F. Knollys' Exceptions to Whitgift's Statements concerning Episcopacy — Bellarmine's Statement of the Roman Doctrine — The Church Militant — Notes of the Church — Papal Infallibility — Four Distinct Opinions — Bellarmine's Exposition — Comparative Authority of the Pope and a General Council . . . . .	202
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XX.

Views of the Brownists — John Raynolds: Conference with Hart — Argument against Peter's Roman Episcopate — Six Conclusions on Scripture and the Church — Argument in Verse — The Church an Article of Faith — Bancroft's Sermon at Paul's Cross — Sir F. Knollys' Exceptions — Bancroft's Answer to Exceptions — Raynolds' Review of the Sermon . . . . .	214
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXI.

Saravia on Degrees in the Ministry — Bishops Necessary to the Church — Presbyters can Ordain, <i>necessitate cogente</i> — Keble's Gloss Amended — Sutcliffe on Presbytery — Querimonia Ecclesiæ — Bancroft's Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline — Lay Eldership — Beza's View — Tenure of the Office — Cartwright Corrected . . . . .	226
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXII.

Bilson's Perpetual Government of the Church — Scope of the Work — Apostolic Succession through Bishops Affirmed — Hooker — Laws of Ecclesi-	
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	PAGE
astical Polity — The Nucleus of the Controversy between the Prelatists and Puritans — Three Views — Hooker's Conduct of the Argument — His Elevated Aim — Distinction between the Church Mystical and Visible — Church and State one Society — Theory Identical with that of Locke — Episcopacy a Divine Institution — Ordination without a Bishop — Presbyterian Orders — Keble's Gloss . . . . .	239

### CHAPTER XXIII.

Field : Of the Church — <i>In</i> and <i>of</i> the Church — Notes — Orders — Presbyterian Ordination — Convocation of Canterbury; Proceedings in 1604-1606; Canons of — Bishop Overall's Convocation Book . . . . .	253
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

### CHAPTER XXIV.

John Robinson, "the Father of Congregationalism": Baillie's Account of Him — Catechism concerning Church Government — Definition — Notes — Officers — Calderwood's Altar of Damascus — Bishop Davenant's Assertion of the Protestant Definition of the Church against Bellarmine; of the Invisible Church; of Degrees in the Ministry; of Presbyterian Ordination — Lord Chancellor Bacon: "Considerations on Church Government" . . . . .	262
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

### CHAPTER XXV.

Bishop Hall's Episcopacy by Divine Right — Revised by Archbishop Laud — Laud's Exposition of Matt. xxviii. 20 — His Doctrine of Apostolical Succession — Divine Right — Bishop Hall's Interpretation — Smectymnuus . . . . .	272
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

### CHAPTER XXVI.

Controversial Activity in 1641 — Mason's Validity of Presbyterian Ordination — Its Genuineness Vindicated — Ground of its Rejection — Milton's Part in the Puritan Controversy — His Exalted Hopes of the "Second Reformation" — Treatise of Reformation Quoted — Origin of these Polemical Tracts — Chillingworth — Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy — Milton's Apology for Smectymnuus — Jeremy Taylor: Sacred Order and Offices of Episcopacy — Characterized by Bishop Heber — Adopts the Puritan Position — Recedes from that of Hooker — On the Plea of Necessity . . . . .	281
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

### CHAPTER XXVII.

Erastianism in Westminster Assembly — John Selden its Leading Advocate — His Exposition of Matt. xviii. 15-17 — The Ruling Eldership — Prolonged Discussion — Calvin's Theory Rejected — Judgment of Blondel and	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Vitringa — Westminster Confession of Faith — Rise of Quakerism — Barclay's Apology — Doctrine of the Church — Dr. Hammond — Four Dissertations — Annotations on the New Testament — Leading the Way to the Reconstruction of the Ordinal — 1661-2 . . . . .	294
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

Stillingfleet's Irenicum — Object of the Work — The Main Question Discussed — Divine Right — Four Pleas — Sermon on Mischief of Separation — Replies of Owen and Baxter — Review by John Howe — "Unreasonableness of Separation" . . . . .	308
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXIX.

Rights of Convocation — Revision of the Liturgy — Alterations Proposed — Opposed by Sherlock — Advocated by Tenison — Anti-Revisionist Triumph — Synodal Condemnation of Burnet's Exposition — Dispute between the Upper and the Lower House — Declaration of the Latter — Address and Counter-Address — The Bishops' Reply — High Church and Low Church . . . . .	317
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXX.

Lord King's Inquiry — Its High Profession of Candor — Not Fully Borne Out — Supports Independency — Answered by Sclater — Original Draught — King's Conversion — Probability of the Tradition — Character of Sclater's Argument . . . . .	323
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXXI.

Warburton's Theory of the Relation of the Church to the State — The Alliance — Analysis of — Coleridge's Theory Compared — Arnold's Theory — Gladstone's — Bunsen's — Prevailing Views of Church Order in England as Represented by Leslie and Law — Emanuel Swedenborg: Church of the New Jerusalem . . . . .	330
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXXII.

The American Episcopate — William White — Scheme for the Organization of the American Episcopal Church — The Divine Right of Episcopacy — Moderate Views — The Question of Lay Eldership in the American Presbyterian Church — Dr. J. P. Wilson — Dr. Miller — Dr. Breckinridge — The Question in the Church of Scotland — Dr. Colin Campbell — Lay Eldership Untenable — Dr. George Campbell of Aberdeen — Lectures on Ecclesiastical History — Bishop Skinner — Defence of Episcopacy . . . . .	345
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXXIII.

PAGE

Tracts for the Times — Distinctive Principles of Anglo-Catholicism — Apostolic Succession — In Connection with the Sacraments — Broad Church View of the Theory — Whately's Kingdom of Christ — Buel's Reply — Isaac Taylor — "Spiritual Despotism" — Testimony to Episcopacy — Bishop O'Brien's Charge — Archer Butler's Sermon — Necessity of Limitation — Principle of Accommodation . . . . .	357
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXXIV.

Church Questions in Germany — Möhler's "Unity in the Church" — Analysis of the Work — Rothe's Anfänge, etc. — A Protestant Counterpart — His Theory of the Church — Based on the Hegelian Principle — Theory of the Origin of the Episcopate — Stahl's Theory of the Church — The Neo-Lutheran and the Anglo-Catholic Fundamentally One — Schleiermacher's Theory — More Recent Views — Schenkel's Exposition of the Protestant View — Conclusion . . . . .	367
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

---

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL APPENDIX: Literature of the Doctrine of the Church; or, A Catalogue of Works relating to the Subject . . . . .	385
INDEX . . . . .	453
INDEX TO THE BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	459



# HISTORY

OF THE

## DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

---

THE history of the doctrine of the Church may be divided into four main periods: the first extending from CLEMENT of Rome to LEO the Great (A. D. 100-460); the second, from LEO the Great to GREGORY VII. (460-1080); the third, from GREGORY VII. to the Reformation (1080-1530); the fourth, from the Reformation to the present time.

To the reader familiar with the course of events in ecclesiastical history it will be at once apparent that these divisions are by no means arbitrary, or chosen with reference to the writer's convenience merely, but are determined by clearly marked epochs of transition from one phase of development in the history of the doctrine of the Church to another. Thus the *first* period finds its proper point of departure in the episcopate of the first of the post-apostolic Fathers, whose Epistle to the Church of Corinth ranks next in order of time, as of intrinsic value, to the apostolic writings.

The patristic utterances on the subject of the constitution of the Church, during the next succeeding centuries, down to the middle of the fifth, are pervaded by the same materialistic spirit that we find already prominently developed in the writings of Ignatius. The Fathers of this period unite with one voice in emphasizing the objective and positive, to the relative depreciation of the subjective and spiritual; thus unconsciously preparing the way for the appearance of the first Pope, properly so called, in the person of LEO I. The ad-

vanced claims set up by this energetic pontiff for the great patriarchate of the West, mark the boundary line between the period of acknowledged equality among the churches of apostolic descent, and that of the usurped domination of one over all others. The culmination of the papal system in the pontificate of HILDEBRAND, fixes the close of the *second* and the beginning of the *third* period; and this — the period of mediæval darkness — finds its fitting close in the rising of the day-star of the Lutheran Reformation, an epoch signalized by the publication of the Augsburg Confession, the enduring groundwork of all the other Protestant symbols. The limits of the *fourth* and last period are definitely determined by the unbroken course of development in the history of our doctrine during the last three centuries.

## FIRST PERIOD.

FROM CLEMENT OF ROME TO LEO THE GREAT.

A. D. 100-460.

---

### CHAPTER I.

EARLY PATRISTIC DEFINITIONS — CLEMENT OF ROME — DEFINITION OF THE CHURCH — UNITY — MINISTRY — THREEFOLD ORDER — EPISCOPACY — IGNATIUS — DEFINITION — THEORY OF UNITY — MINISTRY — THREE ORDERS — CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH.

THE works of the Fathers of the first two centuries that have come down to us contain no distinct treatise on the Church. The statements on the subject scattered through their writings, though by no means scanty, are for the most part of a purely practical or even devotional character. Rarely do the definitions of the Church to be found in the pages of Ignatius or Irenæus, Tertullian or Origen, make any approach to scientific precision.

CLEMENT, bishop of Rome, describes "the Church of God" as constituted of "the called of God through our Lord Jesus Christ—the called and sanctified by the will of God through Christ." (*Ep.* i. 59.) Clement, 100.

The oneness of the Church, in the sense of *exclusiveness*, is not obscurely taught in the fervent appeal of this first of the Fathers to the authors of sedition in the Church of Corinth: "It were better for you to be found in a lowly position and of approved standing in the flock of Christ, than in a position of eminence, to be cast out of his hope;" (*ib.* lvii.)—words which clearly imply that exclusion from the one visible communion of the faithful involves the forfeiture of the hope of salvation. Oneness.

Throughout the Epistle the unity of the Church is brought prominently forward, but it is rather the unity of a particular church, under one government, than that of the Church at large.

Unity. Thus, "Let us consider those who serve under our generals, with what order, obedience, and submissiveness they perform the things commanded them. All are not prefects or commanders of a thousand . . . but each one in his own rank performs the things commanded by the king and the generals. The great cannot subsist without the small, nor the small without the great. . . . Let us take our body for an example. The head is nothing without the feet, and the feet are nothing without the head . . . but all work harmoniously together, and are under one common rule of subjection for the preservation of the whole body. Let our whole body be preserved in Christ Jesus; and let every one be subject to his neighbor, according to the especial gift bestowed upon him. Let the strong not despise the weak, and let the weak show respect to the strong. Let the rich man provide for the wants of the poor," etc. (*Ib.* xxxvii., xxxviii.)

Clement's idea of a church is that of an assembly of individual believers, all being members of an organic whole, each member discharging the functions assigned it by the Head. The Epistle, addressed by a church to a church, makes no mention of the rulers of the church that writes, while the ministers of the church addressed are spoken of in a way that implies the right of the church itself to a share in its own government.

The Ministry. Of the Christian ministry Clement finds a type in the Levitical priesthood: "His own peculiar services are assigned to the high-priest, and their own proper place is prescribed to the priests, and their own special ministrations devolve on the Levites; the layman is bound by the laws that pertain to laymen." (*Ib.* xl.)

Three orders. That three orders or grades of office are here distinguished as obtaining in the Christian ministry, as they had obtained in the Levitical priesthood, might seem too plain for question. It is contended, however, by the

advocates of ministerial parity, that the reference in this passage is exclusively to the Jewish priesthood, and that nothing is to be inferred from this allusion as to the constitution of the ministry in the primitive Church. But if the argument or illustration is by *analogy*, and this is not questioned, it would seem altogether arbitrary to exclude from the analogy the element of threefoldness. The scope of the passage is to show the necessity of due ecclesiastical subordination in a Christian community; and when the writer speaks of the economy of the Jewish Church, it is simply in the way of allusion, for the purpose of suggesting the necessary inference in regard to the Christian ministry. But if the distinction of orders in the Christian Church had not corresponded to that in the Jewish, the allusion would scarcely have been pertinent, or the inference just.

The distinction between the ministerial body and the laity, here broadly drawn, is repeatedly alluded to in the chapters following. Thus, "Let every one of you, brethren, give thanks to God in his own order . . . not going beyond the rule of the ministry prescribed to him. . . . The apostles have preached to us the gospel from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ from God. Christ, therefore, was sent forth by God, and the apostles by Christ. Both these appointments, then, were made in an orderly way, according to the will of God. Having therefore received their orders, . . . they went forth proclaiming that the kingdom of God was at hand. And thus preaching through countries and cities, they appointed the first fruits of their labors, having first proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who should afterwards believe. . . . And what wonder is it if those in Christ who were intrusted with such a duty by God, appointed those (ministers) before mentioned, when the blessed Moses also, 'a faithful servant in all his house,' noted down in the sacred books all the injunctions which were given him." Then, after naming the expedient adopted by Moses to subdue the rivalry in Israel concerning the priestly dignity, he continues: "Our apostles also knew, through our Lord Jesus

Clergy and  
Laity.

Christ, that there would be strife on account of the office (*ὄνοματιος*, *name*, title, dignity) of the episcopate. For this reason, therefore, inasmuch as they had obtained a perfect foreknowledge of this, they appointed those ministers already mentioned, and meanwhile gave instruction (*ἐπινομήν*, *injunction*, or *after-enactment*) that when they (the apostles) should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed them in their (the apostles') ministry. We cannot think, therefore, that those may be justly dismissed from their ministry who were appointed by them (the apostles), or who were afterwards appointed by other eminent men (the apostles' successors), with the consent of the whole Church." (*Ib.* xli.-xliv.)\*

While in these passages, as throughout the Epistle, Clement, in terms, identifies the episcopate, or office of *oversight* in general, with the presbyterate, he yet at the same time indicates the existence, in the primitive Church, of a higher office of oversight or *special* episcopate, as vested in the first called apostles by the Lord, and by them transmitted to their successors.

According to this interpretation of the forty-fourth chapter, as above quoted, it embodies an explicit statement of the apostolical institution of episcopacy as a continuation of the apostolate. According to another interpretation, there is no reference in the passage to episcopacy, properly so called; "bishop" and "presbyter," in the language of Clement, being strictly synonymous terms. The pronouns "they," "their," are thus naturally made to refer to the presbyters first appointed by the apostles themselves.

Between these two interpretations, critical authority is perhaps about equally divided. ROTHE'S strenuous and able advocacy of the former is scarcely balanced by Donaldson's summary defence of the latter, even as reinforced by the suffrage of Lightfoot. (See Rothe, *Anfänge*, pp. 374-92; Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit.* i. 137; Lightfoot, *Philipp.* p. 203; *Epist. S. Clem.* p. 137.)

\* Note A, at the end of the chapter.

IGNATIUS defines the Church as "the multitude or assembly that is in God;" and "the Catholic Church" as being "wherever Jesus Christ is." (*Trall.* viii.; *Smyr.* iii. Here we note the earliest occurrence of the expression "*the Catholic Church.*")

Ignatius, ob.  
115.

The unity of the Church, according to Ignatius, is represented in the EPISCOPATE. In the bishop every particular church, and in the episcopate the collective body of the universal Church, have each its proper bond of union, and centre of unity.

Unity.

That this theory of Church unity claims Ignatius for its author, may appear from the following passages in his Epistles, elucidated by the aid of ROTHE'S masterly analysis:—"Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the (manifested) will of the Father; as also bishops, settled everywhere to the utmost bounds (of the earth), are so, by the will of Jesus Christ. Wherefore it is fitting that ye should run together in accordance with the will of your bishop." (*Ephes.* iii., iv.) Here the common point of union for all Christians is designated as, in its essence, "the will (*γνώμη*) of God," or "of Christ;" in its outward manifestation, "the will of the bishop." But this will of the bishop is represented, not merely as the will of the particular bishop, and, as such, a point of union for the members of a particular church merely, but, at the same time, as the one and the same will of *all* bishops scattered throughout Christendom; consequently also as a point of union for *all* particular churches. The episcopate is set forth as one and the same in all places where the Church is planted, and hence the union of the particular church with its particular bishop, as virtually also a union with *all* bishops, and consequently with *all* churches; in a word, with THE Church.

Ignatian  
theory.

The "running together" of all Christians, according to the will of God, is, moreover, represented as resulting from their "running together in accordance with the will of the bishops, *who are settled everywhere to the utmost bounds of the earth;*" a result described as effected through their all being in unison

with the will of Jesus Christ, and thus also with the will of God; and as being in unison with the will of God, all the faithful are themselves bound together in a perfect oneness. And it is as viewed in this light, namely, as bringing particular churches into organic connection with the Church considered as a collective whole, that the episcopate is characterized expressly, as "*the ministry which pertains to the common weal.*" (*Philad. i.*)

Again: "Wherever the bishop shall appear, there let the multitude (of the people) also be; even as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church." (*Smyr. viii.*) In order to apprehend the true import of this passage, it is necessary not only to understand the meaning of the two clauses composing it, each by itself, but also the relation of the two to each other. Assuming, then, that the two members of this proposition stand to each other in a definite logical relation, and that the latter is the ground of the former — what, we inquire, is the import of the two, each taken separately? And first, as to the latter, "Where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church," the meaning plainly is, that with Christ, the head of his mystical body, all the faithful are intimately united, so as to form, in vital union with him, an external unity; that Christ cannot become the subject of our thought without our thinking, at the same time, of such a communion of his mystical members joined together in an external unity — the Catholic Church, that is to say, the Church *as Catholic*.

The meaning of the first member is no less plain, "Wherever the bishop shall appear," that is to say, in his proper character *as bishop*, "there let the multitude of the people also be;" in other words, there let the particular churches, in full number, be gathered about him, the centre of unity to all the churches under his supreme pastoral oversight. Let all faithfully adhere to him as their bond of union with one another.

Now, from the two members of this passage viewed in their causal relation to each other, we deduce this proposition: As

the community of the faithful in Christ is everywhere essentially and necessarily united to Christ so as to constitute an external organic whole, even so, and The Church in the bishop. *for this reason*, wherever, in a particular church, the bishop publicly appears in his official character as such, there must the Church also, in full number, be gathered together; a proposition, it is evident, which is susceptible of a coherent interpretation only on the supposition that the bishop is the representative and organ of Christ.

To the same effect, ONESIMUS, the bishop of the Church at Ephesus, is described as "your bishop in the flesh," that is to say, your *human, visible, earthly* bishop; so designated, it is evident, in distinction from the *divine, invisible, heavenly* Bishop, Christ or God, and as that invisible Bishop's earthly representative. (*Ephes. i.*)

Further, "For we ought to receive every one whom the master of the house sends to be over his household, as we would do him that sent him. It is manifest, therefore, that we should look upon the bishop even as we would upon the Lord himself." (*Ephes. vi.*) "Study to do all things with a divine harmony, while your bishop presides in the place of God, and your presbyters in the place of the assembly of the apostles, along with your deacons." The bishop Christ's vicar.

(*Magn. vi.*) "It becomes you to yield him (the bishop) all reverence, having respect to the power of God the Father, . . . submitting to him, or rather, not to him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ, the Bishop of us all. It is therefore fitting that you obey (your bishop), in honor of him who has willed us so to do, since he who does not obey deceives, not *the bishop that is visible, but seeks to mock him that is invisible.*" (*Id. iii.*)

"Since ye are subject to the bishop as to Jesus Christ, ye appear to me to live, not after the manner of men, but according to Jesus Christ. It is No Church without the bishop. necessary that, as indeed ye do, so without the bishop ye should do nothing." (*Trall. ii.*) "Let all reverence the bishop as Jesus Christ, who is the Son of the Father; and

the presbytery as the Sanhedrin of God, and assembly of the apostles. Apart from these there is no church." (*Id.* iii.)

Now, if the bishop is Christ's representative, it follows that the external, visible society of Christians must needs sustain the same relation to him that, in virtue of an inner necessity, it sustains to Christ himself. But if the visible Christian community is related to Christ, essentially and necessarily, as a (visible) unity, then the particular part of that community committed to the oversight of a bishop, that is, the particular church in which he exercises his office as Christ's representative and organ, must also be related to its bishop as an external, visible unity. And thus, according to Ignatius, the bishop, as Christ's representative, is also virtually the representative, at the same time, of the external unity of all the faithful in Christ—the representative of CHURCH UNITY. Not only the representative, however, the bishop is also the organ of Church unity; that is to say, he not merely represents the external unity of all the faithful in his own person, but he actually realizes that unity, in his forming a centre of unity around which the collective body of the faithful gather in a visible union. But this holds true, according to Ignatius, not of the individual bishop, as such, but of the collective whole of all individual bishops; in a word, not of the bishop, but of THE EPISCOPATE. The bishops are the representatives and organs of the Church, in so far as they, in accordance with the specific character of the episcopate, are the immediate representatives, plenipotentiaries, and organs of Christ. In them, Christ, so to speak, is multiplied; in them, his omnipresence, within the sphere of Christendom is rendered visible. It is HE who, in reality, through the bishop as his instrument, exercises in ALL churches a guiding and controlling influence. One and the same divine Being, therefore, presides over *every* particular church, through the medium, indeed, of different individual representatives. And thus all particular churches are bound together in the most thorough unity; only, however, under the condition of organic adhesion, on the part of each particular church, to its own bishop. This adhesion of

particular churches, severally, to their bishop, virtually involves adhesion to the bishops collectively of all other particular churches, (and through them also to all other particular Churches themselves,) inasmuch as all particular bishops find their common centre of being, or point of union, in one person — in Christ, in God.\*

Here, then, at the very dawn of the post-apostolic period, we trace the germinal development of that theory of church unity which, as first fully unfolded in the writings of CYPRIAN, is commonly known as the *Cyprianic*.†

In the Epistle of Ignatius to the church at Smyrna, we have noted the earliest express mention of the *catholicity* of the Church. Those who dispute the genuineness of this epistle, (admitting that only of the *Syrian recension*,) find the first occurrence of this predicate in the inscription of the circular, *Epistle of the Church of Smyrna concerning* Catholicity.  
*the martyrdom of St. Polycarp* (147-169): "The church of God sojourning at Smyrna, to the church of God sojourning at Philomelium, and to all the congregations of the *Holy and CATHOLIC Church* in every place."

In this, its primary application, the term Catholicity, it is obvious, is not simply equivalent, as in modern use, to universality, but rather conveys the idea of organic unity — "a whole composed of various parts, which have no proper existence independently of that of which they are parts;" Primary im-  
port.  
in a word, (according to its etymology,) an organized totality. It was in contrast to sectarianism — *heresy*, the principle of division — that the term Catholic, as a descriptive title, was first applied to the Church. It would thus, in primitive use, seem to have comprised the three distinct notions of *unity*, properly so called, or the union of the members of Christ's mystical body with the head and with each other; of *oneness* — oneliness, or *exclusiveness* — as distinguished from unity; and of *universality*.

It is in this superscription of the Smyrnaean epistle, moreover, that we find the earliest explicit mention of *holiness*, as

\* Note B.

† Note C.

an attribute of the Church Catholic. Thus, in a document belonging to the first half of the second century, we meet with the selfsame predicates of the Church which are contained in the Apostles' Creed: UNITY, ONENESS or EXCLUSIVENESS, HOLINESS, CATHOLICITY.

---

NOTES.

A.

Και οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. Διὰ τούτην οὖν αἰτίαν πρόβηνοι εὐλαβέστες τελείαν κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομήν δεδώκασιν ὅπως, εἰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδεδεικασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Τοὺς οὖν κατασθαθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων ἢ μεταξὺ ὑψ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκῆσάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης . . . τοῦτους οὐ δίκαιως νομίζομεν ἀποβαλλέσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας.

For *ἐπινομήν* — of very doubtful meaning — Bunsen and Lightfoot adopt the conjectural reading *ἐπιμονήν*, the former in the sense of “*life-tenure*,” (*Hierol.* i., p. 45, ed. 2;) the latter in that of “*permanence to the office*.” (*Ep. Clem.*, p. 136.) The change in either meaning is scarcely an amendment, as the commonly received interpretation yields an unexceptionable sense. The ground of objection to Rothe’s rendering of the whole passage, as alleged by Lightfoot, viz., that “it disregards the purpose of the letter, and interrupts the context with irrelevant matter,” (*Ep. Phil.*, p. 203; *Ep. Clem.*, p. 137,) is also put forward by Donaldson, who strangely renders *ἐπινομήν* “an addition,” or “a distribution” — meaning that “the apostles made a second choice of men, in order that if the first should die, there would be others ready to take their place.” (*Crit. Hist.* i., 138.) This latter writer does Rothe scant justice in assigning to his translation of the word in dispute, “a *fundamental* position in his exposition of the government of the Church at this period.” On the contrary, Rothe’s exposition is supported by considerations quite independent of any one translation of the term in question. (*Anf.*, pp. 354-92.)

B.

I have assumed, as being supported by the weight of modern critical authority, the genuineness and substantial integrity of the Ignatian Epistles of the shorter Greek recension. On this point, an enumeration of no less than eighty-eight opinions is given by Jacobson, *Proleg.* xxv.-lvii. The state of the question is well exhibited in brief compass by UHLHORN, in *Hertzog’s Real Encyclop.*, art. IGNATIUS. In his summary of the evidence in favor of the genuineness of the seven smaller Epistles, Dr. Schaff makes a point of “their urgent recommendation of episcopacy as an institution still new and fresh.” (*Hist.* i. 469.) That a writer of Dr. Schaff’s superior candor should lend the sanction of his name to so feeble an attempt to explain the singular urgency of Ignatius in recommending episcopacy is indeed

surprising, and would be unaccountable, did we not know the power of preconceived opinion in warping the strongest judgment. To no unbiased mind can that explanation commend itself as even plausible. The claims of "an institution still new and fresh"—a known departure from the original apostolic order, would naturally be urged by its first advocates with studied moderation; at least, those claims would not be vehemently pressed, as demanding unconditional and universal recognition. Why not at once accept the explanation given by Ignatius himself. In a noteworthy passage, he describes himself as "a man formed and fitted for promoting UNITY"—*ανθρωπος εις ενωσιν κληρησιαμενος*—that is to say, one who regarded it as his especial mission to check the inroads of a spreading spirit of insubordination in the churches, threatening, as he was persuaded, their utter disintegration. As the sole effectual means of accomplishing this object, he is moved to insist, *with all the authority of a man divinely inspired for the purpose*, upon a strict adherence to the episcopal form of polity, known to him as of apostolic institution, and devoutly believed by him to be *of divine right*: "I cried whilst I was among you: I spake with a loud voice: *attend to the bishop, and to the presbytery, and to the deacons*. Now some supposed that I spake this as foreseeing the division that should come among you. But He is my witness, for whose sake I am in bonds, that I know nothing from any man. *But the SPIRIT spake*, saying on this wise: *Do nothing without the bishop.*" (*Phil. viii.*; *ibid. i.*)

## C.

According to another interpretation of the Ignatian theory, the bishop is the representative of the unity of the *congregation*, or of a particular church only; not that of the collective whole of all churches throughout the world; of this—"the Catholic Church"—Christ alone is the centre of unity. Thus *Uhlhorn*, who says, "Ignatius sees in the episcopate, indeed, as the headship of a particular church, a special means for the preservation of ecclesiastical unity against the inroads of heresy; but the bishops are not, in his view, the bearers of traditional doctrine on the ground of a special gift of the Holy Spirit, nor is any particular importance attached to the succession of the bishops." While the form of church polity found in Ignatius is acknowledged by this writer to be a decided advance upon that developed in the Epistle of Clement, in which only a prominent presbyter—*primus inter pares*—appears, yet it falls, he insists, considerably short of that developed in the writings of Irenæus. (*Hertzog*, vi. 629.) How some of the Ignatian utterances are to be reduced into harmony with this explanation, it is not easy to see.

## CHAPTER II.

IRENAEUS — DEFINITION OF THE CHURCH — EXCLUSIVENESS — UNITY — APOSTOLICITY — OF THE CHURCH OF ROME — TERTULLIAN — APOSTOLICITY OF THE CHURCH — SUCCESSION OF DOCTRINE — OF THE CHURCH OF ROME — AGREEMENT WITH IRENAEUS — THE UNIVERSAL PRIESTHOOD — OF THE BISHOP OF ROME.

FULLY accordant with the teaching of Ignatius is that of IRENAEUS, who defines the Church as “the synagogue of God, which God, the Son himself, has gathered by himself — consisting of those who have received the adoption.” (*Haer.* iii. 6.) The Church’s *exclusiveness* is insisted upon by Irenaeus with peculiar urgency: “In the Church, the apostles, like a rich man depositing his money in a bank, lodged all things pertaining to the truth; so that from her, every man, whosoever will, can draw the water of life. She is the entrance to life; all others are thieves and robbers.” “This gift of God — our faith, which Exclusiveness. having been received from the Church, we do preserve . . . has been intrusted to the Church, as breath was to the first created man, for this end, that all the members receiving it may be vivified. . . . All the means through which the Spirit works, God hath set in his Church; of which all who do not unite with the Church do not partake, but defraud themselves of life. For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and every kind of grace.” (*Ib.*)

Of the UNITY of the Church, Irenaeus, in full harmony with Ignatius, makes the episcopate the specific organ: “True Unity. knowledge is that which consists in the doctrine of the apostles, and the ancient constitution (*συστημα*) of the Church throughout all the world, and the distinctive manifestation of the body of Christ (*character corporis*)

according to the successions of the bishops, by which they have handed down that church which exists in every place, and has come even unto us." (*Ib.* iv. 33.) These words can import no less than that the unity of the Church universal, as a regularly organized system, is constituted by the episcopate.

The *apostolicity* of the Church is a frequently recurring topic in the writings of this Father. Throughout his great work *Against Heresies*, it is his leading argument against the sectaries, that the Church Catholic could trace back its origin historically to the apostles, through the uninterrupted succession of its bishops; while the separatists of every name were of recent origin. "It is within the power of all," he writes, "in every church, . . . to contemplate clearly the tradition of the apostles manifested throughout the whole world; and we are in a position to reckon up those who were by the apostles instituted bishops in the churches, and (to show) the successions of these men to our own times; those who neither taught nor knew of anything like what these (heretics) rave about." (*Adv. Haer.* iii. 1.)

Apostolicity.

"Wherefore we ought to obey the presbyters who are in the Church, who have the succession from the apostles, as we have shown, who, with the succession of the episcopate, have received the sure gift of truth, according to the Father's good pleasure. But to regard others who are separate from the principal succession, and are gathered together in any place, as suspected, or as heretics and of bad principles, or as schismatic, and proud, and self-pleasing, or as hypocrites who act on account of gain or vain-glory; but all these have departed from the truth; and, indeed, heretics who offer on the altar of God strange fire, that is, strange doctrines, will be burned with fire from heaven, like Nadab and Abihu. But those who rise up against the truth, and exhort others against the Church of God, remain in the infernal regions, being swallowed up in an earthquake, as were those about Corah, Dathan, and Abiram. But those who divide and separate the unity of the Church, receive from God the same punishment as Jeroboam." (*Ibid.* iv. 43.)

“All these (heretics) are of much later date than the bishops to whom the apostles committed the churches. It follows, then, as a matter of course, that these heretics, since they are blind to the truth, and deviate from the right way, will walk in various roads ; and therefore the footsteps of their doctrine are scattered here and there, without agreement or connection. But the path of those belonging to the Church circumscribes the whole world, as possessing the sure tradition from the apostles, and gives unto us to see that the faith of all is one and the same, since all receive one and the same God, the Father, and believe in the same dispensation regarding the incarnation of the Son of God, and are cognizant of the same gift of the Spirit, and are conversant with the same commandments, and preserve the same form of ecclesiastical constitution, and expect the same advent of the Lord, and await the same salvation of the complete man, that is, of the soul and body.” (*Ib.* v. 20.)

Of the Church of Rome, Irenaeus speaks in these remarkable terms: “With this church, on account of its more important pre-eminence (*potentiorē principalitatem*), or superior headship, it is necessary that every church, that is, the faithful on every side (or everywhere — *undique*) should agree, in which (church) that tradition which is from the apostles has always been preserved by those who are on every side.” (*Haer.* iii. 3.)\*

The Church  
of Rome.

In order to ascertain the true import of these words, which have been much disputed, it will be necessary to view them in their connection. In the section of his treatise in which they occur, the writer’s argument against the heretics is drawn from apostolic tradition, as preserved in the churches planted by the apostles, in which a perpetual succession of bishops had been kept up: — “It is within the power of all, therefore, in every church, who may wish to see the truth, to contemplate clearly the tradition of the apostles manifested throughout the whole world; and we are in a position to reckon up those who were by the apostles instituted bishops in the

\* Note D.

churches, and the successions of these men to our own times; those who neither taught nor knew anything like what these (heretics) rave about. For if the apostles had known hidden mysteries, which they were in the habit of imparting to 'the perfect' apart and privily from the rest, they would have delivered them especially to those to whom they were also committing the churches themselves. For they were desirous that these men should be very perfect and blameless in all things, whom also they were leaving behind as their successors, delivering up their own place of government to these men; who, if they discharged their functions honestly, would be a great boon (to the Church), but if they should fall away, the direst calamity.

"Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of *all* the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vain-glory, or by blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings, by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, of *the very great, the very ancient, and universally known church founded and organized at Rome* by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the successions of the bishops. For with this church, on account of its more important pre-eminence, it is," etc., as already quoted.

Here, say the Romanist theologians, is a clear affirmation of the supremacy of the Church of Rome, and of the duty of all Christians, and of all churches, to submit to her as supreme. And, since the Bishop of Rome is the head of that church, all owe him obedience. But the <sup>Romish</sup> interpretation. Romish interpretation of the words, "It is necessary that every church agree with this (the Roman) church," viz., "It is the duty of every particular church to *conform* to the Church of Rome," (Protestants contend,) is in conflict with the drift of the writer's argument. His appeal is to the witness of the *Church universal*. By "every church," as explained by himself—"that is, *the faithful everywhere*," the whole body

of believers—he means THE WHOLE CHURCH; and he singles out *one* church as an unexceptionable representative of the whole, as having been founded by the apostles Peter and Paul, and from them, through an unbroken succession of bishops, down to the then presiding Bishop of Rome, having preserved in purity, and handed down inviolate, the apostolic faith.

True  
interpretation. Irenaeus, then, means to say, not that every church must yield obedience to that of Rome; but that the Catholic faith being one, and the Catholic Church being one in the confession of that faith, and the Church of Rome being a constituent part of that undivided whole, which, confessedly, is “the pillar and ground of the truth,” and being, moreover, distinguished among all the churches of the West by its *greater amplitude*, its *more august antiquity*, and its *more important precedence*, as founded by the two most eminent apostles, it may be assumed as a moral certainty that every church throughout the world—the Church universal—is in agreement with that of Rome, and truly represented by her; and hence, that in appealing to Rome, he in effect appeals to the whole Church, whose witness is virtually embodied in hers.

The same line of argument in refutation of heresy is pursued by Irenaeus’s contemporary, TERTULLIAN, who constantly appeals to the *apostolical churches collectively*, as bearing concordant witness to the one apostolic and Catholic faith.

Tertullian,  
160–220.

This first of the Latin Fathers, in a treatise written before his conversion to Montanism, speaks of the Church as deriving its descent from the apostles; as being composed of the collective whole of the churches founded by the apostles, together with their offshoots; all preserving the unity of the same faith and discipline. “The apostles,” he writes, “having obtained the promised power of the Holy Spirit for the working of miracles, and for utterance, first having throughout Judea borne witness to the faith of Jesus Christ, and established churches, next went forth into the world, and preached the same doctrine of the same faith to the nations, and forthwith founded churches in every city,

Apostolicity.

from whence the other churches thenceforward received the tradition of the faith and the seeds of doctrine, and are daily receiving them, that they may become churches. The whole kind must needs be classed under their original. Wherefore, these churches, so many and so great, *are but that ONE primitive Church* from the apostles, whence they all spring. Thus *all are the primitive*, and all the apostolical (Church), while *all are one*. The communion of peace, the title of brotherhood, and the token of hospitality prove this unity—a unity which has its fundamental principle in the *oneness* of the tradition of the same doctrine” (*sacramenti*—the sacred truth of the gospel, styled in Eph. iii. 4, “the mystery”—*sacramentum*—“of Christ”). (*De Prescript. Haer. xx*).

Again: “To this point, therefore, we direct prescription; that if the Lord Jesus Christ sent the apostles to preach, no others ought to be received as preachers than those whom Christ appointed; for ‘no man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son hath revealed him.’ Neither doth the Son seem to have revealed him to any other than to the apostles, whom he sent to preach that, namely, which he had revealed to them. Now, what they did preach—that is, what Christ did reveal unto them, I will also here rule, must be proved in no other way than *by those same churches which the apostles themselves founded*; themselves, I say, by preaching to them as well *vivâ voce* (as men say) as afterward by epistles.”

“If these things be so, it becomes at once manifest that *the doctrine which agrees with these apostolic churches*—the wombs and originals of the faith—must be accounted as the truth: as, without doubt, containing that which the churches have received from the apostles, the apostles from Christ, Christ from God; and that all other doctrine must be judged at once to be false which is opposed to that of the churches, of the apostles, of Christ, and of God. It remaineth, therefore, that we show whether this our doctrine, the rule of which we have above declared, be derived from the tradition of the apostles, and from this very

Succession of  
doctrine.

fact, whether the other doctrines come of falsehood. We have communion with the apostolic churches because we have no doctrine differing from them. This is evidence of truth." (*Id.* xxi.)

"But if there be any heresies which venture to plant themselves in the midst of the age of the apostles, that they may therefore be thought to be handed down from the apostles, because they existed under the apostles, we may say: Let them show the origin of their churches; let them trace the succession (unfold the roll) of their bishops so coming down from the beginning, that their first bishop had for his author and predecessor (*auctorem et antecessorem*)—some one of the apostles, or of apostolic men who always continued steadfast in the apostles' doctrine. For it is in this manner that the apostolic churches show their origin (or bring down their register—*census*); as the Church of the Smyrnaeans traces its bishops in an unbroken line from Polycarp, who was placed there by John; and as that of the Romans from Clement, who in like manner was ordained by Peter. In the very same way can all the other churches point out those who were ordained by the apostles to the episcopate among them, for the transmission of the apostolic teaching.

"Let the heretics invent something of the same sort; for, after blasphemy, what is withholden from them? But even though they invent it, they will not advance a single step; for their doctrine, when compared with that of the apostles, will of itself declare, by the difference and contrariety between them, that it had neither any apostle for its author, nor any apostolic man; because, as the apostles would not have taught things differing from each other, so neither would apostolic men have set forth things contrary to the apostles, unless those who learned from apostles preached a different doctrine.

"To this test, then, they will be challenged by those churches which, although they can bring forward as their author (*auctorem*) no one of the apostles or of apostolic men, as being of much later date, and, indeed, being founded daily, nevertheless

since they agree in the same faith, are, *by reason of their consanguinity in doctrine*, counted not the less apostolical.

“So let all heresies, when challenged by our churches to both these tests, prove themselves apostolical in whatever way they think themselves so to be. But in truth they neither are so, nor can prove themselves to be what they are not; nor are they received into union and communion by churches in any way apostolical; and for this reason, namely, because they are in no way apostolical, (as is manifest) by the difference of the doctrine (*sacramenti*—the whole sacred truth) which they teach.” (*Id.* xxxii.)

Quite parallel with the disputed passage in Irenæus concerning the necessity of agreement with the apostolic Church at Rome, and happily illustrating it, <sup>Agreement with Irenæus.</sup> is the following: “Would you exercise your curiosity to better purpose in the business of your salvation, *run through the apostolic churches*, in which the very seats in which the apostles sat are now filled; where their authentic epistles are read, conveying the sound of their voices and the representation of their persons. *Is Achaia near you? You have CORINTH.* If you are not far from Macedonia, *you have PHILIPPI; you have the THESSALONIANS.* If you can pass over to Asia, *you have EPHESUS;* but if you are near Italy, *you have ROME*, whence we can also have the authority at hand. Happy Church! to which the apostles poured forth all their doctrine with their blood; where Peter had a like passion with the Lord; where Paul hath for his crown the same death with John; where the apostle John was plunged into boiling oil, and suffered nothing, and was afterward banished to an island.” (*Id.* xxxvi.)

On the subject of the universal priesthood, and the question of the peculiar functions of the clergy, Tertullian, still in communion with the Catholic Church, writes: “It remains for me to give an admonition also concerning the right rule of giving and receiving baptism. The right of giving it, indeed, is vested in the chief priest <sup>Universal priesthood.</sup> (*summus sacerdos*), who is the bishop; then the presbyters and

deacons; yet not without the authority of the bishop, on account of the honor of the Church, the maintenance of the Church's peace depending on the maintenance of the bishop's authority. Beside these, laymen also have the right; for that which is equally received may be equally given. Unless bishops or priests, or deacons, be on the spot, disciples are called (to baptize). The word of the Lord ought not to be hidden by any; wherefore baptism, which is equally derived from God, may be administered by all. But how much more is the discipline of reverence and modesty incumbent on laymen—seeing that these (powers) belong (strictly) to their superiors—lest they assume to themselves the specific function of the bishop. Emulation of the episcopal office is the mother of schisms. The most holy apostle has said that 'all things are lawful, but not all expedient.' Let it suffice in cases of necessity to avail yourself (of the right to baptize), if at any time circumstance either of place or of time, or of person, compels you (so to do)." (*De Bapt.* xvii.)

After his conversion to Montanism, Tertullian writes in a strain somewhat different: "Are not all Christians priests? The distinction between the clergy and laity has been established by the authority of the Church, and for its honor, which derives sanctity from the assembled clergy. In places where there are no clergy, any single Christian may exercise the functions of the priesthood—may celebrate the eucharist and baptize. *But where three, though laymen, are gathered together, there is a church.* If, then, you possess within yourself the right of the priesthood, to be exercised in cases of necessity, you ought also to practise the discipline incumbent on the priesthood, whose rites it may become necessary for you (in cases of emergency) to exercise." (*De Exhort. Cast.* vii.) The distinction between the clergy and laity, which Tertullian, on the strength of this passage among others, is alleged to have ignored or denied, is, on the contrary, it will have been perceived, here broadly drawn.

In referring the distinction to "the authority of the CHURCH," Tertullian evidently means to say that it may be traced to the

apostles, the founders of the Church; appealing, as he constantly does, for the settlement of a disputed point of doctrine or discipline, to the faith or practice of the churches founded by the apostles, in which the apostolic traditions were faithfully preserved.

Of the Bishop of Rome, Tertullian, writing as a Montanist, uses this remarkable language: "I hear that an edict, and that a peremptory one, has been set forth. The *Pontifex Maximus*, forsooth, the *Bishop of bishops*, says: 'I forgive the sins of *mæchia* and *fornicatio* to those who <sup>Bishop of Rome.</sup> have professed repentance.'" (*De Pudicit.* i.) From this passage the inference seems plain that even at this early period, the titles of "Supreme Pontiff" and "Bishop of bishops" had been assumed by the Bishop of Rome. While, as a Montanist, Tertullian disputed the application of the text, "*Thou art Peter*," etc., to the apostle Peter and Roman bishops as his successors — maintaining that it refers to Peter only, as a man specially enlightened by the Holy Spirit, and to all *spiritual men* equally with him — before his conversion to Montanism his view of the passage is expressed in language which almost anticipates the exposition of Cyprian: "It is to be remarked that Peter was called *PETRA*, *Rock* of the Church to be built, received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the power of loosing and binding in heaven and on earth." (*De Prescript. Hær.* xxii.)

---

NOTES.

D.

"Ad hanc enim ecclesiam, propter potentio rem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in quâ, semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab apostolis traditio."

It has been conjectured that the words in the Greek text of Irenæus here rendered *potentio rem principalitatem*, were ἰκανωτέραν ἀρχαιότητα — *a more august antiquity* — appropriately predicated of the Church of Rome, as the first founded in the West, and the only Western Church founded by apostles.

*Necesse est* is not to be confounded with *oportet*: the former expresses a natural necessity — what is demanded by the nature of the case — what may be assumed as a matter of course; the latter implies a moral necessity — an obligation, duty.

This confusion is involved in the Romanist interpretation of the passage. The plain meaning is: A pre-eminence belongs to *all apostolic* churches, as having been founded by apostles; to the Roman Church a more important pre-eminence, on account of its greatness, its antiquity, and its having been founded by the two most distinguished apostles. In view of this, its more important pre-eminence, it must needs be that the churches in the West, on every side of it, which had none of them been planted by an apostle, and were all of later growth, should, as a matter of course, refer to it as the mother church for the settlement of all disputed points of doctrine or discipline. In the absence of the Greek original, the meaning of *convenire* is open to dispute. As the equivalent of *συμβαίνειν*, it means *to agree* with; as rendering *συνερχεσθαι*, to come together in person. Neander attempts to defend the latter interpretation, with slight success. "Irenæus appeals to the *ecclesia apostolica* in Rome, as the greatest, the oldest, (which must be doubted,) the universally known, the church founded by the two most illustrious apostles, where Christians congregate from the communities of the whole world, and could not fail to learn the doctrine taught by the apostles. . . . On account of the rank which this church maintains as the *ecclesia urbis*, all churches, that is, believers from all churches, must — the 'must' here lies in the nature of the case — come together there; and since now from the beginning, Christians from all countries must come together there, it follows that the apostolic tradition has been preserved from generation to generation by the Christians from all countries of the world who are there united together. Every deviation from it would here fall immediately under the observation of all." (*Hist.* i. 205.)

### CHAPTER III.

JUSTIN MARTYR — UNITY OF THE CHURCH — UNIVERSAL PRIESTHOOD —  
CHURCH-OFFICERS — ORDER OF SUNDAY SERVICE — CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA,  
DEFINITION OF THE CHURCH — EXCLUSIVENESS — UNITY — ORIGEN — DEFINITION — ONENESS — APOSTOLICITY — HOLINESS — RECOGNITIONS OF CLEMENT  
— EPISCOPACY — APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS — THE BAPTISMAL SYMBOL.

THE writings of the first Christian apologist, JUSTIN MARTYR, make comparatively slight mention of the Church. Two or three passages in the "Dialogue with Trypho" contain all that has been preserved to us of this Father's views of the nature of the Christian commonwealth. In the one hundred and thirty-fourth chapter he represents the marriages of Jacob as a figure of the Church: "The marriages of Jacob were types of that which Christ was about to accomplish. . . . Leah is your (the Jews') people and synagogue; but Rachel is our Church. And for these, and for the servants in both, Christ even now serves . . . having come to restore both the free sons and the servants, conferring the same honor on all who keep his commandments. . . . Jacob served Laban for speckled and many-spotted sheep; and Christ served, even to the slavery of the cross, for the various and many-formed races of mankind, acquiring them by the blood and mystery of the cross. Leah was weak-eyed; for the eyes of your (Jews') souls are excessively weak. Rachel stole the gods of Laban, and has hid them to this day; and we (Gentiles) have lost our paternal and material gods. Jacob was hated for all time by his brother; and we now, and our Lord himself, are hated by you and by all men, though we are brothers by nature. Jacob was called Israel; and Israel has been demonstrated to be Christ, who is and is called Jesus."

Justin describes the unity of the Church as an organic unity;

the faithful in Christ as one body — a unity determined rather by oneness of sentiment and sympathy than by visible organization. Thus, in explaining Isaiah liii. 1, 2, he writes in this mystical strain: "Israel speaks as if he were personating the apostles, when they say to Christ that they believe not in their own report, but in the power of him who sent them. And so he says, 'Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? We have preached before him as if (he were) a child — as if a root in a dry ground.' But when the passage speaks as from the lips of many, 'We have preached before him,' and adds, 'as if a child,' it signifies that the wicked shall become subject to him, and shall obey his command, and that all shall become as ONE *child*. Such a thing as you may witness in the body; although the members are enumerated as many, all together are called ONE, and are ONE BODY. For indeed the people (*δημος*) and CHURCH (*εκκλησια*), though many individuals in number, are, in fact, as being one, called and addressed by one appellation." (lxii.)

In his exposition of the forty-fifth Psalm, Justin, moreover, asserts that part of it is addressed to "those who put their trust in him (Christ), as being one soul, and one assembly, and *one Church* — a Church which is sprung from his name, and partakes of his name; for we are all called Christians." (lxiii.)

In these passages the Church is identified with the collective body of the faithful.

Every Christian, according to Justin, sustains the priestly character: "We, who as one man have trusted in God, the Creator of the whole, through the name of Jesus, having put off our filthy garments — that is, our sins — through the name of his first-born; having also been inflamed through the word of his calling, are the true high-priestly race of God, as God himself bears witness, saying that in every place among the nations, sacrifices, well-pleasing and pure, are brought to him. But God does not accept sacrifices from any one unless through his priests." (cxvi.)

Unity of the  
Church.

Universal  
priesthood.

“Accordingly, God, anticipating all the sacrifices which we offer through this name, and which Jesus the Christ enjoined us to offer — that is, the eucharist of the bread and the cup, and which are presented by Christians in all places throughout the world, bears witness that they are well-pleasing to him. . . . That prayers and thanksgivings, when offered by worthy men, are *the only perfect and well-pleasing sacrifices to God*, I also admit. For *such alone Christians have undertaken to offer*, and in the remembrance effected by their solid and liquid food, by which the suffering of the Son of God (or “God of God”), which he endured, is brought to mind.” . . . “There is not one single race of men, whether barbarian or Greek, or called by any name whatever . . . among whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered up to the Father . . . through the name of the crucified Jesus.” (cxvii.)

The only ministers of the Church named by Justin are the president (ὁ πρῶτος) and the deacons (οἱ διακονοί): “On the day called the day of the sun, all who live in cities or in the country, gather together in one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the <sup>Church-officers.</sup> prophets are read as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise up together, and send up prayers; and, as we said before, when our prayer is ended, bread is brought, and wine and water, and the president sends up prayers in like manner, and thanksgivings, according to his power (ὅση δύναμις ἀδελφοί), and the people add aloud, Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given (the eucharistic elements), and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is laid up with the president, who helps the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and, in a word, takes care of all who are in need.” (lxvii.)

Here, the order of the Sunday service is, the reading of the Scriptures; the address of the president; the prayer, at which all stand, and in which all audibly join, uniting, perhaps, in a form known to all; then the thanksgiving uttered, it would seem, by the president alone, either as prepared by him for the occasion, or extempore, and the people's *Amen*; then the distribution of the bread and wine; and, at a point of the service not specified, a collection for the poor.

As Justin makes no mention of the singing of a hymn or psalm, which we know from Pliny's letter to Trajan to have been a regular part of the service, his description is not perhaps to be taken as exact or complete. These points, however, are clearly stated: the eucharist was celebrated by the primitive Christians every Lord's day; the prayers offered before communion were *common* prayers, in which all the people united audibly; the eucharistic or consecrating prayer was uttered by the president alone, the people at the close adding *Amen*; and the same officer alone addressed the congregation.

CLEMENT of *Alexandria* describes the Church as "the congregation of the elect—the assembly of those devoting themselves to prayer, the body of the Lord, the spiritual and holy choir, of which those who have the name only, without the life of Christ, are the carnal part." (*Strom.* vii.)

Clemens  
Alexandr.,  
150–220.

The oneness or exclusiveness of the Church Clement regards as involved in its *maternity*: "The universal Father is one, and one is the universal Word; and the Holy Spirit is one and the same everywhere; and one is the only Virgin Mother. I love to call her THE CHURCH. This mother, when alone, had not milk, because alone she was not a woman. But she is at once virgin and mother—pure as a virgin, loving as a mother. And calling her children to her, she nurses them with holy milk, viz., with the Word for childhood. Therefore she had not milk; for the milk was this child, fair and comely, the body of Christ, which nourishes by the Word the young brood which the Lord himself brought forth in the throes of the flesh, which the Lord himself swathed

Oneness.

in his precious blood. . . . The Word is all to the child — both father and mother and tutor and nurse. ‘Eat my flesh,’ he says, ‘and drink my blood.’” (*Pædag.* i. 6.)

On this point — the *oneness* and also the *unity* of the Church — Clement’s most emphatic utterance is the following: — “It is my opinion that the true Church, that which is really ancient, is ONE; and that in it those who, according to God’s purpose, are just, are enrolled. For on the very ground that God is one, and the Lord one, that which is in the highest degree honorable is lauded in consequence of its singleness, being an imitation of the One First Principle. In the nature of THE ONE, then, is associated in a joint heritage the ONE CHURCH which they (heretics) strive to cast asunder into many sects. Therefore, in substance and idea, in origin, in pre-eminence, we say that the ancient and Catholic Church is ALONE, collecting, as it does, into the unity of the one faith — which results from the peculiar Testaments, or, rather, the one Testament in different times by the will of the one God, through one Lord — those already ordained, whom God predestinated, knowing before the foundation of the world that they would be righteous.

“But the pre-eminence of the Church, as the principle of union, is in its ONENESS, in this surpassing all else, and having nothing like or equal to itself.” (*Strom.* vii. 17.)

In this assertion of the Church’s exclusiveness is plainly involved that view of the Church Universal which identifies it with the collective body of all the truly faithful of all ages, past, present, and to come.

ORIGEN professes to derive his definition of the Church directly from the Holy Scripture: “The divine oracles describe the whole Church of God as the Body of Christ, animated by the Son of God, the members of the Body being all who believe in him.” (*Cont. Cels.* vi.)

Origen,  
186-253.

Like his master, Clement, he emphasizes the *oneness* of the Church, out of which there is no salvation; and with him, also draws a clear line of distinction between the true Church and the false: “The Church is illuminated by the light of Christ,

who is himself the true Light; and, as thus illuminated, the Church is itself made the light of the world. It is they who have neither spot nor wrinkle, nor any such thing, who constitute the true Church.”

Oneness.

Insisting upon the attribute of *apostolicity*, Origen describes the body of Christ in its earthly being, as “the heavenly Church of Jesus Christ, according to the succession of the apostles,” (*De Princip.* iv. 9,) and says: “Seeing there are many who think they hold the opinions of Christ, and yet some of these think differently from their predecessors, yet as the teaching of the Church, *transmitted in orderly succession from the apostles*, and remaining in the churches to the present day, is still preserved, that alone is to be accepted as truth which differs in no respect from ecclesiastical and apostolical tradition.” (*Id., Proem.* ii.)

Apostolicity.

Origen is the first of the Fathers to give distinct expression to the doctrine of the *Holiness* of the Church. His statements on this point are more clear and full, if not more satisfactory, than any to be found in the writings of his predecessors. He distinguishes two coexisting elements in the Church visible, viz., its essentially constituent elements, composing the Church strictly so called (*κυριως εκκλησια*), and the elements adhering to it externally only, and hence also in a merely casual manner. To the former, constituting the true substance of the Church visible — THE CHURCH properly so called — and to it alone, he ascribes the property of Holiness; and this in the full sense of the Scriptural expression — *perfect Holiness*. Only he, therefore, who is perfectly holy, according to Origen, belongs to the Church properly so called. His words are these: “There is a difference between the Church and the synagogue — the Church, I mean, strictly so called, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but holy and blameless.” (*De Orat.* xx.) “If we consider that every sin which leads to Hades is a gate of Hades, we shall comprehend how it is that the soul which has spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, and by reason of evil is neither holy nor blameless, is not a rock upon which Christ builds, nor a church, nor a part

Holiness.

of a church, which Christ builds upon the rock. But if any one, in reply to this, would shame us by referring to the multitudes in the Church who are supposed to believe, let him be told not only that 'many are called, but few chosen;' but also that which was spoken by the Saviour to those coming to him: 'Strive to enter in' at the strait gate, for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in through the strait gate, and shall not be able. Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.' Now these expressions, 'many shall seek,' etc., refer to those who boast that they are *of the Church*, but live unworthy lives." (*Com. in Matt.*)

According to this representation, strictly interpreted, the only ground upon which the Catholic Church can justly claim to be called Holy, is the sure and firmly grounded presumption that all the elements in the Church not properly belonging to it will one day be completely separated from it, together with the certain hope of its future glorification. Hence, it is not to be wondered at, as Rothe remarks, that Origen, as Clement before him, came very near the idea of the *Church triumphant*. Thus, addressing catechumens, he says: "Jesus draws you to salvation, gathers you into the Church now upon earth, but if you bring forth worthy fruits, *into the Church of the first-born* which are written in heaven." (*Hom. vii. in Luc.*)

THE RECOGNITIONS OF CLEMENT, compiled, probably, in the first quarter of the third century, (quoted by Origen in his Comment. on Genesis, written in A. D. 231,) and the CLEMENTINE HOMILIES of the same period, represent the episcopate as the bond of union among Christians, and the only effective defence against the incursions of schism. They throughout describe particular churches as properly organized only by the headship of a bishop — St. Peter being represented as ordaining one in every church planted by him; e. g., in Cesarea, Zaccheus, and with him "twelve presbyters and four deacons." "You ought to honor your bishop," the apostle is made to say, "as holding the place of Christ, obeying him for your salvation," etc., quite in the strain of the Ignatian Epistles. At Antioch he ordains,

The  
Recognitions.

as bishop over the Church, "Maro, and with him twelve presbyters and deacons, charging them to obey their bishop in all things." (*Recogn.* iii. 66; vi. 15.) James appears as the chief bishop of the universal Church, to whom Peter is to give an account of all his proceedings.

To the same effect speak the APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS (about 250): "If he that calleth one of the laity *raca*, or fool, shall be punished as doing injury to the name of Christ, how dareth any man speak against his bishop, by whom the Lord gave the Holy Spirit among you upon the laying on of his hands." . . . "By thy bishop, O man, God adopteth thee for his child. Acknowledge, O son, that right hand which was a mother to thee. Love him, who, after God, is become a father to thee, and honor him." (ii. 32.) "By how much more valuable the soul is than the body, so much is the priestly office above the kingly; for it binds and looses those that are worthy of punishment or of remission. Wherefore ye ought to love your bishop as your father, and fear him as your king, and honor him as your lord." (*Id.* xxxiv.) "The bishop is the minister of the Word, the keeper of knowledge, the *mediator between God and you* in the several parts of your divine worship. Next after God, he is your father, who hath begotten you again to the adoption of sons by water and the Spirit. He is your ruler and governor, he is your king and potentate; he is, next after God, your earthly god, who hath a right to be honored by you." (*Id.* xxvi.)

This compilation contains an early form of the Christian Confession, or Baptismal Symbol, which embodies a distinct recognition of the Holiness of the Church Catholic as an article of faith, defining it as consisting essentially in the inward purity of its individual members, effected by the indwelling Spirit. The candidate for baptism declares: "I am baptized also into the Holy Ghost, that is, the Comforter, who wrought in all the saints from the beginning of the world, but was afterward sent to the apostles by the Father, according to the promise of our Saviour and Lord,

Jesus Christ, and, after the apostles, to all who believe, in the HOLY *Catholic* Church." (*Id.* vii. 41.)

In the Symbol to which Cyprian repeatedly refers — the Creed, probably, in its primitive form — Holiness is expressly ascribed to the Church: "When we say, I believe in the life everlasting, and the remission of sins *through the HOLY Church*, we understand that remission of sins is not given save in the Church." (*Ep.* lxx.) And again: speaking of the Novatianists as not differing from the Catholic Church in the form of the baptismal interrogatory, he says: "There is not one law of the Creed, nor the same interrogatory common to us and to schismatics. For when they say: *Dost thou believe the remission of sins and the life everlasting through the HOLY CHURCH?* they lie in their interrogatory, since they have not the Church." (*Ep.* lxxv.)

## CHAPTER IV.

CYPRIAN — OF THE EXCLUSIVENESS OF THE CHURCH — UNITY OF THE CHURCH — EQUALITY IN THE EPISCOPATE — CYPRIANIC THEORY — THE PETRI CATHEDRA — THE PRE-EMINENCE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME — THE PRIMACY OF PETER — THE POWERS OF THE CHURCH — THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD — THE FUNDAMENTAL DEFECT OF THE CYPRIANIC THEORY — THE MONTANIST THEORY OF THE CHURCH — THE NOVATIANIST THEORY, IN CONFLICT WITH THE CYPRIANIC — TRIUMPH OF THE CYPRIANIC — FIRMIAN AT ONE WITH CYPRIAN — APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS — OPTATUS OF MILEVIS IN AGREEMENT WITH CYPRIAN — LACTANTIUS — NOTES.

THE writings of CYPRIAN constitute an epoch in our history, containing, as they do, a full development of that theory of Church-unity which reached its culmination in the Papacy. Next to AUGUSTINE, the most influential of the Fathers in forming the mind of the Western Church on this question, Cyprian was the first to give expression to his views on the subject in a separate treatise—*De Unitate Ecclesiæ* [No. 4]; and may hence be styled the Father of Ecclesiastical Polity, in much the same sense in which we name Eusebius “the Father of Ecclesiastical History.” In this tract, as also in a number of his Epistles, Cyprian’s statements in reference to the oneness—the *oneliness*, or *exclusiveness* of the Church (and it is this, mainly, that Cyprian means to express by the word *unity*), are of the most emphatic character. Thus:—“There is but one Church, which, with a fruitful increase, is spread abroad far and wide. As the rays of the sun, though many, issue from one luminary; as the branches of a tree, however numerous, are all sustained by one strength, based in its tenacious root, and as a multitude of rivulets, fed from the same fountain, are all connected by the singleness of the well-head; so also the Church, shone over with the light of

Cyprian,  
200-258.

Oneness.

the Lord, sheds forth her rays over the whole world; yet it is one light that is everywhere diffused, and the body is not divided. Her fruitful abundance spreads her branches over the whole world. She pours forth, far and wide, her copious streams, yet her head is one, her source is one. She is one mother, plentiful in the results of fruitfulness: from her womb we are born, by her milk we are nourished, by her spirit we are animated. He can no longer have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his mother. He cannot be a martyr who is not in the Church. Separated from the maternal womb he cannot breathe: he loses the substance of salvation."

No less clear and emphatic are Cyprian's utterances in regard to the Church's unity:—"They are the Church who are a people united to their priest (sacerdoti), and a flock which adheres to its pastor," (the bishop.) "The bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the bishop; so that if any one is not with the bishop, he is not in the Church." (*Ep.* lxxviii.) "The Church, one and Catholic, is knit and compacted together by the mutual adhesion of a cemented priesthood; as the one Church has been divided by Christ into many members throughout the world, so that the one episcopate is everywhere diffused by the harmonious multiplicity of many bishops." (*Ep.* li.) "And this unity we ought firmly to hold and assert, especially those of us that are bishops, that we may prove the episcopate itself to be one and undivided. Let no one deceive the brotherhood by a falsehood: let no one corrupt the truth of the faith by perfidious prevarication. The episcopate is one, each part of which is held by each individual bishop without division of the whole." (*De Unit.* v.)\*

At the same time Cyprian gives emphatic expression to the prevailing belief, that all bishops were equal in dignity and power, each in his own diocese being answerable to God alone. Thus, in his allocution to the seventh council of Carthage: "It remains that upon this question (the baptism of

\* Note E.

heretics) each of us (the eighty-seven African bishops) should bring forward what we think, judging no man, and rejecting no man from the right of communion, if he should think differently from us. For neither does any one of us set himself up as a bishop of bishops, nor by tyrannical terror does any one compel his colleague to the necessity of obedience; since *every bishop, according to the allowance of his liberty and power, has his own proper right of judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another.* But let us all wait for the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who solely and alone has the power both of preferring us in the government of his Church, and of judging us in our conduct there." (*Sentent. Episc. lxxxvii.*)

To the same effect he writes successively to two bishops of Rome, Cornelius and Stephen: "As it has been decreed by all of us, and is equally fair and just, that the cause of every one should be heard there where the crime has been committed; and a portion of the flock has been assigned to each individual pastor, which he is to rule and govern, as one who must give account to the Lord, it certainly behoves those over whom we are placed not to run about, nor to break up the harmonious agreement of the bishops with their crafty and deceitful rashness, but there to plead their cause, where they may be able to have both accusers and witnesses of their offence; unless, perchance, the authority of the bishops constituted in Africa, who have already determined their cause, seems to a few desperate and abandoned men to be too little, (or inferior to that of Rome.) Already their cause has been heard and their sentence pronounced; nor is it fitting that the judgment of the priest should be blamed by the levity of a fickle and inconstant mind, when the Lord teaches: 'Let your communication be, yea, yea; nay, nay.'" (*Ep. lv. 14, ad Cornel.*) Thus to *Cornelius*; afterward to *Stephen*: "We know that some will not lay aside what they have once imbibed, and do not easily change their purpose; but keeping fast the bond of peace and concord among their colleagues, retain

certain things peculiar to themselves, which have once been adopted among them. In which behalf we neither do violence to, nor impose a law upon any one, since each prelate (*præpositus*) has, in the administration of the Church, the free exercise of his own will, as he shall give account to the Lord." (*Ep.* lxxi)

This theory of Church unity is commonly designated the *Cyprianic*, as being supposed to claim Cyprian for its author. As we have seen, however, it had already been propounded by Ignatius, more than a century before; while Cyprian, in now giving it clearer expression and more complete development, advances much beyond it. Not content, with Ignatius, to rest in the abstract view of the unity of the universal episcopate, he seeks to behold that unity visibly represented; the abstract conception he would fain contemplate as a concrete fact; and this visible centre of unity he readily finds in *that* ONE of the bishops who is the occupant, for the time being, of the episcopal chair at Rome. That chair Cyprian is himself the first to designate the *locum Petri* (*Ep.* lii.), and *Petri cathedram* (*Ep.* liv.); at the same time, however, designating all bishops successors of Peter: "the Church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the Church is controlled by these same prelates." (*Ep.* xxvi.) It might thus appear, that while naming the see of Rome the chair of Peter, he yet held the same opinion in regard to Peter's connection with the Roman Church as that of Eusebius, Ruffinus, and Epiphanius, viz., that, during his stay at Rome, Peter, in the character of apostle, and not of bishop, had the supreme direction of the Church there. This may be considered as rendered doubtful by the fact that Cyprian's contemporary, Firmilian, describes Stephen, bishop of Rome, as "glorying in the place of his episcopate, and maintaining that he held the *succession of Peter*." (*Ep. Cyp.* lxxv.)

Cyprianic  
Theory.

Petri  
Cathedra.

In regard to the pre-eminence of the Church of Rome, the prevailing view in the Western Church had already, as we have seen, found distinct expression in the writings of Irenæus; and though Cyprian cannot properly be said to follow up the

teachings of Irenæus, advancing as he does a long way beyond them, yet his advance is manifestly in the same line of progress. Thus, writing to Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, he characterizes the Novatian faction at Rome as guilty of an "obstinate and inflexible pertinacity in rejecting the bosom and the embrace of its *root and mother*," that is, the Church of Rome, — "the root and womb of the Catholic Church." (xli. 1, xliv. 3.)

Headship of  
the Church  
of Rome.

Speaking of schism, he deduces its origin from neglect of the fountain-head of truth — the doctrine of our heavenly Master. "There is no need of lengthened discussion, or labored argument. The proof for faith is easy in a short summary of the truth. The Lord speaks to Peter: 'I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,' etc., etc. And again, after His resurrection, He says to Him: 'Feed my sheep.'

"And although, after his resurrection, he invests all the apostles with an equal power, saying to them, 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit,' etc., yet that He might exhibit (the principle of) *unity*, He, by his authority, so arranged the origin of that unity that it should take its beginning from one, (Peter.) The other apostles, indeed, were what Peter was — endowed with an equal share of honor and power; but the beginning proceeds from unity, [and the primacy is given to Peter, in order that it may be shown that there is one Church and one chair.] \* Does he, who does not hold this unity of the Church, think that he holds the faith? Does he who strives against and resists the Church, [who deserts the chair of Peter, upon whom the Church is founded,] \* trust that he is in the Church, when the blessed apostle Paul also teaches the same thing, and sets forth the sacrament of unity, saying: 'There is one body and one spirit,' etc." (*De Unit. Eccl. iv.*)

\* The words enclosed in brackets are generally considered spurious.

“Where, and by whom, remission of sins in baptism is given is plain. For to Peter first, upon whom the Lord built the Church, and from whom He appointed and showed the origin of unity, He gave that power, viz., that whatsoever he should remit on earth, should be remitted also in heaven.

And after his resurrection, also, He speaks to the apostles, saying: ‘As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you.’” (*Ep.* lxxii. 7.) “After these things, they (the schismatics) yet dare — a false bishop having been appointed for them by the heretics — to set sail and to bear letters from schismatic and profane persons to the chair of Peter and to the chief church *whence priestly unity takes its source.*” (*Ep.* liv. 14.)\*

Primacy  
of Peter.

In view of these utterances, and others of like tenor scattered through the writings of Cyprian, well might Mœhler assert that, even as early as the third century, “The Pope was but waiting a summons to make his appearance.” (*Einhcit in der Kirche*, p. 247.)

Our exposition of Cyprian's doctrine of the Church would be incomplete without some notice of his teaching respecting its peculiar powers and prerogatives. On this point his theory is identical with that set forth in the decrees of the Council of Trent, viz., that the Church is invested with all the prerogatives of Christ Himself, her Divine Head, as prophet, priest, and king, and, as His representative upon earth, is the repository, and even the source, of all grace. Thus, in regard to the communication of saving grace: “The Lord invites those who thirst to come and drink of the living water which flows from Him. Whither, then, is he who thirsts, to betake himself? To the heretics, among whom there is no fountain and no living water at all; or to the Church, which is one, and is founded upon one who has received the keys of it by the Lord's voice. It is she alone who holds and possesses all the power of her spouse and Lord. In her we preside; for her honor and unity we fight; her grace, as well as her glory, we defend with faithful

Powers of  
the Church.

\* Note F.

devotion," (*Ep.* lxxii. II.) "They who had believed in Samaria had believed with a true faith; and within, in the Church, which is one, and to which alone it is granted to bestow the grace of baptism and to remit sins." (*Id.* 9.) "It is the Church alone which, being united to Christ, spiritually generates sons. . . . But as the birth of Christians is in baptism, while the generation and sanctification of baptism are with the spouse of Christ alone, who is able spiritually to conceive and bear sons to God, where, and of whom, and to whom is he born, who is not a son of the Church, so as that he should have God as his Father, before he has had the Church for his mother?" (*Ep.* lxxiii. 6, 7.) "It is manifest that they who are not in the Church of Christ are reckoned among the dead; . . . since there is one Church which has received the grace of eternal life, which lives for ever, and quickens the people of God." (*Ep.* lxx. 1.)

Now, in the language of Cyprian, the Church stands for the body of the clergy, or *the priesthood*, as its representatives; so that with him, it is in reality *the bishops*, and, as delegated by them, the rest of the clergy, who are the specific channels for

the conveyance of Divine grace to the faithful.

The  
Priesthood. "In this (Church) we (the bishops) preside; for its honor and unity we contend; its grace and glory we, with faithful devotion, defend." (*Ep.* lxxiii.) "In order that the water of baptism may wash away sin, it is necessary that it be cleansed and sanctified by the priest. . . . But how can he cleanse the water who himself is unclean, and destitute of the Spirit? Or how can he, by baptism, convey to another remission of sins, whose own sins, being those of a schismatic, are not remitted?" (*Ep.* lxx.) "Let each of you confess his sin, while confession is available; while satisfaction and remission effected through the priest (*facta per sacerdotes*) are acceptable with God." (*De Laps.*)

From this analysis of CYPRIAN'S teaching on the subject of the Church, it is plain that, in its leading features, it is not to be distinguished from that of the ROMAN CATHECHISM; and among the truths which our review of it brings forcibly home

to us not the least important is this: that the advocate of primitive Christianity can maintain his position against the Romanist, solely on the ground of the *purely primitive tradition, in other words, THE WRITTEN REVELATION.*

It scarcely needs pointing out, moreover, that the fundamental defect of Cyprian's theory of the Church is that which HOOKER, in a well-known passage, designates as the source of "oversights neither few nor light," viz., failure to distinguish between "that Church of Christ which we properly term his body mystical," and the Church of Christ which is "a sensible known company"—"the Church visible," so called, which is "one in outward profession of those things which supernaturally appertain to the very essence of Christianity." (*Eccl. Pol.* iii. 1.)

Fundamental  
defect.

In strong contrast with this, the prevailing, outward view of the Church, was that of the MONTANISTS of this period; a view of which Tertullian, after his perversion, is the acknowledged exponent. The Montanistic theory is stated by him in these words: "The Church, in the proper and pre-eminent sense, is the Holy Spirit Himself, in which the Three are One—and next the whole community of those who are agreed in this faith (that God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are one) is called after its founder and consecrator, (the Holy Spirit,) THE CHURCH."

Montanistic  
Theory.

While the prevailing (Catholic) view is expressed in the well-known words of Irenæus: *Ubi ecclesia, ibi Spiritus Dei; et ubi Spiritus Dei, ibi ecclesia*—giving priority to the Church, and thus, by this very position of priority, making it outward and visible; and representing the agency of the Holy Spirit as conditioned by, and hence derived through this mediation, Montanism reverses the order: *Ubi Spiritus, ibi ecclesia; et ubi ecclesia, ibi Spiritus*; giving precedence to the Spirit, and assigning the Church a secondary position. The operation of the Spirit, however, according to the Montanistic conception, is not the spiritual illumination of believers, but a supernatural revelation, or extraordinary inspiration. The Church

of the Montanists was thus a Church of the Spirit, consisting of *the spiritual* (spirituales), or men possessed of the Spirit in the Montanistic sense.

While admitting the immutability of the apostolic doctrine, Tertullian — the Montanist — maintains the changeable character of all matters of order and discipline. The power of the keys, given to Peter, he insists, was given to Peter personally, and — not to his successors in the episcopate — but to those who, like Peter, were filled with the Holy Spirit.

Equally in contrast with the prevailing view of the Church, as set forth by Cyprian, is that of the NOVATIANISTS, viz., that purity being one of the essential characteristics of a true Church, every church which fails to exercise due church discipline, by excluding from its communion such persons as by gross sins have broken their baptismal vow, ceases, by that very act, to be a true Christian Church.

The fundamental error of the Novatianists — the PURITANS of the third century — as Neander has pointed out, was the same as that of their opponents. It consisted in confounding the mystical body of Christ with the outward visible organization. “Transferring the predicate of unspotted holiness, which belongs to the former — the community of saints as such — to the visible form in which that community becomes apparent, the Novatianists drew the conclusion that every society of Christians which tolerates in its communion the impure, ceases to be a true church.” Thus, setting out from the same fundamental principle, Cyprian and Novatian reached opposite conclusions; the former, that the Church, transmitted and propagated by the succession of bishops, is, *as such*, a pure and holy one; the latter, that only a *visibly* pure and holy church is a true church. Though alike involved in the error of confounding the outward with the inward, the two opposing theories maintained with each other an unequal conflict; the Cyprianic triumphed speedily emerging from the contest as the received Catholic

Novatianist  
Theory.

Triumph of  
the Cyprianic  
Theory.

Church system; the Novatianist continuing to exist only as an insignificant sect.\*

This conception of the Church was not confined to the West. We trace its prevalence, at this early period, also in the East. It is found clearly developed in two independent documents of Eastern origin, and both belonging to the middle of the third century, viz., the well-known Epistle of FIRMILIAN, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, among CYPRIAN'S *Epistles*, No. 75, and the APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS, (the first six books.)

What is known as the Cyprianic doctrine of the *exclusiveness* of the Catholic Church visible, out of which there is no possibility of salvation, is expressed by FIRMILIAN in terms the most definite and forcible. In the Church alone, he declares, is to be found the efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit, or of the redeeming grace of Christ. The bishops, and, in connection with them, the other clergy, he regards as the exclusive organs of the communication of all spiritual blessings. And this is expressed not merely as his own individual opinion, but as the received view of a large section of the Oriental Church.

Firmilian,  
270.

Not less clear and strong is this Father's indorsement of Cyprian's utterances in regard to the *unity* of the Church. He indignantly reprobates the course of STEPHEN, Bishop of Rome, in acknowledging the validity of the baptism of heretics, as a virtual betrayal and surrender of the Church's unity. Freely conceding Stephen's claim to the succession to the *Cathedra Petri*, he yet condemns his conduct in the severest terms, saying, in effect, that while, as the successor of Peter, Stephen had been divinely commissioned to be the peculiar organ of the maintenance and promotion of ecclesiastical unity, he yet with unaccountable folly (*stultitia*) pursued a course directly tending to destroy it.†

At one with  
Cyprian.

In yet stronger terms, if possible, speak the *Apostolical Constitutions*, representing, as they do, the bishop as the organ of

\* For an exhaustive exposition of the Cyprianic theory, see ROTHE, pp. 636-76.

† Note G.

the Church's head, in communicating, through the imposition of hands, the gift of the Holy Ghost; in his possession of the power, with God, of life and death—the power, that is to say, of condemning the sinner to eternal pains, and of remitting the penalty in behalf of the penitent; and in his being a mediator between God and men. The specific object, indeed, of the author or authors of the *Constitutions*, appears plainly to have been to establish and confirm the prevailing view of the exclusiveness and unity of the visible Church Catholic—a unity realized in the collective episcopate.

Apostolical  
Constitutions,  
280.

Late in the following century appeared OPTATUS of Milevis, in Numidia, (375-8,) the author of a work entitled *De Schismate Donatistarum*, libri vii., *adversus Parmenianum*. [No. 7.]

Optatus of  
Mileve,  
375-8.

In the second book of this treatise he develops the Cyprianic theory of the Church in a style of marked originality. Thus: "The Church is ONE; it possesses five essential properties (dotes): 1. *Cathedra*—The unity of the episcopate of all individual bishops, having its root in Peter as the point of unity of the apostolic college, and this unity of the episcopate is to be perpetually maintained through the Roman episcopate as the point of unity of the collective or universal Church." In the union of all bishops with the uninterrupted succession of the bishops of Rome from St. Peter, he finds the essential unity of the Church: "In Rome, to Peter first was given the episcopal chair, in which sat Peter, the head of all the apostles; whence he was also named CEPHAS. In this one chair unity was to be maintained by all."

Hence, with Optatus, the *Cathedra*, as the *chair of PETER*, is the ground of all the other endowments of the Church, (dotes Ecclesia.) 2. *Angelus*—The Bishop himself. The allusion in this appellation is not only to the apocalyptic angels, but also to the angel in John v. 2. 3. *Spiritus Sanctus*. 4. *Fons*—Baptism. 5. *Sigillum*—The baptismal symbol. All these, the essential properties of the Church, are conjoined in inseparable union.

The fundamental conception of Optatus is precisely one with that of Cyprian: the essential being of the true Church consists in its unity, which, on one side, is a unity of the apostolic faith, as set forth in the baptismal or Catholic symbol, and on the other side is realized in every particular church through the bishop, who is the specific organ of the communication of the Holy Spirit, by means of baptism, and the sacraments in general.\*

So universally received was the Cyprianic doctrine of the exclusiveness of the Church, at the close of the third century, that even LACTANTIUS, though by no means churchly in other respects, and, with his liberal views of Christianity, little disposed personally to press such a point, gives expression to it even in its strictest form.

Lactantius,  
330.

All who are not in communion with the one Catholic Church he brands as "no longer Christians; and the one Catholic Church is that alone which retains the true worship. This is the fountain of truth, the home of faith, the temple of God, into which he who has not entered, or from which he who has departed, is a stranger to the hope of eternal salvation." (*Inst. Div.* iii. 30; iv. 14.)

---

NOTES.

E.

Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. Other renderings of this important sentence may throw light upon its meaning: "The episcopate is one, each part of which is held by each for the whole." "There is one episcopate, of which each member has an undivided share." "There is one undivided episcopate, which becomes visible in the person of each individual bishop."

Quam unitatem firmiter tenere et vindicare debemus, maxime episcopi, qui in ecclesia praesidemus, ut episcopatum quoque ipsum unum atque indivisum probemus. Nemo fraternitatem mendacio fallat, nemo fidei veritatem perfida praevaricatione corrumpat. Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. Ecclesia quoque una est, etc. (*De Unit. Eccl.*, v.)

---

\* As the *Angelus*, in the terminology of Optatus, refers particularly to the angel who imparted healing properties to the pool of Bethesda, (John v. 4,) so the *Fons* and *Sigillum* contain an allusion to the "Fountain sealed" (*Fons signatus*, in the Vulgate) in Solomon's Song iv. 12.

## F.

Navigare audent et ad Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et profanis literas ferre. (*Ep* lix. 19, *ed.* Goldhorn.) The context of this important passage is as follows :

“Quibus etiam satis non fuit, . . . foris sibi extra ecclesiam et contra ecclesiam constituisse conventiculum perditae factionis, cum male sibi consciorum et Deum rogare ac satisfacere nolentium caterva conflueret. Post ista adhuc insuper pseudo-episcopo sibi ab haereticis constituto navigare audent ad Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et profanis literas ferre nec cogitare, eos esse Romanos, quorum fides apostolo praedicante laudata est, ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum.” (*Ep* lix. 19, *ed.* Goldhorn.)

The passage quoted p. 54, in reference to the headship of the Church of Rome, is as follows : “Miseramus nuper collegas nostros Caldonium et Fortunatum, ut non tantum persuasione literarum nostrarum, sed praesentia sua et consilio omnium vestrum eniterentur quantum possent et elaborarent, ut ad catholicae ecclesiae unitatem scissi corporis membra componerent et Christianae caritatis vinculo copularent. Sed quoniam diversae partis obstinata et inflexibilis pertinacia non tantum radices et matris sinum atque complexum recusavit, sed etiam gliscente et in pejus recrudescente discordia episcopum sibi constituit et contra sacramentum semel traditum divinae dispositionis et catholicae unitatis adulterum et contrarium caput extra ecclesiam fecit,” etc. (*Ep*. xlv. 1.) For the convenience of the English reader, the references in the text are conformed to the numbering of the Ante-Nicene Library edition.

## G.

The genuineness of this Letter, which has come down to us under the name of Firmilian, (usually numbered as the seventy-fifth in the collection of Cyprian's Epistles,) is too well established to require defence against the cavils of the papal advocates, who find it necessary to repudiate it at all hazards. The ground of exception will be apparent from the following quotations :—“Sed haec interim, quae a Stephano gesta sunt, praetereantur, ne dum audaciae et insolentiae ejus meminimus, de rebus ab eo improbe gestis longiorem moestitiam nobis inferamus. . . . Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam quod qui sic de Episcopatus sui loco gloriatur, et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta Ecclesiae collocata sunt, multas alias petras inducat.—Lites et dissensiones quantas parâsti (Stephane) per ecclesias totius mundi? Peccatum vero quam magnum tibi exaggerâsti quando te a tot gregibus scidisti? Excidisti enim temetipsum : noli te fallere. Si quidem ille est vere schismaticus, qui se a communione ecclesiasticae unitatis apostatam fecerit. Dum enim putas omnes a te abstinere posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti. (*Ep*. xliii. *Ed.* Morellii. *Par.* 1564; the *first* ed. in which this *Ep.* is found.)

## CHAPTER V.

AUGUSTINE — OF THE EXCLUSIVENESS OF THE CHURCH — UNITY — HOLINESS — DONATISTIC VIEW — CATHOLIC VIEW — SETTLED BY AUGUSTINE — IN THE CHURCH, NOT OF THE CHURCH — NOT TWO CHURCHES — MODIFICATION OF THE PRIMITIVE VIEW — AUGUSTINIAN VIEW OF THE TRUE CHURCH NOT IDENTICAL WITH THE PROTESTANT DOCTRINE OF THE INVISIBLE CHURCH — THEORY OF TICHONIUS — “THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS” FIRST INSERTED IN THE AFRICAN SYMBOL — LORD KING’S EXPLANATION.

THE views of AUGUSTINE, in regard to the nature and constitution of the Church, were fully developed in the course of his long conflict with the Pelagians, the Manicheans, and the Donatists. In all its essential features, his theory is not to be distinguished from that of Cyprian. In making it his own, however, he imparted to it, as Rothe expresses it, “the strength and richness of his own wonderful intellect, and in virtue of his clear, scientific spirit, handled it with a precision and keen logical method before unknown.”

Augustine.  
354-430.

The doctrine of the oneness, oneliness, or *exclusiveness* of the Church is exhibited by Augustine as of the first importance. In the course of the painful conflicts through which he had passed in the progress of his religious experience, “the idea of Christianity and the idea of the Catholic Church had, in his consciousness, become most thoroughly identified. The position in which he found rescue from the shipwreck of his inner life, and to which he convulsively clung with all the vehemence of his energetic spirit, was the profound conviction that the Catholic Church, and that alone, is an historical phenomenon in which the Christian spirit can actually express and realize itself, and in which he possessed a living, powerful organism for his activity — in a word,

Exclusiveness  
of the  
Church.

the consciousness of the specific and exclusive adaptation of the Catholic Church to the Christian life, as the mould in which that life was to be formed. In his view, the Catholic Church stood forth as the compassionate, loving guide of erring man, who, apart from her, must needs be abandoned, without hope of deliverance, to himself, fallen and isolated in his selfishness; as the never-failing fountain from which alone divine grace and vital force are derived; as the truly divine community upon earth, in which alone there is a true life of holy love; and as the paternal home in which each one, according to his individual need, finds sympathy and faithful care for his infirmities, and, at the same time, an adequate theatre for his Christian activity.\* All these images are for him, as they had already been for Cyprian, fused and embodied in the one general conception of the *maternity* of the Catholic Church, a conception to which he imparted all the fervor and tenderness of a nature of profound sensibility. In this idea of the Church's maternity is expressed his view of its exclusiveness. Christ and the Catholic Church are with him one and the same; his life is its life; and, separate from its communion, communion with Christ is impossible. (*De Unit. Eccl.* 6, 7, 49.) Hence it is in the Catholic Church alone that the Holy Spirit is to be received; for in her alone lives the Spirit of Love. The really good cannot separate themselves from the Church; separation can spring only from evil motives, and involves the loss of salvation. 'No man can be saved who is not in union with Christ, the Head; and no man can be in union with Christ who is not in his body — the Church.' " \*

How firmly Augustine held to the doctrine of the exclusiveness of the Church is further shown in the clearest light by his apparent denial of it, as involved in his recognition of the validity of Donatistic baptism. With the Church Catholic Augustine maintained the lawfulness of baptism administered by heretics and schismatics; and yet he would not in the least recede from the strictest view of the exclusiveness of the Catholic Church. To preserve his consistency he invented a lim-

\* *Anfänge*, pp. 680 sq. Note 96.

itation, which found a certain basis in his idea that the Spirit of Love abode in the Catholic Church alone. While conceding that the baptism of the Donatists was true and valid, he yet maintained that it could not lead to salvation, if the subject of it should not afterward enter into communion with the Catholic Church; and that without this, such baptism, so far from availing to salvation, would only increase condemnation. (*De Unico Bapt.* § 8.) Thus, while on the one side the exclusiveness of the Church is thrown into the shade, on the other it is carried to the highest possible point.

So, also, on the doctrine of the Church's unity, Augustine's view was strictly conformed to that of Cyprian: The unity of the episcopate is the basis of the unity of the Church Catholic; and in the chair of Peter, that is, the Bishop of Rome, as its organic point of union and communion, that unity of the episcopate finds its realization.

Unity.

By means of its living reproduction in the person of Augustine, the Cyprianic conception of the Church obtained a vastly augmented power over Christendom, not merely in that age, but also, through the powerful influence of Augustine in the Church at large, over the Christendom of all succeeding centuries. Augustine's doctrine of the Church became, indeed, wellnigh symbolical. As early as the age of FULGENTIUS, (478-533,) the Augustinian utterances on this point are repeated and enforced as the doctrine of the universal Church.\*

The currency of this theory throughout the Western Church was the fruit of the hard-won victory of Augustine over the opposing systems of the Pelagians, the Manicheans, and the Donatists. "The Pelagians were so far unchurchly," says Hagenbach, "that, in their abstract mode of looking at things, they considered only the *individual* Christian as such, and overlooked the mysterious connection between the individual and the totality of believers. Their strict ethical ideas led necessarily to Puritanism; hence the Synod of Diospolis (415) blamed Pelagius for having said: *Ecclesiam hic esse sine macula et ruga* — 'The Church upon earth is without spot or wrinkle.'"

\* Rothe, *Anfänge*, 684-6.

“The Manichean Church,” says Baur, “is in relation to the world what the limited circle of the *electi* is in relation to the larger assembly of the *auditores*; that which is yet variously divided and separated in the latter has its central point of union in the former.” . . . “By separating the *elect* (so called) from the rest of the congregation of the faithful (called *auditores*), the Manicheans gave countenance to the principle of an *Ecclesiola in Ecclesia*, while the great body of the Manichean Church itself, composed of *auditores* in connection with the *electi*, formed, as the one elect world of light, a dualistic contrast with the vast material mass of darkness.” \*

The doctrine of the DONATISTS is essentially that of the

Holiness: / NOVATIANS of the preceding century: that the  
Donatistic / true Church is composed exclusively of real Chris-  
views. / tians, and, as a pure community, must necessarily  
exclude all unworthy members.

It was in his controversy with this body of separatists, that  
Catholic / Augustine was led fully to develop the Catholic  
view. / doctrine of the Church. His statements in regard  
to the Church's unity and exclusiveness are, as we

have seen, only a reproduction of the Ignatian or Cyprianic theory. In reference to one important point only was there

Settled by / yet room for further development — the Church's  
Augustine. / predicate of *Holiness*; and this is thoroughly dis-  
cussed and definitively settled in Augustine's anti-

Donatist controversial treatises. Chief among these are *Epistola ad Catholicos*, commonly known under the title *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, and *De Baptismo, Contra Donatistas*. [Nos. 8-10.]

The Donatists maintained that sanctity or purity is not merely *one* essential attribute of the Church, but is properly the fundamental and crowning attribute, to which all the rest are subordinate, and more especially that of universality. Hence, they affirmed that a church, however widely diffused, if polluted by unworthy members tolerated in her bosom, is not truly Catholic; but that this title belongs only to that

\* Hagenb. *Hist. Doct.* i. 352.

church which tolerates no wickedness in her communion, even though she be hidden in the remotest corner of the earth. While freely admitting that their own church was not *perfectly* pure, and that a perfectly pure church could not exist upon earth, they yet insisted (and here they were clearly in the right) that a distinction must be drawn between the wicked members of the Church, who are not known as such, and the openly and notoriously wicked. By her toleration of the latter, the Church, they asserted, had lost the attribute of Holiness, and thus ceased to be a church according to its proper idea.

The Catholic Fathers might well point to the article in the Creed—*The Holy Catholic Church*—as unmistakably expressive of her doctrine on this fundamental point; but the mere assertion of the Holiness of the Church was not enough; it was necessary to show it as exemplified visibly in the existing Church. This problem, pressed upon his attention as it was by the Donatistic conflict, Augustine undertook to solve; and the result of his ample discussion of the subject was—that Holiness, as a predicate of the Church Catholic, which had hitherto been a somewhat vague conception, was now definitively set forth in a form ever after generally received.

While OPTATUS of Milevis had rested in the statement that the Holiness of the Church is to be found, not essentially in the sanctity of its members, but only in the fact of the Church's being the depository of the essential principles and conditions of sanctification, (the sacraments being considered the grand means of sanctification,) Augustine developed a view of the subject which is substantially that of Origen. He distinguished between a church-membership which is proper and essential, and that which is merely accidental and transient, and applied the predicate of Holiness exclusively to the proper and essential membership—the individual believers constituting the substance, the body of the Church as its real members, denying that the merely nominal members belong to the Church, in the proper sense of the word, and hence repudiating their claim to the character of holiness. The

wicked, he asserts, *appear* indeed to be within the Church, while in truth they are outside of it.

“Omnes ille iniqui Ecclesiam non tenent, qui tamen intus videntur, et baptismum dare et habere a nullo nostrum negantur.” (*De Bapt. lib. v.*) “Malos — quos non pertinere ad sanctam Ecclesiam Dei, quamvis intus esse videantur.” (*Ib. lib. vi.*) “Et multi tales (the openly wicked) sunt in Sacramentorum communione cum Ecclesiâ, et tamen jam non sunt in Ecclesiâ.” (*De Unit. Eccl. § 74.*)

Representing the Church as the House of the Lord, he declares that some are in the house in such a sense that they themselves constitute the house built upon a rock; others, on the contrary, are in the house in such a sense that they do

*In the Church* not belong to the structure; they are in it just as  
*not of it.* the chaff is in the wheat. (*De Bapt. lib. vii.*)

Accordingly he distinguishes in the existing (*phenomenal*) Church a *true body of Christ* — *corpus Christi verum* — and a feigned or mixed body of Christ — *corpus Christi simulatum, vel permixtum*) — the former composed of true Christians, who in the Church attain salvation, the latter consisting of merely nominal Christians, who, though they are (outwardly) in the Church, will yet be finally lost. Here upon earth the two classes of Christians are now intermingled, and no human power is competent to sever them; but in his own time the Redeemer will again appear, and, as infallible and omnipotent Judge, separate all false Christians from the phenomenal Church, and restore it to perfect purity and holiness.

Hence, in reply to the cavil of the Donatists, who charged him with making two churches, Augustine could well avail

*Not two Churches.* himself of the formula: We do not distinguish so as to make two distinct churches, but only two distinct states of one and the same Church, which is now mortal, and as such composed in part of wicked men, but will one day be immortal, and then also perfectly pure and holy.

Moreover, in connection with this view, Augustine held that communion with the Catholic Church is the indispensable

condition of participation in the redemption bestowed in Christ; while yet, in itself alone, such communion is no adequate ground of that participation: a view perfectly consistent with the assumption that the phenomenal Church is essentially in harmony with the idea of the Christian Church.

Augustine's conception of the holiness of the Church, as we have explained it, is only a modification of the view held from the beginning: a modification, according to Rothe, conformed to the historical relations of his age, and having its basis in the primitive view — that the holiness of the Church consists, not in a state of actual, entire sanctification, but simply in the characteristic feature, that, as a community of saints, it is now undergoing an infallibly efficient process of purification. “In describing the Church,” writes Augustine, “as *not having spot or wrinkle*, I do not mean to describe it as it now is, but as it is now being prepared to be, when it shall hereafter appear as also a glorious Church. For now, by reason of the faults and infirmities of its members, the whole Church has to pray daily: ‘*Forgive us our debts.*’” (*Retract.* ii. 18.)

Modification  
of primitive  
view.

It was merely as to the progressive character of that process of purification that Augustine's views differed from those of the earlier Fathers. Hitherto that process had been conceived of as continuous, carried forward from an inner necessity, in the conviction that the proper life-process of the Church is, in its nature, essentially such a constant purifying process. According to this view, the attribute of holiness, in the strictest sense of the term, belongs to the Church. But such a view of the process of purification is indisputably in conflict with experience. Hence Augustine asserted the reality of an effective process of purification ever going forward *with* the Church; but instead of viewing it as immanent *in* the Church itself, and, as such, going forward *in* it, he viewed it only as going forward *in connection with* the Church. He conceived of it, moreover, as an act of Christ or God, not, however, as an act of Christ animating the Church, immanent in it; that is to say, not as an act of the Holy Ghost, but as a critical act of God

external to the Church, as an act of Christ *returning* to judgment: hence not as a process continually carried on to accomplishment, but altogether lying in the future, and to be initiated at the end of time. Since, at the close of the earthly course of time, God will remove out of the Church every element of impurity — on this ground, as Augustine held, the predicate of holiness, even now, belongs rightfully to the Church. The Church *militant* is holy because the unfailing *promise* of the Church *triumphant* has been given.

Augustine's view of the Church as *the true body of Christ* is not to be confounded with the Protestant doctrine of the *invisible Church*. The two are similar, but not coincident. They agree in the statement that the phenomenal Church (or that in the existing Church which meets the senses) is not to be identified with the true and proper Church of Christ. They differ widely in this: that while, according to the Protestant view, the real members of the true Church (the invisible) are not joined together in an outward ecclesiastical unity, (being scattered, on the contrary, in a multiplicity of separate communities;) according to Augustine, the case is so far different that membership in the Church which is externally one community is the absolute condition of membership in the Church properly so called, which, though not identical with the former, is yet to be found exclusively in it. While the Protestant position in regard to the relation of the invisible Church to the visible is expressed in the well-known words, *extra cœtum vocatorum non sunt QUÆRENDI electi* — the members of Christ's body mystical are not *to be sought for* save in the visible Church, the Augustinian is expressed by the same sentence with the omission of a single word, *extra cœtum vocatorum non SUNT electi* — true Christians are *to be found* only in the visible Church.

An intermediate position between the Catholic and the stricter Donatistic theory was occupied by the grammarian TICHONIUS, a Donatist of the more liberal school, who distinguished between two parts of the body of Christ — *Corpus Domini bipartitum* — the two constituting, together, the actually

existing or phenomenal Church. The one part is that which is composed of the individual members of Christ's body dispersed throughout the world, who by faith are truly one with Christ, the head. The other part comprehends all who belong to the Church by profession merely, or externally; in a word, the body of merely nominal Christians. The two parts of the one visible body are nowhere found disjoined, but are inseparably connected with each other throughout the world.

Tichonius  
A. D. 362.

The theory of Tichonius is scarcely to be distinguished from that of Augustine. In the Church he beheld *the one* divine institute of salvation, connection with which is necessary to the attainment of eternal life. He found that such a definition of the Church precluded the making of its worth and efficiency to depend on the ethical character of its members, and that no one in the Church could be rendered impure and deprived of his hope of salvation through the sins of other members of the Christian body. He held that no one coming over from the Catholic Church to the Donatists should be compelled to submit to rebaptism, acknowledging that the baptism performed in the Catholic Church was a fully valid and efficacious sacrament of reception into *the* Church of Christ. Still he would hold no communion with the Catholics, continuing true to the Donatists, whom he regarded as a part of the Christian Church contending upon principle for strictness of morals, and which ought to be maintained in its attitude of separation and protest, both on account of the holiness of its aim and the secularization of the Catholic Church in its connection with the State. Having expressed his views in a treatise entitled, *De bello intestino*, and other writings, in which he cited the old synodal decrees of the Donatists in support of his opinions, he was attacked by *Parmenian*, a Donatist of the stricter party, as having surrendered the theoretical and historical foundation of Donatism, and betrayed the cause he professed to support. (*Vogel, in Hertzog, vol. xvi.*)

So far, however, were the defenders of the Church Catholic (so called, since the time of Ignatius, in opposition to the

Separatists of all names) from surrendering the Church's claim to the character of Sanctity — one of its essential predicates, as they no less than their opponents maintained — that it was just at this juncture that, in opposition to the Donatistic pretensions, they first expressly described the Church, in the Creed, as *the Communion of SAINTS*. For it is noticeable that this supplementary clause was first incorporated in the AFRICAN symbol, a fact which seems to indicate that its insertion in the Creed may have been occasioned by the position of the Catholics against the Donatists.

“The introduction of this clause,” says Lord KING, “was occasioned by the Donatists, who affirmed that their own party, though confined to a small part of Africa, was alone and exclusively *the One Holy Catholic Church*, all others being without its pale, having no right to administer its ordinances and sacraments. Hence they rebaptized all who revolted to them from the Catholic Church, avowedly renouncing all communion and fellowship with every church which was not of their party. In opposition to these proud opinions and schismatical practices, it is very probable that *the Communion of Saints* was added as an explanatory clause of *the Holy Catholic Church*, to signify that though there is but one Universal Church, yet the particular churches and members thereof maintained a strict union and correspondence with each other; that whatever was regularly performed in one church was esteemed valid by all others; or, that though the Universal Church was necessarily divided into many particular churches, yet the Christian unity was not thereby destroyed, but was still preserved by their reciprocal agreement and communion.” (*Hist. Ap. Creed.*, pp. 348-354.)

Communion  
of Saints.

Lord King's  
Comment.

## CHAPTER VI.

STATEMENTS OF JEROME IN REGARD TO THE ORIGIN OF THE EPISCOPATE — BISHOPS SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES — OTHER APOSTLES BESIDES "THE TWELVE" — ORIGIN OF THE EPISCOPATE — EQUALITY OF BISHOPS — ORIGINAL IDENTITY OF BISHOPS AND PREBYTERS — JEROME INTERPRETED (*a*) BY THE ADVOCATES OF MINISTERIAL PARITY; (*b*) BY THE UPHOLDERS OF A THREEFOLD ORDER — THE "TESTIMONY" OF EUTYCHIUS (A. D. 933) WORTHLESS — ŒCUMENICAL COUNCILS; AUTHORITY OF; AUGUSTINE'S THEORY — VINCENT OF LERINS — UTILITY OF COUNCILS — JUDGMENT OF GREGORY NAZIANZEN — CANONS AND DECREES OF GENERAL COUNCILS.

**D**URING the last three centuries, the statements of JEROME on the question of the primitive constitution of the Christian ministry have been made the subject of animated, often of eager controversy.

Of the numerous passages in his writings bearing on the point I quote the most important:

"1. Among us, bishops hold the place of apostles; among them (Montanists), it is the third place." (*Ad Marcellum.*)

2. "We know that the apostolical traditions were taken out of the Old Testament, that what Aaron and his sons and Levites were in the temple, bishops, presbyters, and deacons claim for themselves in the Church." (*Ad Evagrium.*)

3. "On account of his extraordinary character and incomparable faith, and wisdom of no common kind, he (James) hath been called the brother of our Lord, and for that reason was the first to be over that church which was the first to believe in Christ, and to be gathered out of the Jews. Certain other apostles also are called the brethren of our Lord, as in the Gospel, 'Go and tell my brethren,' etc. (*John* xx. 17.) . . . But besides the Twelve, certain other persons were called apostles for this reason, that all who have seen the Lord, and afterward

Jerome,  
331 - 420.

Bishops  
succeeded  
Apostles.

Other apostles  
besides  
the twelve.

preached Him, were called apostles, as it is written to the Corinthians: 'Then He was seen of the eleven,' etc. . . . 'After that He was seen of James; then of *all the apostles.*' (1 Cor. xv. 5-7.) In course of time others also were ordained apostles by those whom the Lord had chosen, as that discourse to the Philippians declares: 'Yet I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother, etc. . . . but your *apostle,*' etc. (ii. 25.) And to the Corinthians of such it is written: 'Or the apostles of the churches in the glory of God.' (2 Cor. viii. 23.) Silas also and Judas are named apostles by the apostles. (*Acts* xv.) . . . This James was the first bishop of Jerusalem, surnamed the Just." (*Comm. in Ep. ad Gal.* i. 19.)

4. "I hear that a certain person has rushed into so great folly as to place deacons above presbyters, that is, above bishops. The apostle plainly teaches that presbyters are the same as bishops. What! a server of tables and widows to puff himself up above those at whose prayers is made the body and blood of Christ! Dost thou seek authority? Hear testimony: 'Paul and Timothy, etc. . . . to all the saints . . . at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.' (*Phil.* i. 1.) . . . To the priests of one church Paul speaks thus: 'Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops,' etc. (Here follow Titus i. 5-7; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 1 Peter v. 1, 2.)

"But that afterward one was chosen to be over the rest was done to prevent schism, lest each one, drawing the Church of Christ after him, should break it up. For at Alexandria also, from Mark the Evangelist to the bishops Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters always called one elected from among themselves, and placed in a higher rank, bishop; just as an army may constitute its general (*imperatorem*, rendered by Presbyterian writers, *emperor*), or deacons may elect one of themselves, whom they may know to be diligent, and call him archdeacon. For what does a bishop do, except in the case of ordination, which a presbyter may not do?

Origin of the  
episcopate.

“Wherever there is a bishop, be it at Rome or Eugubium, at Constantinople or Rhegium, Alexandria or Tanis, they are of the same merit, of the same priesthood. The power of riches and the meanness of poverty make not a bishop higher or lower, for they are all successors of the apostles. A presbyter and a bishop are titles, the one of age, the other of office. Whence there is mention, in the Epistle to Titus, and to Timothy, concerning the ordination of a bishop and a deacon; but there is entire silence about presbyters, because in the bishop the presbyter is included.” (*Ad Evagr.*)

Equality of  
bishops.

“A presbyter, therefore, is the same as a bishop, and before dissensions were introduced into religion by the instigation of the devil, and it was said among the peoples, ‘I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, and I of Cephass,’ churches were governed by a common council of presbyters. But afterwards, when every one accounted those whom he baptized as his own, and not Christ’s, it was decreed in the whole world that one chosen out of the presbytery should be placed over the rest, to whom the whole care of the Church should belong, that the seeds of schism might be plucked up. Whoever thinks that there is no proof from Scripture, but that this is my opinion, that a presbyter and bishop are the same, . . . let him read the words of the apostle to the Philippians, etc. (*Phil. i. 1.*) Our purpose is to show that, among the ancients, presbyters were the same as bishops; but by degrees (*paulatim*), that the plants of dissension might be rooted up, all responsibility was transferred to one person. As the presbyters, therefore, know that it is by the custom of the Church that they are subjected to him who is set over them, so let the bishops know that they are greater than presbyters rather by custom than by the Lord’s express appointment (*dispositionis Dominicæ veritate*). (*Comm. in Tit.*)

Original identity of bishop  
and presbyter.

Now, here, say the advocates of ministerial parity, we have the “testimony” of this illustrious Father to the effect that, in their original constitution, the churches were governed by the joint council of the presbytery; that the elevation of one pres-

byter over the others was a human contrivance; that the first bishops were made by the presbyters themselves; and, consequently, could neither have nor communicate any authority above that of presbyters. "The utmost that can be obtained

from the teaching of Jerome," say others, "is that a bishop or presbyter existed, from the time of the apostles, as a *primus inter pares* in regard to his brother presbyters, and that any distinction which he had superior to them was conferred upon him, not by any distinct order of bishops, such as existed in the time of Jerome, but by his fellow-presbyters and equals."\* So Cartwright, Beza, Smectymnuus, Blondel, Mason, Miller, etc., etc.

On the other hand, the advocates of episcopacy, from Whitgift down, find in the utterances of Jerome a meaning fully accordant with their own views. Thus, in the Defence of the Answer to the Admonition: "Here a man may reason thus. The distinction of degrees began in the Church when men began to say, I hold of Paul, I hold of Apollo, etc. But this was in the apostles' time. (1 Cor. i.) Therefore these distinctions of degrees began in the apostles' time." (*Tract viii., c. iii.*)

So also BILSON: "These words of Jerome may be either very true, according to the time that they be referred unto, or very false. If you so construe Jerome, that the while the apostles lived, bishops were all one with presbyters, and had no more charge nor power in the Church than presbyters, you make Jerome contradict the Scriptures, himself, and the whole array of all the ancient Fathers and apostolic churches that ever were since Christ's time; for all these affirm and prove the contrary. But if you so expound Jerome, that the apostles for a time suffered the presbyters to have equal power and care in guiding the Church, themselves always sitting at the stern and holding the helms while they were present in those parts of the world, till by the factions and divisions of so many governors the churches were almost rent in pieces; and thereupon the apostles, forced, did set another order in the Church than was at first, and with the good liking of all the churches—

\* Harrison, App. No. 794.

either troubled with contentions, or justly fearing the like events in time to come — did commit each place to one pastor, leaving the rest to consult and advise with him for the health and peace of the people, and by this example taught the whole Church what perpetual rule to observe after their deaths, Jerome saith as much as I can or do desire." (*Perpet. Gov.*, p. 290.)

Thus HOOKER: "The drift and purpose of St. Jerome's speech doth plainly show what his meaning was; for whereas some did over extol the office of the deacon in the Church of Rome, where deacons being grown great, through wealth, challenged place above presbyters; St. Jerome, to abate this insolency, diminisheth by all means the deacon's estimation, and lifteth up presbyters as far as possible the truth might bear." Hence Jerome "notes one only circumstance belonging to the manner" of the bishop's election in the Church of Alexandria, which circumstance is, that in Alexandria they used to choose their bishops altogether *out of the college of their own presbyters*, and neither from abroad, nor out of any other inferior order of the clergy; whereas oftentimes elsewhere the use was to choose as well from abroad as at home, as well inferior unto presbyters as presbyters when they saw occasion. This custom, saith he, the Church of Alexandria did always keep, till in Heraclas and Dionysius they began to do otherwise. These two were the very first not chosen out of their college of presbyters.

"Now whereas Jerome doth term the government of bishops by restraint an apostolical tradition," — how is this to be reconciled with his assertion that *the custom of the Church* is "to be accounted its chiefest prop? To this we answer, That forasmuch as the whole body of the Church hath power to alter, with general consent, and upon necessary occasions, even the positive laws of the apostles, if there be no command to the contrary, and it manifestly appears to her that change of times have clearly taken away the very reasons of God's first institution; as by sundry examples may be most clearly proved: what laws the universal Church might change, and

doth not, if they have long continued without any alteration, it seemeth that St. Jerome ascribeth the continuance of such positive laws, though instituted by God himself, to the judgment of the Church. For they which might abrogate a law and do not, are properly said to uphold, to establish it, and to give it being. The regiment, therefore, whereof Jerome speaketh being positive, and consequently not absolutely necessary, but of a changeable nature, because there is no divine voice which in express words forbiddeth it to be changed; he might imagine both that it came by the apostles by very divine appointment, at the first, and notwithstanding be, after a sort, said to stand in force, rather by the custom of the Church, choosing to continue in it, than by the necessary constraint of any commandment from the word, requiring perpetual continuance thereof. . . . So that St. Jerome's admonition is . . . to this effect: The ruling superiority of one bishop among many presbyters in each church is an order descended from Christ to the apostles, who were themselves bishops at large, and from the apostles to those whom they in their steads appointed bishops over particular countries and cities; and even from those ancient times, universally established, thus many years it hath continued throughout the world; for which cause presbyters must not grudge to continue subject unto their bishops. . . . On the other side, bishops, albeit they may avouch with conformity of truth that their authority hath thus descended even from the very apostles themselves, yet the absolute and everlasting continuance of it they cannot say that any commandment of the Lord doth enjoin; and therefore must acknowledge that the Church hath power by universal consent upon urgent cause to take it away, if thereto she be constrained through the proud, tyrannical, and unreformable dealings of her bishops, whose regiment she hath long delighted in, because she hath found it good and requisite to be so governed." (vi., v. 6. 8.)

Bp. HALL: "Jerome saith, this was rather by the '*custom*' of the Church, 'than by the truth of the Lord's disposition.' True, it was by the custom of the Church, but that Church

was apostolical : not by the Lord's disposition immediately ; for Christ gave no express rule for it ; but mediately it was from Christ, as from his inspired apostles." (*Defence, sec. vi.*)

To the same effect Bp. Stillingfleet, in correction of earlier statements in his *Irenicum* : " It is hard to conceive how such an alteration should happen without the *apostles' act* : for if they had left the presbyters in full power of government, it is not to be imagined they would so universally part with it, without being obliged thereto by those who had authority over them." (*Serm. at St. Paul's.*) As Bp. Hall expresses it : " What can be more plain than that Jerome's '*it was decreed all the world over*' relates to apostolic constitution. I would fain know by what power, besides apostolical, such a decree (that bishops should be set up) could be so soon and so universally enacted." (*Ubi sup.*) To the same effect, DAVENANT, *Determ. xlii.*

" Jerome's design," says Bp. Hoadley, " evidently was to say all that he thought true against the distinction between bishops and presbyters. And yet in his zeal against this distinction, he saith only that there was a time when this distinction was not in being ; but never intimates *that it was not made and settled in the days of the apostles themselves* ; or that presbyters of after ages altered the design of the apostles after their death ; which single thing, if he could have said it with any truth, must have done his cause more service than all he hath alleged ; and therefore I conclude *he would certainly have said it, and endeavored to prove it, if he had thought it true.*" (*Defence of Episc. Ordination.*)

According to Jerome, moreover, episcopacy by restraint took its rise at Alexandria " from Mark the Evangelist," (hence in the apostolic age,) and he commemorates the custom of the Alexandrian Church at the period named, as especially noteworthy on account of its contrariety to that of his own age. Then and there the college of presbyters always elected the bishops out of their own body. In Jerome's day, " the choice was generally made by the emperor or by the bishops of the province, by whom they were afterwards ordained."

No difference, however, in regard to the manner of their ordination, is named or alluded to. "These bishops, continues Hoadley, must, according to Jerome, have been the governors of the Church, and of the presbyters themselves; for he makes all the care concerning ecclesiastical affairs to be devolved upon them as soon as they were constituted. They must be the ordainers of other presbyters, even according to BLONDEL himself, unless he deny to them what he grants to his *prime-presbyters* in each church. So that here are bishops with distinct powers, after their election, from those of their electors, immediately succeeding St. Mark in the Church of Alexandria; and consequently the like in other churches, according to St. Jerome, *who makes all churches uniform*, and the reception of episcopacy, wherever it was received, *to be universal at the same time.*" And after mentioning this peculiarity in the mode of the bishop's *election* in the Church at Alexandria, he immediately adds: "*For what* does a bishop do, ordination excepted, which a presbyter may not do?"—an acknowledgment, surely, that presbyters had no right to ordain, *from the beginning*; since in Jerome's day, by ecclesiastical law, bishops had other prerogatives besides that of ordination. While abasing bishops to the lowest possible point, he yet never ascribes to presbyters the *ordaining power*. The utmost he assigns to them is, the power of *government*, "at the same time denying to them," as Hoadley remarks, "the right of ordination," not only in his own day, but in all time.

And with Jerome, on this point, stands CHRYSOSTOM:  
Chrysostom,  
351-411. "Bishops are only superior to presbyters in the one point of having the power, or right of ordination, and seem to have no other superiority over presbyters." (*In Ep. ad 1 Tim.*) He here evidently speaks of the rights of the episcopate *as originally constituted*, not as they were in his own days, when bishops had the pre-eminence *in other respects*, as well as ordination.

The defenders of parity\* attempt to reinforce the "testimony" of Jerome in behalf of presbyterial ordination by that

\* Stillingfleet in *Irenicum*; Campbell, *Lect. Ecc. Hist.*; Miller, *Letters*; etc.

of EUTYCHIUS, Patriarch of Alexandria in the *tenth* century :  
 “ Mark, having constituted Hananias patriarch of Alexandria,  
 appointed with him twelve presbyters, who were to remain  
 with the patriarch, so that when the patriarchate was vacant,  
 they might elect one of the twelve presbyters, upon whose  
 head the other eleven might place their hands  
 and bless him, and create him patriarch, and then  
 choose some excellent man, and appoint him presbyter with  
 themselves, in the place of him who was made patriarch,  
 that thus there might always be twelve. Nor did this custom  
 respecting the presbyters, namely, that they should create  
 their patriarchs from the twelve presbyters, cease at Alexan-  
 dria until the times of Alexander, Patriarch of Alexandria, who  
 was of the number of the three hundred and eighteen,”  
 (bishops of Nice.)

Eutychius, 933.

In reference to this so-called “ testimony,” anti-presbyte-  
 rian writers cannot withhold the expression of  
 their “ surprise” that this “ worthless legend”  
 from the pen “ of so late, ignorant, and blunder-  
 ing a writer” should be quoted in the controversy. They  
 point to the fact that, “ among other fatal absurdities, it makes  
 Alexander, the well-known bishop of Alexandria in the time  
 of Arius, who also participated in a council (in 324) which  
 condemned non-episcopal orders in the case of Colluthus,  
 yet all the while to have had all his own predecessors, nay,  
 apparently even himself, actually and notoriously consecrated  
 by only presbyterian consecration.” \*

His testimony  
 worthless.

The external unity of the Church Catholic was further re-  
 presented in this period by the *Œcumenical* Councils, so called  
 as representing the whole Church throughout the  
 Roman empire, (*οικουμηνη*), and convened by the  
 emperor. As the provincial synods were univer-  
 sally regarded as organs of the Holy Spirit for the guidance  
 of the churches of a certain district, so the uni-  
 versal councils were held to sustain a like rela-

Œcumenical  
 Councils.

Authority of.

\* PEARSON, *Vind.*, pp. 326-7; BOWDEN, *let.* 1; HADDAN, *Ap. Success.*, pp. 123, etc.

tion to the universal Church. They were the organs of the Spirit indwelling in the Church, by which He guided its progressive movement—the voice by which He authoritatively determined what had before been doubtful, to which all were bound to yield implicit submission.

The theory of Augustine on this point, and that which generally obtained throughout the Church, since his time, is best expressed in his own words: “The decision of contro-  
Augustine's  
theory. verted questions does not proceed in the first instance and directly from the transactions of these councils; but these transactions, rather, are prepared by the theological discussions which have preceded them. The decisions of councils simply give the expression of public authority to the result at which the Church, in its development, thus far, has arrived. Hence a general council may find itself, at a given time, incompetent to decide a disputed point, from the fact that previous discussion had not, as yet, prepared the way for a definitive decision.” (*De Bapt.*)

According to this theory it would appear that the decisions of an earlier council might be subject to correction by those of a later; since each council gives only that decision which answers to the Church's existing stage of development. But it is by no means certain from his words as just quoted, that such was Augustine's opinion. It is more probable that his  
Vincent of  
Lerins, 434. view was coincident with that soon afterward expressed by VINCENT OF LERINS, namely, “that a later council might correct the decisions of an earlier, *only so far as to define what the earlier had left undetermined*; just as the more advanced development of the Church might require, in its opposition to new forms of error.” (*Commonit.* xxix.)

That the decrees of *provincial* councils, in Vincent's opinion, were entitled to no such unquestioning submission, is plain from his language in reference to the Council of Carthage, held under the presidency of Cyprian: “What force had the Council or Decree of Africa? (condemning the baptism of heretics.) By God's Providence, none; but all was abolished,

disannulled, abrogated, as dreams, as fables. And, oh, strange change of the world! the authors of that opinion are judged to be Catholics, but the followers of the same, heretics; the masters discharged, the disciples condemned; the writers of those books shall be the children of the kingdom, but hell shall receive their maintainers. For who is so mad as to doubt that that light of all saints, bishops, and martyrs, the most blessed Cyprian, with the rest of his companions, shall reign with Christ forever? And, contrariwise, who is so profane as to deny that the Donatists, and such other pests, which vaunt that they do practise rebaptization by the authority of that council, shall burn forever with the devil?" (*Pro. Cath. Fid.* vi.)

In regard to the utility of ecclesiastical councils, the judgment of the Fathers of this period exhibits a considerable diversity. It is recorded as one of the noteworthy sayings of FACUNDUS, the excellent bishop of Hermiane in Africa, (550-70,) that the usefulness of councils was confined to a single point, viz., "that they enable us to believe on *authority* that which we are incompetent intellectually to apprehend."

Utility of  
Councils.

The judgment of GREGORY NAZIANZEN, "the result of a large and various experience," is well known: "I am so constituted, that, to speak the truth, I dread every assembly of bishops; for I have never yet seen a good end of any one — never have been at a synod which did more for the suppression, than it did for the increase, of evils; for an indescribable thirst for contention and for rule prevails in them, and a man will be far more likely to draw upon himself the reproach of wishing to set himself up as a judge of other men's wickedness, than he will be to succeed in attempting to remove it." (*Ep. ad Procep.* lv.)

The canons and decrees of the Œcumenical Councils, determined, as they were, in matters of doctrine, by a unanimous vote of the assembly, and, in matters of discipline, by that of a majority, constituted a body of ecclesiastical law, universally binding on the Church, at least within the Roman em-

pire. Of these, two collections made in the sixth century acquired general currency: one by DIONYSIUS EXIGUUS, a Roman abbot, who combined (500) a former collection of the decisions of the Roman bishops, (Decretals,) from  
Canons and  
decrees. the time of Siricius, (374,) with the decrees of the first four general councils — used by the Western Church; the other by JOHN SCHOLASTICUS, (ob. 578,) Patriarch of Constantinople, consisting of fifty heads, and used by the Greek Church.

## SECOND PERIOD.

### FROM LEO I. TO GREGORY VII.

A. D. 460-1080.

---

#### CHAPTER VII.

PRIMACY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME EARLY ASSERTED—PRIMACY OF THE BISHOP OF ROME—SUPREMACY OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF, FIRST ASSERTED BY LEO I.—LAW OF VALENTINIAN—CANON OF THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON—REPUDIATED BY LEO—GROUNDS OF THE CLAIM—PETER'S RELATION TO CHRIST—RELATION TO THE OTHER APOSTLES—RELATION OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF TO OTHER BISHOPS—RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO THE STATE—THE PAPAL SYSTEM—GELASIUS—HIS ADVANCED POSITION—GREGORY THE GREAT REPUDIATES THE TITLE OF UNIVERSAL BISHOP AS PROFANE—ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, OF ECCLESIASTICAL DEGREES.

WE have seen at what an early period the claim of the Church of Rome to a certain primacy or pre-eminence among the Western churches was generally acknowledged. The grounds upon which this claim was originally based are clearly enough indicated by Irenæus, (the first of the Fathers to make distinct allusion to it,) when he describes that Church as “the greatest, the oldest, the universally known church, founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul.” Its superior magnitude, its higher antiquity, and its eminent apostolicity are here alleged as the well-known grounds of the pre-eminence conceded to the Church of Rome. In other words, among all the churches of the West, the Church of Rome was at once the largest, the first founded, and the only one founded by an apostle. Its chief title to distinction or precedence, however, was the alleged fact, as

Primacy of the  
Church of  
Rome.

urged by Irenæus, of its eminent apostolic descent: while no other church throughout the West could claim an apostle for its founder, the Church of Rome had the pre-eminent honor of having been founded by *two*, the most distinguished of the apostles.

But while the primacy of this church was thus early acknowledged, the primacy of its pastoral head is first found definitely alluded to in the writings of Cyprian. Not before the fifth century, however, do we discern the beginnings of a development of this now settled dogma of a primacy of order in the person of the Roman Pontiff into that of a primacy of power, or supremacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church.

In the uncompromising assertion of this position of sovereignty for the See of Rome, LEO I. holds the first place. In a letter addressed to the Illyrian bishops, he claims that "on him, as the successor of the apostle Peter, on whom, as the reward of his faith, the Lord had conferred the primacy of apostolic rank, and on whom He had firmly grounded the universal Church, was devolved the care of all the other churches."

(*Ep. v. ad Metrop. Illyr.*) And to settle the point beyond further controversy, he procured from the young emperor, Valentinian III., the enactment of a law, (445,) supposed to have been dictated by himself, constituting the Bishop of Rome the supreme head of the whole Western Church. "The primacy of the apostolic see (so reads the law) having been established by the merit of St. Peter — the prince of the episcopal crown — by the dignity of the city of Rome, and by the authority of a holy synod, let no pretended power arrogate to itself anything against the authority of that see. For the peace of the churches is to be universally preserved only when the whole Church acknowledges its ruler. . . . Nor this only . . . but to prevent the rise of dissension in the churches, and that discipline may not, in any particular, seem to be relaxed, we ordain, by this perpetual decree, that it shall not be lawful for

Primacy of the  
Bishop of  
Rome.

Supremacy of  
the Roman  
Pontiff asserted  
by Leo I.,  
440-460.

Law of Valen-  
tinian.

the bishops, as well those of Gaul as of the other provinces, to attempt anything in opposition to ancient custom, without the authority of the venerable man, the Pope of the eternal city." Resistance to the authority of the Roman Bishop is thus declared to be an offence against the Roman state; and it is further enacted, that "whatever the Apostolic See ordains shall be law for all; and that any bishop who neglects a summons to the tribunal of the Roman Bishop, shall be forcibly compelled to appear by the civil governor of the province." (*Leonis Opp. Ep.* xi.) [No. 13.]

The second œcumenical council (of Constantinople, 381) had decreed in its third canon "that the Bishop of Constantinople should have the prerogative of honor next after the Bishop of Rome, because it (Constantinople) is New Rome." This decree was confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon (451) in its twenty-eighth canon, with this explanation: "For to the throne of old Rome, *because that was the imperial city*, the fathers rightly granted privileges; and moved by the same considerations, the one hundred and fifty bishops (of the Council of Constantinople) have given the like privileges to the most holy throne of New Rome, rightly judging that the city which was honored with the seat of empire and the senate, enjoying, too, the same *civil* privileges with the old imperial Rome, should be honored as she is in ecclesiastical matters also, being second, after her."

Canon of the  
Council of  
Chalcedon.

Against this decree, as resting the higher dignity of the Roman see on the political superiority of the Roman city, instead of a divine institution, the delegates of Leo the Great in the council entered an emphatic protest. Leo himself denounced it as a usurpation. Writing to the emperor, he says: "The case is quite different with worldly relations, and with those that concern the things of God; and without that rock which our Lord has wonderfully laid as the foundation, no structure can stand firm. Let it satisfy Anatolius (Patriarch of Constantinople) that, by your assistance, and by my ready assent, he has attained to the bishopric of so great a city. Let not the imperial city be too

Repudiated  
by Leo.

small for him, which yet he cannot convert into an apostolic see" — *sedes apostolica* — the Church at Constantinoplé not having been founded or presided over by an apostle. (*Ep.* lxxviii.) Anatolius having appealed to the authority of the second œcumenical council, which had adjudged this rank to the Constantinopolitan Church, Leo, in reply, pronounced the canon to that effect null and void, if for no other reason, "*because it had never been communicated to the Apostolic See.*" (*Ep.* lxxx. 5.)

In the very beginning of the Council of Constantinople, the papal legates made this declaration: "We hold in our hands the injunctions of the most blessed and apostolical Pope of the city of Rome, which is the head of all churches, in which his apostleship deigns to command that Dioscurus, Archbishop of Alexandria, shall not sit in the council, but may be admitted for a hearing. This it is necessary that we observe. If then, your majesty commands, either he must go forth, or we depart. It is necessary that he give an account of his conduct in having dared, without authority, presumptuously to convoke a council (the Robber Synod) without the authority of the Apostolic See, which was in violation of all law and of all precedent."

The ground of these lofty claims Leo pretends to find in the relation of Peter to Christ and to the other apostles; more particularly, in the peculiarly intimate relation of the prince of the apostles to Christ: "Peter being received by Christ into communion of undivided unity with himself, the Lord willed him to be named that which he himself was, when he said: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church;' that the building of the eternal temple, by a wonderful gift of divine grace, might consist in Peter's steadfastness; by his firmness strengthening His Church, so that neither human temerity nor the gates of hell, should prevail against it." This communion of indivisible unity into which the Lord received Peter is based "upon the good confession which Peter was the first to make — a confession which he could have made only as he was strong in the

Grounds of  
the claim.

power of the Lord." This communion of the person was, however, to extend itself to a community of authority and power: "Because thou art Peter; that is, since I am the corner-stone who make both one, I the foundation, beside which no one can lay any other; yet thou also art a rock, because thou art steadfast by my strength, so that whatever is proper to me, by inherent power, is common to you with me by participation." (*Ep.* iv. 2.) Peter, indeed, wavered in his faith, denying the Lord; but this was permitted only in order that in the prince of the Church might be laid up the remedy of penitence, and that no one might dare to confide in his own strength, when not even the blessed Peter was able to escape the danger of mutability. But the rock speedily returned to his stability, receiving so great a measure of strength, that whereas he was then struck with dread at Christ's passion, he afterward endured his own without fear. (*Ep.* lx. 4.)

Peter's relation to the other apostles is such that he not only is all that they are, but also has and is much that is exclusively his own: "Peter was so plentifully endowed from the fountain of all gifts and graces, that while he alone was the recipient of many, no one gift was bestowed on any other without his participation. From the whole world Peter alone is chosen to occupy the position of precedence, both in relation to the calling of all nations, and to all the apostles and fathers of the Church; that however numerous might be the priests and pastors of the people of God, Peter should yet properly rule over all, whom Christ also rules over in the highest sense. Great and wonderful the community of its power vouchsafed to Peter by the divine condescension! And if any gift were bestowed upon other princes in common with him, it was bestowed only through him." (*Ep.* iv. 2.) "The power of the keys was given indeed to all the apostles, yet not without purpose is that expressly committed to one which is announced to all. To Peter this trust is peculiarly given, since to him is assigned the presidency over all the rulers of the Church. And as Peter is the head of all the apostles, so

Peter's relation  
to the other  
apostles.

also are all intrusted with their office only *in him*, all in him saved; therefore is he taken into the Lord's special care; hence the Lord prays for him in a special manner, as if the state of others would become more secure if his faith should abide unmoved."

As Leo identifies the Church with the incarnation of Christ, so he identifies Peter with Christ. Hence the primacy is of perpetual continuance; for as that in the person of Christ which was the object of Peter's faith is perpetual, so that which Christ ordained in the person of Peter is also perpetual. This primacy is perpetuated in the successors of Peter, who sustain the same relation to Peter that Peter sustains to Christ. "As Christ is in Peter, so is Peter in his successors; in them Peter fulfils evermore the commission of the Lord: *Feed my sheep*. Christ bestowed on him whom He made prince of the whole Church such ample power that whatever is properly done by us, even in our own age, is to be ascribed to his agency, intervention, or oversight, to whom it was said: 'and thou, when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.'" (*Serm. iv. 4.*)

"Rome," says Leo, "is made illustrious by the death of the two most eminent apostles, Paul and Peter; they advanced thee (Rome) to such a pitch of glory, that a holy nation, a chosen people, a sacerdotal and royal city, by means of the sacred seat of the blessed Peter made the capital of the globe, thou mightest exercise a more extensive sway by means of divine religion, than by an earthly dominion. (*Serm. lxxxii. 1.*) . . . That the effect of this unspeakable grace (of the Incarnation) might be diffused throughout the whole world, Divine Providence prepared the Roman kingdom, the bounds of which became so extended that they bordered on all the nations of the globe. It well accorded with a work divinely ordered, that many kingdoms should become incorporated in one empire, and the preaching of the gospel thus speedily reach nations held under the government of a single city." Leo thus recognizes a special ordering of Divine Providence in the fact that Peter was directed to abide at Rome, and that

Rome, in and through him, was constituted the centre of the Christian world.

According to Leo, the relation of the Bishop of Rome to all other bishops is the same as that of Peter to his fellow-apostles: "The bishops have the same dignity, but not the same power. For even among the holy apostles, though they all alike bore the title of apostle, yet a marked subordination obtained, so that only one — Peter — occupied the first place. Hence is derived the distinction among the bishops. It is a fundamental law of the Church, that all may not claim all in the same way, but in every province is one (the bishop of the provincial chief city) who has the first voice among his brethren. Again, to those who occupy the episcopal chairs in the greater cities (the metropolitans) there belongs a greater power. But the supervision of the whole Church is committed to the care of the chair of Peter, and no one may separate himself from it — the common head."

Relation of the  
Supreme Pon-  
tiff to other  
bishops.

Such is Leo's exposition of the pretended supernatural power of Peter, his mysterious unity with the Lord, and his earthly dominion. He is the head of the Church, and, according to divine institution, has to care for the whole Church, both of the West and East, for he is the medium "from which, as from the fountain-head, God pours out his gifts as it were upon the whole body." The Pope rules over the whole Church in the name of Peter, who still ever sits upon his seat; he decides and pronounces by divine inspiration; the administration of the Church is by divine appointment committed to him. For this object the other bishops are to co-operate with him, since they also are taught of Christ and the apostles. The Roman Bishop is therefore possessed of authority adequate for the doctrine and discipline of the Church; and has especially to take care that heresies and schisms do not destroy the orthodoxy and unity of the Church. He is thus the highest court of appeal in all controversies. While thus explicitly asserting for his chair an absolute primacy in the Church, Leo took special care, it is to be

remarked, to express himself guardedly in reference to the bearing of his system on the question of the subordination of the secular to the spiritual power.

Thus, he says: "It pertains to the imperial power to provide that the disturbers of the Church's peace and of the republic, which justly glories in Christian princes, be restrained." (*Ep.* cxviii. 1.) And addressing the emperor, he says: "It is incumbent on thee to remember that the royal

Relation of  
the Church to  
the State.

power is conferred upon thee not for the government of the world alone, but chiefly for the defence and protection of the Church." And even the edict of Valentinian, which so unreservedly acknowledges the Roman primacy, bears the impress of a consciousness that the imperial authority is paramount to every other. Leo needed the aid of the secular power, as an instrument for the furtherance of his plans, too much, to risk the loss of it by an open assertion of his claim to precedence. So much the more decidedly, however, did he proclaim his unlimited authority in ecclesiastical affairs, as when he writes: "Who-soever he be who thinks that the primacy (*principatum*) is to be denied to Peter, is not able to detract from his dignity in the least, but, inflated with the spirit of his own pride, sinks himself down to hell." (*Ep.* x. 2. *S. Leonis Magni Opera Omnia*, Paris, 2 vols. 4to, 1675.)

Thus in the person of LEO I. we have the first clear revelation of that "mystery of iniquity"—THE PAPAL SYSTEM. "The calamities of the age" favored its development, "removing from the path of Roman ambition the hindrance which had

The Papal  
System.

been opposed by the independent Church of Africa—a church distinguished far beyond Rome itself by the services which its members had rendered to theology and learning. The Africans, oppressed by the Arian invaders of their country, were glad to seek support from a connection with Rome; and the interference which had been boldly rejected in the days of Zozimus, was admitted, without objection, at the hands of the latter bishop." \*

\* Robertson, i. 480.

It is worthy of remark that the Bishops of Rome were hitherto distinguished by no peculiar title. That of *patriarch*, as also of *pope* — *papa apostolicus* — *Vicar of Christ*, Title of Pope. *Chief Pontiff*, were common to them with other bishops, both East and West. The term *Apostolic See* was moreover applied to the Roman Church in common with other churches of apostolic descent.

As a worthy successor of Leo, GELASIUS claimed for the Roman See, not only the highest judicial authority in the Church, but also the prerogative of oversight in regard alike to orthodoxy and the execution of ecclesiastical laws throughout Christendom. While his immediate predecessors were sometimes content to rest these claims on the combined authority of the imperial edicts and synodal decrees, (thus HILARY, *Ep.* xi., quoted in *Geiseler*, i., p. 497,) Gelasius founds them on the primacy transmitted through Peter, and exercised by him jointly with Paul, disdaining to base them on the decrees of synods; thus exalting the authority of the Roman See above the authority of councils. In the *decree concerning books to be received and to be rejected*, ascribed to him, he writes: "The holy Roman Church has precedence over other churches, not by virtue of any synodical decrees or canons; but she obtained the primacy by the voice of our Lord and Saviour in the gospel: *Thou art Peter, etc.* With whom was associated the blessed apostle Paul, who, on the same day with Peter, received the crown of martyrdom, in a glorious death, at Rome. And they equally (by their joint action) consecrated the Roman Church to Christ, and by their presence and glorious martyrdom (*venerando triumpho*) gave it pre-eminence over all other churches throughout the whole world." Again: "Not only has the Roman See the right to judge and decide, but all appeal from the decisions of that see are inadmissible, the first place being, by the universal consent of the Church, conceded to it, in virtue of which it confirms the decrees of every synod by its authority, and, in accordance with its position of primacy, (*principatu*), supervises these by a constant

Gelasius,  
492-6.

His advanced  
position.

oversight." (*Ep. xiii. ad Episc. Dardan. Mansi. S. Con. viii.*) In a letter to *Faustus*, he deigns to recognize (*pro forma*) some authority in synodical decrees: "So far, as religion is concerned, the last appeal, *according to the canons*, belongs of right exclusively to the Apostolic See." (*Gcl. Ep. iv.*)

A century later, GREGORY THE FIRST vindicates his claim to the title of "the Great," not less by his adoption of that of *Servus servorum Dei*, than by his energetic repudiation of that of "universal bishop."

Gregory I.,  
590-604.

"It is plain," he writes to the Emperor Maurice, "to all those who know the gospel, that by the Lord's word the care of the whole Church was committed to the holy apostle Peter, prince of all the apostles." . . . "The care of the whole Church and its government are committed to him; nevertheless, he is not called *universal apostle*; but JOHN, (*the Faster*, Patriarch of Constantinople,) that most holy man, my fellow-priest, attempts to be called *universal bishop*. I am compelled to exclaim, O times! O customs! Behold, all things in all parts of Europe have been delivered up to the will of the barbarians, . . . and yet priests, who ought to lie weeping on the pavement and in ashes, covet names of vanity for themselves, and glory in new and profane titles. . . . Who is he who now presumes to usurp a new name to himself, contrary to the evangelical statutes; contrary to the decrees of the councils? . . . But let this name of blasphemy be far from the hearts of Christians, in which the honor of all priests is taken away, whilst by one it is madly arrogated to himself. For the honor of the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, indeed, the name was offered by the venerated Council of Chalcedon to the Roman Pontiff; but no one of them ever assumed this term of singularity." (*Ep. xxxii.*)

Universal  
Bishop.

A profane  
title.

To JOHN himself: "If Paul would not suffer the members of the Lord's body to subject themselves to any other head than Christ, not even to an apostle, what wilt thou say to Christ, the head of the universal Church, at the last judgment? Thou who hast sought, by the title of universal bishop, to sub-

ject all his members to thyself? . . . Peter, indeed, is the first member of the holy and universal Church. Paul, Andrew, John, what else but heads of particular peoples? Yet all of them are members of the Church under the One Head." (*Ep.* xxxviii.) [No. 17.]

"It is very hard that, after we have parted with our silver, our gold, our slaves, and even our garments, for the public welfare, we should be obliged to part with our faith, too; for to agree to that impious title (*scelerato vocabulo*) were parting with our faith." (*Ad Anian.*)

"I speak confidently, for whosoever calls himself universal priest, (*universalem sacerdotem*,) or desires to be so called, is, in his loftiness, the precursor of Antichrist, because in his pride he sets himself before others." (*Ep.* xxx.)

Contemporary with Gregory was ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, the most learned theologian and most celebrated writer of the seventh century. In the twelfth chapter of the seventh book of his *Etymologiæ*, [No. 20,] incorporated into the *Decretum Gratiani*, (*P. i. Dist. xxi.*

Isidore of  
Seville,  
636.

1,) he describes all the grades of the hierarchy, and, strangely enough, *makes no mention of the highest* — the supreme pontificate. Of the chapter in the *Decretum* headed *Whence the names of ecclesiastical degrees are taken* — too long for transcription — the following are the principal parts: "We believe that the term *clergy* had its origin in the fact that Matthias, who, as we read, was first ordained by the apostles, was elected *by lot*. For

Degrees of  
the hierarchy.

*κληρος* in Greek means lot or heritage in Latin. They are therefore called *clergy* because they are the Lord's heritage, or because they have the Lord for their portion. But generally all are called clergymen who serve in the Church of Christ; and of these the degrees and names are the following: *Ostiarus*, or doorkeeper, psalmist, reader, exorcist, acolyte, sub-deacon, deacon, presbyter, bishop. The order of bishops is fourfold, consisting of patriarchs, archbishops, metropolitans, and bishops. The patriarch, signifying in Greek the chief of the fathers, is so named because he holds the first, that is, the

apostolic place, and is invested with the highest honor, as the Roman, the Antiochian, the Alexandrian patriarch. The archbishop is so named in Greek because he is chief of the bishops, for he holds the apostolic place, (*vicem*,) and presides over the metropolitans as well as other bishops.

“Metropolitans are so named from the size of cities; for they occupy the first place, each in his own province; to their authority and teaching the other priests are subject, and without them it is not lawful for the other bishops to do anything, for to them the care of the whole province is committed. . . .

5. But all the orders (*ordines*) above named are designated by one and the same title — bishop; yet so that some use their own private name in order to distinguish their peculiar powers. 6. Patriarch, prince of the fathers: *αρχων* being the Greek for prince; then archbishop, prince of bishops, as metropolitan, from the size of cities. 7. The word episcopate implies superintendence, he who is made a bishop exercising a superintending care over subordinates. The word bishop in Greek means inspector in Latin; for a prelate (*præpositus*) in the Church is called inspector, (*speculator*,) because he inspects the life and manners of people placed under him. 8. Pontiff is prince of priests, . . . and is styled both high priest (*summus sacerdos*) and chief pontiff (*pontifex maximus*.) For he makes priests and Levites; he disposes all ecclesiastical orders; he shows what each one ought to do. Formerly those who were kings were also pontiffs. For it was the custom of the ancients that the king should be both priest and pontiff. Hence the Roman emperors were called pontiffs. 9. *Vates* is so named from force of mind (*a vi mentis*.) It has several meanings — priest, prophet, poet. 10. A priest is called *president* (*antistes*) because he presides (*antestat*); he is the first in the order of the Church; *he has no one above him*. 11. The word *sacerdos* is a Greek and Latin compound as it were *sacrumdans*; for *rex* is from *regendo* so *sacerdos* is from *sacrificando*; for he consecrates and sacrifices. But the heathen priests were called *flamens*, q. d. *flamines*, so called from the woollen thread (*filum*) with which they used to bind their head. 12. Presbyter

is Greek for elder, so named not only on account of age, but also on account of the honor and dignity which they have received. Hence *with the ancients, bishops and presbyters were the same*, because the name is one of dignity, and not of age. Presbyters as well as bishops are called priests, because they minister in sacred things; and yet, though priests, they have not attained the height of the pontificate, since they do not sign the forehead with chrism, (*confirm*,) nor give the Spirit, the Paraclete, which, as the Acts of the Apostles shows, belongs to the bishops alone."

## THIRD PERIOD.

### FROM GREGORY VII. TO THE REFORMATION.

A. D. 1080—1530.

---

#### CHAPTER VIII.

THE PSEUDO-ISIDORIAN DECRETALS—OBJECT OF THE COMPILATION—SAMPLE OF THEIR TEACHING—GREGORY VII.—SUPREMACY OF THE CHURCH OVER THE STATE—DICTATES OF GREGORY—LEADING FEATURES OF THE PAPAL SYSTEM—NEW RELATION OF THE PAPACY TO THE CHURCH—DEVELOPMENT OF PAPAL POWER UNDER INNOCENT III.—POPE NOW NAMED *Vicar of Christ*—LESS THAN GOD—GREATER THAN MAN—THE SOURCE OF ALL LAW—HUGO OF ST. VICTOR.

MENTION has been made of a collection of ecclesiastical laws drawn up by DIONYSIUS EXIGUUS in the sixth century, containing the Papal Decretals from the time of Siricius to the date of the compilation. Of the numerous re-  
Pseudo-Isido- censions of this collection one was especially  
rian known by the name of ISIDORE OF SEVILLE; and  
Decretals. the same venerated name (as that of the most popular and influential writer of the age) was made use of to give currency to a collection of spurious decretals, known as the *Pseudo-Isidoriana*, (829–857.) [No. 21.] This new code, which appeared “on a sudden, unannounced, without preparation, not absolutely unquestioned, but apparently overawing at once all doubt,” added to the former authentic documents fifty-nine letters and decrees of the twenty oldest Popes, from Clement to Melchiades, and the donation of Constantine; and in the third part, among the decrees of the Popes and of the councils from Silvester to Gregory II., thirty-nine false de-

crees, and the acts of several unauthentic councils. "In this vast manual of sacerdotal Christianity the Popes appear from the first the parents, guardians, legislators of the faith throughout the world." \*

The object of the compilation, as it is now generally held, was to render the Church independent of the State, and to give it a self-dependent centre of protection in the Roman See. Exaltation of the episcopate; numerous definitions for the purpose of securing the clergy, and, in particular, the bishops, against attacks; limitation of the metropolitans, who were often very much dependent upon, the civil power; elevation of the primates to be the first instruments of the Popes; and, in particular, an enlargement of the privileges of the Roman See; these, as enumerated by Gieseler, form the chief ecclesiastical and legal contents of the *Pseudo-Isidoriana*.

Object of the compilation.

Here, for the first time, the Pope appears as the supreme head, lawgiver, and judge of the Church, the one bishop of the whole. To him, as the court of ultimate appeal, all causes may be carried; to him alone it belongs to decide all weighty or difficult causes. Without his leave, not even provincial councils may be called, nor have their judgments any validity. Bishops are declared exempt from all secular judgment. The judgment of wicked bishops is to be left to God. If charges should be brought against a bishop, care is taken, by laying down such necessary conditions as to render their prosecution almost impossible.

As a fair sample of the teaching of these famous documents, take the following passage, partly incorporated into the *Decretum Gratiani*: "It is matter of doubt to none that the Roman Church is the foundation and pattern (*forma*, I Pet. v. 3—*τυποι του ποιμνιου*—Vulg. *forma gregis*) of the churches, from which all churches received their beginning; since, although the choice of all the apostles was the same, yet to the blessed Peter it was granted that he should have precedence of the rest; whence also he is called

Quotation from Gratian.

\* Milman.

Cephas, *because he is the head* and first of all the apostles. And it is necessary that that which preceded in the head should follow in the members. Wherefore the holy Roman Church, for his merit consecrated by the voice of the Lord, and strengthened by the authority of the holy fathers, holds the primacy of all the churches; and to her, as to the head, are ever to be referred as well the most important affairs of the bishops, alike their judgments and complaints, as the more important questions of the Churches. For even he who knows that he is placed over others should not take it ill that one is placed over him; for the Church herself which is first (the Roman) hath so intrusted the administration of her affairs to other churches, that they are called to share her anxious care, not the plenitude of her power." (This remarkable expression is borrowed from Leo I., *Ep. xii. ad Anastas. Thessal.*) (*Vigilii Ep. ad Profut. vii.*)

"This apostolical seat was constituted by the Lord Himself, and by no other, the hinge and head of all churches. And as by the hinge the door is ruled, so by the authority of this holy see all churches are ruled according to the Lord's arrangement. (*Anaclet. I. Ep. iii.*) In the New Testament, after Christ the Lord, sacerdotal order begins from Peter, because to him first the pontificate in the Church of Christ was given. (*Matt. xvi. 18.*) He first of all received from the Lord the power of binding and loosing. The other apostles indeed received honor and power in an equal fellowship with him, but him they desired to be their prince. . . . When they died, the bishops succeeded in their place." (*Id. Ep. Gratian, I. xxi. 2.*)

In the practical application of the principles thus promulgated, the pontificate of GREGORY VII. stands pre-eminent. Under the vigorous administration of this prince of pontiffs, the united dogmas of the supremacy of the Pope over the Church, and of the Church over the State—the latter, for the most part, hitherto undeveloped—first assumed the form of a fully organized system. The Epistles of Gregory [No. 25] furnish a full delineation of the system in the most authentic form.

Gregory VII.,  
1073-85.

Thus, in a letter written in the fourth year of his pontificate (1076): "When God gave to blessed Peter, in chief, the power of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth, *He made no exception; He withheld nothing from his power.* For if *any one* denies that he can be bound by the chain of the Church, he denies also, in effect, that he can be absolved by its power. And he who impudently denies this wholly separates himself from Christ. For if the holy apostolical see, in virtue of the princely power divinely conferred upon it, by its decrees determines spiritual matters, why not also secular matters?" (*Lib. iv. Ep. 2.*) And five years later (1081) he writes: "Shall the regal dignity, held as it is even by men ignorant of God, not be subject to that dignity (the sacerdotal) which the providence of Almighty God has instituted for his own honor, and in mercy bestowed on the world? The Son of God, as He is undoubtingly believed to be God and man, so is He regarded as High Priest, Head of all priests, sitting at the right hand of the Father, ever making intercession for us. He looks down with contempt on worldly dominion, which the children of the world pride themselves upon, while He freely (*spontaneous*) comes to the priesthood of the cross. Who knows not that kings and dukes deduce their origin from those who, ignorant of God, and actuated by the prince of the world, even the devil — by pride, rapine, perfidy, murder, nay, almost every species of atrocity, have usurped dominion over their equals, with a blind cupidity and intolerable presumption? Who can doubt that the priests of Christ are to be esteemed the fathers and masters of kings and princes and of all the faithful? Were it not a miserable madness for a son to attempt to subjugate his father to himself, the disciple the master: to subject to unjust obligations him, by whom, as he believes, he himself can be bound and loosed, not only on earth, but also in heaven?" (*Lib. viii. Ep. 21.*)

Supremacy of  
the Church  
over the State.

The so-called *Dictates of Gregory VII.*, though perhaps drawn up by another hand, are generally regarded as expressing the views of Gregory, and may, as Gieseler suggests, be an

*Index Capitulorum* of a synod held under him. As an exhibition of the Hildebrandine system in the most authentic form, they may appropriately find a place in this record: "1. That the Roman Church was founded by the Lord alone. 2. That the Roman Pontiff alone may rightly be called universal (bishop). 3. That he alone can depose or restore bishops. 4. That his legate, even though he be of inferior degree, takes precedence (of bishops) in council, and can pronounce sentence of deposition against them. 5. That a pope can depose absent (bishops.) 6. That with those excommunicated by him we ought not to abide in the same house. 7. That he alone has the right, as necessity may from time to time require, to make new laws, to assemble or constitute new orders, (*novas plebes*,) of an order of canons to make a monastery, and *e contra*; to divide a wealthy bishopric, and to unite poor ones. 8. That he alone may use imperial insignia. 9. That all princes may kiss the feet of the Pope alone.\* 10. That the name of the Pope only may be recited in the churches. 11. That the name (of pope) is unique (belongs to him alone) in the world. 12. That he has authority to depose emperors. 13. That he has the right, necessity compelling, to translate bishops from one see to another. 14. That he can ordain a clergyman of any church whatever, as he may choose. 15. That one ordained by him may be over another church, but may not perform military duty, and ought not to receive a higher degree from any (other) bishop. 16. That no synod, without his command, ought to be called general. 17. That no chapter and no book be held canonical without his authority. 18. That no judgment of his ought to be revised by any one, he alone having the right of such revision. 19. That he ought to be judged by no man. 20. That no man should dare to condemn any one appealing to the Apostolic See. 21. That the more important causes of any church ought to be referred to that see. 22. That *the Roman Church has never erred*, nor shall it, as the Scripture witnesses, ever err. 23. That the Roman Pontiff, if canonically ordained, is, beyond doubt, made holy by the merits of the blessed Peter,

Dictatus  
Gregorii VII.

as St. Ennodius and many other holy fathers testify, etc. 24. That by his permission or command subjects may accuse (their rulers). 25. That without convening a synod he may depose and restore bishops. 26. That he is not to be held a Catholic who is not in agreement with the Roman Church. 27. That he can absolve the subjects of wicked (princes) from their allegiance." (*Greg. Ep., lib. ii., Ep. 55.*) [See App., No. 25.]

In this remarkable document we find the leading features of the PAPAL SYSTEM, which attained its complete development under GREGORY'S successors — ALEXANDER III., (1159–1181,) INNOCENT III., (1198–1216,) GREGORY IX., (1227–1241,) INNOCENT IV., (1243–1254,) and BONIFACE VIII., (1294–1303.)

Of this system the salient points are the following: (a) The Bishop of Rome is the Vicar of Christ upon earth. (b) He is the universal Bishop, to whom alone belongs the name of Pope. (c) To him has been committed the plenitude of power, a portion of which he intrusts to the bishops, as his assistants. (d) He decides what position these assistants are to hold; their institution, deposition, translation, depend on him alone. (e) He can compel the adjudication of every cause at the court of Rome, or he can withdraw it, at his pleasure, from any court to which he has committed it, in order to assign it to another, in particular, to a special representative of his own person, a legate, who has precedence over all other official persons. (f) He is the lawgiver of the Church. (g) Without his permission, no synod can be held. (h) He is infallible; his decisions in reference to matters of faith are final. (k) He is amenable to the judgment of no man; all men are subject to his judgment.

Salient points  
of the Papal  
system.

As the Pope, according to the papal system, cannot be judged by any human tribunal, so he cannot be deposed. A passive resistance is however justified even by the adherents of this extreme view. Thus BELLARMINE: "It is lawful to resist a Pope, seeking the ruin of souls, and much more, if he should seek to destroy the Church; it is lawful, I say, to resist, by not doing what he commands, and by hindering the execution of his will." (*De Pontif. Rom., lib. ii. 29.*)\*

\* Note I.

From the time of Gregory the Papacy assumed a new relation to the Church. Not only was it now the prevailing view that the form of the government of the Church is *jure divino* monarchical—as it had been set forth in the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals; but also that it is, by the divine appointment, an absolute despotism; all other ecclesiastical authority being regarded as merely the organ of the Supreme Pontiff, and valid only so far and so long as he may choose.

New relation  
of the Papacy  
to the Church.

It is in this character of irresponsible dictator of the Church that the Pope comes prominently before us, a century later, in the person of INNOCENT III. In his *Epistles*, [No. 27,] Innocent puts forth claims in advance of those of all his predecessors; not too lofty, however, it would appear, to be at once very generally allowed. Hitherto the Pope had been content with the sufficiently imposing title of *the Vicar of Peter*; Innocent was the first of the Roman bishops to assume that of *the Vicar of*

Development  
under  
Innocent III.

The Pope  
named Vicar  
of Christ.

*God, or Christ*, and, as such, to claim to be the sole source of lawful jurisdiction. Thus in his epistle to Faventinus: “The supreme pontiff is called the vicar, not of a mere man, but of the true

God. For although we are the successors of the prince of the apostles, we are nevertheless not his vicars, not those of any apostle, or man, but of Jesus Christ Himself. Hence, whenever we remove those whom God hath bound together in a spiritual connection—bishops—from their sees, by their resignation, deposition, or translation, it is not man, but God, who makes the separation, since we are not man's vicar, but God's.” (*Lib. i., Ep. 326.*) Again: “It is not man but God who separates, because the Roman Pontiff, *who fills the place, not of a mere man, but of the true God upon earth*—severs the connection not by a human but by a divine authority.” (*Id. Ep. 335.*) He moreover describes himself as *citra Deum ultra hominem*; and *minor Deo, major homine*, (*Lib. i., Ep. 326.*) and claims to be invested with such absolute dominion over the laws that he could grant dispensation from the obligation to obey them. Hitherto dispensations had only granted pardon for

the infraction of a canon, as a *past fact*; now, for the first time, we read of a dispensation for future transgression: "The supreme pontiff, having admitted others to share his solicitude, has been advanced to the plenitude of power: himself lord and ruler (moderator) of canons, he does a law no injury, if he dispenses with it." (*Lib. xvi., Ep. 154.*) "According to our plenitude of power, we are able, *de jure* — of right, to grant dispensations, *supra jus* — above right." (*Decret. Greg. III., tit. viii. 4.*) On this, as embodied in the decretals, the gloss says: "The Pope grants a dispensation *above right*, since he dispenses contrary to the apostle and to the canons of the apostles, as well as to the Old Testament, in the matter of giving tithes, and in regard to vows, and oaths — yet he cannot grant a dispensation contrary to the universal order of the Church, as that a monk may hold property; nor against the four Gospels, nor against the command of an apostle in regard to those things which have respect to articles of faith."

Less than  
God — greater  
than man.

The source of  
all law.

The episcopate Innocent represents as a cession made by him of a part of his own universal pastorship (*Id. Epp. 495-6*;) — a view of the papal prerogative explicitly supported by the canon law, in which it is affirmed of the Roman Pontiff that — "He is regarded as having all law treasured up in the repository of his own breast." (*Sexti Decret., lib. i., tit. ii. 1.*)\*

In the midst of the prevailing tendency to contemplate the Church exclusively in its outward aspect, the apostolical idea of the mystical body of Christ, as a purely spiritual organism, and the notion of the universal priesthood of the faithful, which was intimately connected with it, were by no means wholly lost sight of. HUGO OF ST. VICTOR is quoted by Hagenbach as giving more or less definite expression to views of this character: "Christ is the invisible head of the Church, and the whole company of the faithful is his body. The Church as a whole is divided into two halves, (walls,) the laity and

\* Note K.

the clergy, (the left side and the right side.)” At the same time, he asserts the supremacy of the spiritual power in the strongest terms: “As much as the spirit is above the body, so much is the ecclesiastical power above the secular. Hence the right of the former to institute the latter, and also to judge it when corrupt. But the ecclesiastical power itself, since it is instituted by God, can be judged only by God, when it turns from the right path. (1 Cor. vi.)” (*De Sacram., l. ii., p. 3.*) The Pope HUGO moreover acknowledges as the *Vicar of Peter*, (not of Christ,) to whom belong “the prerogative of being served by all ecclesiastics, and the unlimited power of binding and loosing all things upon earth.” (ii. 72.)

Hugo of St.  
Victor,  
1097-1141.

---

#### NOTES.

##### H.

Kissing the foot, as an Oriental sign of homage, came into the West through Constantinople. It had often been rendered both to emperors and bishops. The Popes now claimed it as a proof of allegiance belonging exclusively to themselves, just as they demanded from princes the performance of the duty of an equerry — holding the stirrup, etc.

##### I.

While the Ultramontane writers (e. g. *Baronius*) defend the genuineness of the *Dictates*, the Gallicans hold them to be not only spurious, but also at variance with the principles of Gregory. (So *Launoy, Pagi, Natalis Alexander.*) Yet it is obvious, as Hardwicke remarks, that “they have preserved, in a laconic shape, the principles on which his policy was uniformly based.” . . . “They contain,” says Neander, “the principles which he sought to realize in his government of the Church — the principles of papal absolutism — signaling that new epoch in the history of the Papacy which is to be attributed to him as the author, in which the jurisdiction over emperors and kings, as over all the bishops of the Church, was placed in his hands.” (See *Gieseler, Hist. ii § 47, note 3. Giesebrecht: De Gregor. VII. Registro emendando. Regimont: 1858.*)

The papal prerogatives, irrespective of the temporal dominion, are all included under the two heads of a primacy of jurisdiction and a primacy of honor:

I. *Primacy of jurisdiction* includes — I. The representation of the Romish Church. As representative head, the Pope, partly in his own person, partly in connection with the cardinals, has the care of the interests of the Church at large.

2. Supreme legislative power. The Pope issues decrees relating both to discipline and doctrine, securing for them the assent of the Church by means of a council, or in some other way. The necessity of the assent of a council is not, indeed, acknowledged by the papal advocates. Since the Pope, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, according to the Church's doctrine, cannot err, every member of the Church of Rome is bound in such a case to submit to the decisions of the Head. This principle has obtained recognition in our own day in the establishment of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

3. Supreme ecclesiastical oversight. The Pope regularly receives, from time to time, accounts from all dioceses. The bishops pledge themselves by oath, at their consecration, to present themselves for this purpose, in person or by deputy, or by a written account of the state of their dioceses.

4. Supreme government of the Church. This embraces the decision of the so-called *causæ arduæ et majores*; the confirmation and consecration of bishops, their translation and deposition, the acceptance of resignations, appointment of coadjutors, the establishment, division, and union of bishoprics, grant of the pallium, the institution and abolition of spiritual orders and ecclesiastical institutions, canonization, identification of relics, the institution, shifting, and abolition of general festivals, etc., etc.

II. *Primacy of honor* includes — 1. Precedence not only of all spiritual dignitaries, but also of all temporal lordship. 2. The titles of Pope, Supreme Pontiff, Most Holy Father, etc. 3. As a special homage, the kissing of the foot — *adoratio*. 4. The *insignia* of the Pope, in addition to the complete pontifical vestments of the bishops, and the pallium, include also the straight pastoral staff — *pedum rectum* — furnished with a cross, while the episcopal staff is crooked. (*Jacobson*, in *Hertzog*, vol. ii., pp. 90–2.)

## K.

We may here properly advert to the new school of canonists which took its rise in this period, under the name of *Decretists*, afterward *Decretalists*. As early as the middle of the twelfth century appeared the collection known as the *Decretum Gratiani*, (1151,) in which the compiler attempts to harmonize, by a sort of Procrustean process, as indicated in the title of his work, *Concordantia Discordantium Canonum*, the older canons with the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals. The rapid multiplication, however, of the papal edicts — in the course of a century, superseding more and more the ancient usages and regulations of the Church — rendered necessary a *second* compilation, which came out in the year 1234, under the sanction of Gregory IX., in five books. A *sixth* (*liber sextus*) was added sixty-four years later, (1298,) by Boniface VIII., and a *seventh*, (*liber septimus*,) known as the *Clementines*, by Clement V., in 1313. With the seventh book “the code of canon law, as such, may be said to have been completed, as the power of the Popes has not since been such as to lend the force of law to their enactments throughout Christendom.”

The four compilations named form collectively the *CORPUS JURIS CANONICI*, the great law-book of the Church, and bulwark of the papal despotism during the mediæval period.

## CHAPTER IX.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY — STATEMENTS OF LEO IX. RESPECTING INDEFECTIBILITY OF FAITH IN THE PAPAL SEE; OF INNOCENT III.; OF IVO, BISHOP OF CHARTRES — THOMAS AQUINAS AFFIRMS THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE — RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO THE STATE — THE TWO SWORDS — PLENITUDE OF PAPAL POWER ASSERTED BY BONIFACE VIII. — THE BULL UNAM SANCTAM — DECREE OF THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE; OF BASLE — THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS — THE EPISCOPAL SYSTEM IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

IT is in this period that we meet with the first more or less indistinct utterances on the subject of *papal infallibility*. Leo IX. seems to have been the first of the Popes to affirm the claim of Peter's successors to indefectibility of faith, grounding it upon the text ever after employed for the same purpose: *I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not.* (Lu. xxii. 32.) "This prayer," writes Leo, "has proved effectual in so far as that Peter's faith has not failed hitherto, and, it is believed, will not hereafter fail *in his throne*, to all ages." (*Ep.* 55.) [No. 24.] The *Dictates of Gregory*, as we have seen, assert *the inerrability of the Roman Church*; and to the same effect, in his *Epistles*, Gregory writes: "The Roman Church, through blessed Peter, enjoys the privilege of being, from the very first beginnings of the faith, *the mother of all churches*, and as such it will always be held, even unto the end. In her no heretic is known to have presided, nor, as we trust, resting on the Lord's promise, will such a one ever be placed over her. For the Lord Jesus says: *I have prayed for thee, etc.*"

So also Innocent III.: "Unless I were firmly settled in the faith, how could I strengthen others in the faith — a prerogative which is known to pertain specially to my office, as the

Lord declares: *I have prayed for thee, Peter, etc.* He prayed and obtained his petition, since *he was heard in all things for his fear*, (Heb. v. 7.) And therefore, the faith of the Apostolical See hath never failed, but hath ever remained whole and unimpaired, that the privilege of Peter might continue untouched." (*Serm. ii. de Consecrat. Pontif.*) And yet that Innocent did not mean by these strong expressions respecting the indefectibility of the faith of the Roman See, to teach that the Pope is absolutely infallible in matters of faith, is plain from his words in another place: "Faith is necessary to me in so far as that, while in regard to other sins, I have God as my judge, in regard to *sin which is committed in a matter of faith*, I may be judged by the Church." (*Id. Serm. iii.*)

So Ivo, the great and good Bishop of Chartres: "If the Roman Pontiffs enjoin the observance of things opposed to evangelical or apostolic doctrine, that in those things *they are not to be obeyed*, we teach by the example of the apostle Paul, who resisted to the face Peter, though superior to himself, (*sibi prælato*), as not walking rightly according to the truth of the gospel." (*Ep. 233.*) And yet more distinctly to the same effect GRATIAN: "The Pope is to be judge of all, but he himself is to be judged by none, *unless he be found departing from the faith.*" (*Dist. xl. 6—taken from the sayings of Boniface the Martyr.*) And Gratian himself, after quoting a passage from Gregory III., boldly declares: "This statement of Gregory is altogether opposed to the sacred canons, *nay, to the evangelical and apostolic doctrine.*" (*Caus. xxxii., qu. vii. 18.*)

Ivo,  
1090-1115.

It thus appears that as late as the close of the twelfth century, the Pope was considered to be amenable to the correction of the Church, for error in points of faith, and that the personal errors of the Popes were held to be not incompatible with the infallibility of the Roman Church, or the Roman See.

Infallibility  
denied.

It is not until the middle of the next century that we meet with the first explicit assertion of the infallibility of the Pope in matters of faith. THOMAS AQUINAS, (1227-74,) the ac-

knowledge prince of mediæval theologians, claims the distinction of first plainly propounding the doctrine: "The judgment of those who preside over the Church may err in any matters whatever, if respect be had to their persons only. But

Thomas  
Aquinas.  
1227-74.

if the Divine Providence be considered, who directs his Church by his Holy Spirit, so that it may not err, as He has promised, (*John xv.*) 'when the Spirit is come he shall teach all truth,' that is to

say, concerning things necessary to salvation, it is certain that it is impossible that the judgment of the Church universal should err in those things that pertain to the faith.

Affirms  
infallibility.

Hence we are to abide by the judgment of the Pope, judicially pronounced, to whom it belongs to determine *de fide*, rather than by the opinion of any men, however wise; since Caiaphas, as we read, though a wicked man, yet, as being high-priest, prophesied. (*John xi.*) But in other judgments pertaining to particular facts, as when the question is concerning property, or crime, or things of this nature, it is possible that the judgment of the Church may err by reason of false testimony." (*Quod lib. ix., art. 16.*) Again: "It belongs to the same authority to put forth a creed to which it pertains to determine finally those things which are of faith, that they may be held by all with an unshaken faith. But this pertains to the authority of the supreme pontiff, to whom are referred the graver and more difficult questions of the Church. Hence the Lord says to Peter, whom He constitutes supreme pontiff: '*I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not, and thou, when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren.*' . . . To put forth a new edition of the creed, therefore, pertains to the province of the supreme pontiff, as do also all other things which concern the whole Church, as, e. g., to convene a general council. By his authority a council is assembled, as its decisions are confirmed." (*Summa, Secunda Secundæ, quest. i., art. 10.*)

One of the leading questions discussed in this period was the relation of the ecclesiastical power to the secular, or of the Church to the State; a relation illustrated by the favorite comparison of the two swords, in allusion to Luke xxii. 38:

*Lord, behold, here are two swords; and He said, It is enough.* These, according to some writers of the period, represent the ecclesiastical and the temporal power as in different hands; while others contend that the two are united in the hand of Peter. The former view was, very naturally, maintained by the emperors and their adherents; the latter by the advocates of the papal system. JOHN OF SALISBURY, (1164-82,) on the one hand, maintained that both the swords are in the hands of the Pope, but yet that the Pope ought to wield the secular sword by the arm of the emperor.

Relation of  
the Church  
to the State.

The Emperor Frederic I., (*Barbarossa*, 1121-90,) on the other hand, referred one of the two swords to the power of the Pope, the other to that of the emperor. (In letters written in 1157, '60, '67.) The Emperor Otto maintained the same position in opposition to Innocent III. Since it was Peter who drew the sword, (*John* xviii. 10,) the advocates of the papal system inferred that *both* the swords ought to be in *one* hand, and that the Pope had only to *lend* it to the emperor. Others, on the contrary, as the author of the work entitled *Der Sachsenspiegel*, (1216,) insisted that the power was to be *divided*; that Christ gave only one of the two swords—symbolizing the spiritual power—to Peter; while he gave the other—the symbol of secular dominion—to the apostle John. The opposite view is defended in the work entitled *Der Schwabenspiegel*.

It was not, however, until near the closing period of the mediæval age that the assertion of the Pope's plenitude of power—his supremacy alike spiritual and secular—was carried to its highest point. In the famous bull *Unam Sanctam*, put forth (1302) by Boniface VIII., the dogma of the papal supremacy is for the first time unequivocally asserted:

Plenitude of  
Papal power  
asserted.

“One holy Catholic and apostolic Church, we, impelled by faith, are bound to believe and hold. Therefore of the one and only Church there is one body, one Head—not two heads, as if it were a monster—namely, Christ and the Vicar

of Christ, Peter, and Peter's successor. . . . And in this power of the Church there are, as the evangelical narratives instruct us, two swords, viz., the spiritual and the temporal. For when the apostles say, *Behold, here are two swords*, (*Lu. xxii. 38.*)

Bull Unam  
Sanctam.

namely, in the Church, the Lord does not answer, It is too much, but '*enough.*' Both, therefore, the spiritual sword and the material sword are in the power of the Church. The latter, indeed, is to be used *for* the Church, but the former *by* the Church; the one by the hand of the priest, the other by the hand of kings and soldiers, but at the behest and with the patience of the priest (*ad nutum \* et patientiam sacerdotis*). But one sword must be under the other—the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual power. For the apostle says, '*There is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God.*' (*Rom. xiii. 1.*) But they would not be so ordained unless sword were under sword. For it is the witness of truth that the spiritual power has to institute the earthly, and to judge it, if it have not been good. This is verified by the prophecy of Jeremy concerning the Church and Church power: Behold, I have set thee this day over the nations and over the kingdoms, etc. (*Jer. i. 10.*) Hence, if the earthly power errs, it is to be judged by the spiritual power; and if an inferior spiritual power errs, it is to be judged by the superior; but if the supreme spiritual power should err, it can be judged by God alone, not by man, as the apostle testifies: *The spiritual man judges all things, but he himself is judged of no man.* (*1 Cor. ii. 15.*) Whosoever therefore resists this power, thus ordained of God, resists the ordinance of God, unless, as Manichæus feigns, there be two principles. . . . Moreover, to every human creature we speak, declare, define, and pronounce, that to be subject to the Roman Pontiff is absolutely necessary to salvation (*omnino esse de necessitate salutis*).” So AQUINAS, fifty years before: “*Ostenditur enim, quod subesse Romano pontifici sit de necessitate salutis.*” (*Cont. Error. Græc.*)

On the other hand, there is the decree of the Council of Constance, in the fifth general session (April 6, 1415): “The

\* This is found in *Bernard, De Consid.* iv. 3.

holy synod declares that, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit, making a general council, and representing the Catholic Church militant, *it has power immediately from Christ*, whom every one without exception, whatever be his station, or however exalted his dignity, even the papal dignity itself, is bound to obey in those things that pertain to faith and the extirpation of schism, and the general reformation of the Church of God in the head and in the members. It further declares that whoever, of whatever condition, station, or dignity, *even the papal*, shall contumaciously refuse to obey the mandates, statutes, or ordinances of this holy synod, or those of any other general council, lawfully assembled, in reference to the things above recited, or the things done, or to be done, in regard to them, he shall be subjected, unless he repent, to condign penance, and be duly punished. . . . It moreover declares that Pope John XXIII., and all prelates, and others called to this sacred council, and those now composing it, have been and now are in plenary liberty, according to the good pleasure of the said holy council, nor has the contrary been brought to the notice of the said persons called to or now of the said council." \*

Council of  
Constance,  
1415.

To the same effect are the decisions of the COUNCIL OF BASLE, renewing the decrees made at Constance respecting the dignity of general councils, and the subordination of the Pope, and asserting in the strongest terms the supremacy of synodical authority in the Church. Some of the leading members of this famous synod, among whom the celebrated philosophical theologian, NICHOLAS CUSANUS, (1401-64,) was the most influential, gave expression to opinions which threatened the total subversion of the papal system. In a work written by this distinguished advocate of Gallicanism, (so called,) entitled *De Concordantia Catholica*, libri iii., are found, among other explicit utterances, the following: "A universal council of the Catholic Church has supreme power in all things above the Roman Pontiff himself. . . . Although, according to many writings of holy men, the power

Council of  
Basle, 1431.

\* Note L.

of the Roman Pontiff is of God, and according to others is of man and universal councils, yet the truth seems to be reached by harmonizing the two views, thus: The power of the Pope, so far as regards pre-eminence, priority, and primacy, *is of God through the medium of man and councils*, to wit, *an elective synod mediating*. . . . Whence, although the Roman Pontiff, either for his position as occupying the seat of Peter, or on account of the superior dignity of his city, should be venerated as chief in primacy among the other bishops of the world, nevertheless, unless his election to that dignity has been carried by the concurrent voice of those who are the representatives of all others, (i. e. the whole Church,) I should not believe him to be president and prince, or judge of all others. Wherefore if, by any possibility, the Archbishop of Treves should be chosen by the assembled Church as its president and head, he would properly be the successor of St. Peter in the primacy, rather than the Roman Pontiff." (*Lib. ii. 34.*)

In the same strain writes to the council the University of Paris: "If the Roman Pontiff seeks to dissolve the council by his own authority, before the full consideration of the subjects which it has undertaken to discuss and settle, we think that in this matter, saving the authority of the see, he ought not to be obeyed, but rather should be resisted, if need be, to the face; even as Paul, the doctor, withstood to the face Peter, the Pontiff. For though the supreme pontiff has the place of pre-eminence and presidency in the council, its decisions are not determined by his will, but by the majority of concordant judgments." (*Ep. Feb. 9, 1432, in Bulaci Hist. Univer. Par. v. 412.*)

In these utterances we trace the development of what was afterward known as the *Episcopal system* in the Romish Church, so called in contradistinction to the papal system. While the two systems alike hold it as an essential principle, that all authority is vested in the clergy — the government of the Church being of right committed to the hierarchy, with the Pope at its head as the organ of unity, they differ in regard to the

University of  
Paris.

The Episcopal  
system in  
the Romish  
Church.

relation of the Pope to the clerical body in general, and to the collective episcopate in particular.\* The latter, as we have seen, regards the Bishop of Rome as the possessor, by divine right, of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the bishops deriving their prerogatives from him. The episcopal system, on the contrary, regards the bishops collectively as the supreme ruling power in the Church, deriving their authority immediately from God; the Pope occupying among them, for the preservation of unity, as the first or chief bishop, the position of a *primus inter pares*. In France the principles of the episcopal system have found special favor; incorporated in the Gallican code of ecclesiastical law, they were officially affirmed in the pragmatic sanction, at Bourges, (1438,) in the declaration of the Theological faculty of Paris, (1663,) and in the articles of the Gallican clergy approved by Louis XIV. In the Netherlands, the episcopal system was greatly promoted by the Jansenist controversies; and especially in the Austrian Netherlands it found general acceptance, extending into Germany itself. Here the Suffragan Bishop of Treves, NICHOLAS VON HONTHEIM, published, under the name of *Justin Febronius*, a complete exposition of the episcopal system [No. 504 b] — *On the State of the Church, and the Legitimate Power of the Roman Pontiff* — a work which contributed not a little to the general diffusion and practical application of the principles of Episcopatism. In Austria, particularly, the system was promoted by numerous publications. Rome has ever consistently repudiated it. Thus the Gallican articles of 1682 were condemned by a bull of Innocent XI. But in France, notwithstanding Rome's persistent persecution of the system, it still continues to have a large body of adherents, and the acts of the Government are from time to time conformed to its principles. In Holland, the archbishopric of Utrecht, with its suffragan bishoprics, perpetuates its existence on the principles of this system. Among its ablest advocates in recent times are VON DROSTE-HÜLSHOFF, *Principles of General Church Law*, Munster, 1830; BRENDL, *Manual of Church Law*, Bamberg,

\* Note M.

1839; NUITZ, *Juris Ecclesiastici Institutiones*, Turin, 1844; and *In Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum Tractationes*, Turin, 1850 — condemned by the papal brief of August 22, 1851.

---

NOTES.

L.

Among the decrees of this council, this has always been particularly offensive to the Ultramontanes, who deny its validity; (CAJETAN, *De Auctoritate Papæ et Concilii*; BELLARMINE, *De Conciliis et Ecclesia*, lib. ii. 19; ANDREAS VALLIUS, *De Suprema Potestate Papæ*, Pt. iv. 2. 7;) — the Gallicans, on the other hand, maintaining it; (MAIMBOURG, *Traite Hist. de l'établissement et des Prerogatives de l'Eglise de Rome et de ses Eveques*, Paris, 1685; DU PIN, *De Antiquâ Ecclesiæ Disciplina*; NATALIS ALEXANDER, *Hist. Eccl. Sac.* xv. xvi.)

M.

WALTER, (Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts,) as quoted by Jacobson, distinguishes three systems: "Some regard the Pope and the Church as ONE, in the strictly monarchical sense, holding that all power in the Church proceeds from the Pope alone. This doctrine is named the papal system. Others ascribe the supreme power to the bishops as a collective whole, so that the Pope, as over against them, is not the first, but is subordinate to them. This theory is called the episcopal system. Others again — and this is unquestionably the correct view — consider the Pope and the bishops as standing to each other in the relation of the head to the members, so that the plenitude of power rests in the collective body of the episcopate, while the Pope is yet ever the head and the highest authority to the bishops individually, as well as collectively." (*Hertzog, Real Encyc.* iv.)

## CHAPTER X.

JOHN GERSON — DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, WHICH IS INFALLIBLE, AND THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH, WHICH IS FALLIBLE — A COUNCIL SUPERIOR TO THE POPE; BOUND TO RESTRAIN THE PAPAL USURPATIONS, AND TO REFORM THE CHURCH — ENORMITY OF THE PAPAL CLAIMS — ACCOUNT OF PREVAILING THEORIES OF CHURCH POWER — TWO EXTREME VIEWS — THE THIRD THEORY — THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE SECULAR POWER — SOVEREIGNTY OF GENERAL COUNCILS — INFALLIBILITY OF GENERAL COUNCILS DEFENDED BY GERSON — DEFINITION OF THE PAPAL SUPREMACY BY THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.

JOHN GERSON, chancellor of the University of Paris, (1363-1429,) in a *Treatise on the modes in which the Unity of the Church may be restored, and its reformation be effected in a General Council*, [No. 38,] published in the year 1410, draws a distinction between "*the one Holy Catholic Church and the Apostolic Church*. Of the former, Christ is the sole head. Of this Church the Pope cannot and should not be called the head; he should be called the Vicar of Christ — his representative on earth. In this Church every man who believes may be saved, even though no Pope should be found in the whole world. This Church can never err, never fail, has never been rent by schism, has never been stained by heresy, could never be deceived or deceive, has never sinned. In it, also, all the faithful, in as far as they are faithful, are one in Christ.

Catholic  
Church in-  
fallible.

"The latter is called *the Apostolic Church*, particular and private, included in the Catholic Church, composed of Pope, cardinals, bishops, prelates, and other ecclesiastics, and called the Roman Church, whose head, as it is believed, is the Pope, the other ecclesiastics being included in it as inferior and superior members. *This Church may err, may deceive and be deceived, may harbor schism and heresy, may even fail or*

come to nought. This Church is evidently far inferior, in point of authority, to the Universal Church; acting, as it were, instrumentally, in the use of the keys of the Universal Church, and in exercising its power of binding and loosing. It neither

Apostolic  
Church  
fallible. has nor can have greater authority, or the exercise of greater power than is conceded to it by the Universal Church." (*Cap.* ii.) "If, for the sake of saving a kingdom, a king, or secular

prince, who occupies the throne by right of immemorial succession, is deposed, much more may a Pope be deposed who has been constituted by the election of cardinals—whose fathers and grandfathers before them hardly got beans enough, perhaps, to satisfy the cravings of hunger, (*ventres implere non sufficiebant fabis.*) Hard indeed it is, if we must hold that the son of some Venetian fisherman may retain the papacy to the detriment of the whole church-commonwealth.

"But here perhaps you refer me to the canon law which declares, in substance, that the Pope's power is so holy, so lofty, that no mortal may presume to judge or depose him, save for incorrigible heresy. (*Distinct.* xl., *Can.* 6.) But consider with what fraud and trickery, in ancient times, this office of the papacy has been administered and upheld—the Popes usurping rights, and consulting their own interests instead of those of the Church. . . . The Pope, as pope, is a man, and as a man, so is the Pope; as pope he may sin, and as man he may err. He is therefore subject, like any other Christian, in all things, to the commands of Christ. That decree, therefore, that the Pope is to be judged by none, is not to be admitted."

"The papacy is not sanctity, nor does it make a man a saint, though, like other ecclesiastical dignities, it may exert an influence favorable to sanctity in the case of the properly disposed. And if it be said, *The Holy See either makes a saint, or finds a saint*; the meaning is—*It ought to find a saint.* It were absurd to say that any mortal man has the power, in heaven and on earth, of binding and loosing from sin, and

yet that he may be a son of perdition, simoniacal, avaricious, mendacious, an exactor, a fornicator, proud, pompous, and worse than a devil." (*Cap. v.*)

"Is a council, then, in which a Pope does not preside, above the Pope? Certainly it is. Superior in authority, superior in dignity, superior in office. For such a council the Pope himself is in all things bound to obey. Such a council has the authority to limit the power of the Pope, since to such a council, representing the Universal Church, the keys of binding and loosing have been committed. Such a council may abolish papal privileges, (*jura*;) from such a council no one has the right to appeal; such a council may elect a Pope, may deprive and depose him, may establish new laws, and abolish old ones. The constitutions, statutes, and rules of such a council are not to be changed, dispensed with, or relaxed, by any authority inferior to that of a council. Neither has the Pope the power, nor has he ever had, to grant a dispensation against the holy canons of general councils, unless a council shall have specially granted him such authority for some weighty reason: a Pope may not alter, or even interpret, the acts of a council, or grant a dispensation contrary to them, since they are even as Christ's Gospels, which are incapable of dispensation, and over which the Pope has no jurisdiction." (*Cap. ix.*)

A Council  
above the  
Pope.

"A general council representing the Universal Church, if it desires to behold unity fully restored, if it desires to suppress schisms, to put an end to divisions, if it would exalt the Church; first and before all things, let it, after the example of the holy fathers who have preceded us, limit and set bounds to the compulsory and usurped papal power; — a power which many supreme pontiffs, through a course of ages, have arrogated to themselves against God and justice, by depriving inferior bishops of the powers and rights conceded to them by God and the Church. These bishops in the primitive Church were of equal power with the Pope, when there were no papal reservations

Ought to  
limit the  
Papal power.

of benefices, no inhibitions of episcopal cases, no sales of indulgences, etc., etc. In course of time, the avarice of the clergy, and the simony, cupidity, and ambition of the Pope increasing, the power and authority of the inferior bishops and prelates appear, as it were, exhausted and completely overthrown; so that they now appear in the Church only as *painted images* — of no use. For now the Pope of Rome has reserved to himself all ecclesiastical benefices, and summoned all causes to his own court. . . . All ordinations whatever he will have performed in his court; and those who could not find ordination in their own country readily procure it at the Roman Court.

“Let the sacred general council, then, restore and reform the Church Universal, after the usage of antiquity; and let it limit the much abused papal power, as set forth in the *Decretum* and the *Decretals*, the *Sextus*, the *Clementines*, and the papal *Extravagants*. For Christ gave no other power to Peter than that of binding and loosing, of binding by means of penances, and of loosing in remitting sins. He did not confer upon him the power to bestow benefices, to possess kingdoms, camps, and cities, to deprive emperors and kings. If Christ had conferred such power as this upon Peter, then surely Peter himself or Paul must have committed a grievous fault in not depriving the Emperor Nero of the empire, knowing him, as he did, to be the most wicked and cruel persecutor of the Christians. And who has ever read or heard that in ancient times the Roman kings or emperors were accustomed to take an oath before the Pope?” (*Cap. x.*)

Again, in the sermon which he preached before Benedict XIII., in Tarascon, on New-Year’s Day, 1404, entitled *Considerations on Peace*, GERSON writes: “Who sees not how impious it is, especially in those who would be called ecclesiastics, to pay no regard to the counsel of those who are skilled in the evangelical law, or — yet greater sacrilege — hold them in contempt? Hence arise errors, hence presumptuous assertions, hence inexplicable perplexities, hence obstinate defence of

human inventions, to the ruin of the Church ; such, namely as these : *That it is not lawful to dispute concerning the power of the Pope — that it may not be said to him : Why dost thou so ? — when he is, nevertheless, peccable ; — That the Church may not, in any case, be convoked, or convened, without him ; — That this, for example, is an article of faith : Benedict is Pope ; — That the Pope may not, in any case, be summoned to a council ; — That without the Pope there is no salvation,* when the salvation of the Church depends absolutely and essentially on God alone, and on the man Christ by ordained law, and accidentally only on a mortal pope. Otherwise, when the see becomes vacant by the Pope's death, either natural or civil, as when he is deposed as a heretic, what man could be saved? *Others declare the Pope to be impeccable ; others omnipotent ; others, again, believe that all, without exception, who do not obey him, or are not of his party, are out of a state of salvation.* How great the temerity of these utterances, let those who put them forth themselves declare." (*Considerat. i.*)

Enormity of  
the Papal  
claims.

In a work written during the sessions of the Council of Constance, [No. 39,] GERSON gives a striking account of the three theories of Church power held by opposing parties in the council, and representative of those of the age : "The first, depressing ecclesiastical power, subjects it to the temporal ; the second exalts it to a likeness with that of the Most High ;" the third, occupying middle ground, between the two extremes. The first insists upon the abolition of all ecclesiastical temporalities, immunities, or dominion, on the ground that they are forbidden by Christ, (*Lu. xiv. 33,*) and, moreover, that ecclesiastics are incapable of temporal jurisdiction, according to the apostolic axiom, (*2 Tim. ii. 2,*) that the clergy should possess nothing of any sort, tithes or oblations, much less other gifts, except only such as are bestowed out of pure charity ; and that of these the clergy who lead unholy lives should be deprived by the secular power ; that whatever the clergy may possess beyond simple food and

Prevailing  
theories of  
Church power.

First extreme  
view.

raiment is the property of the poor, the retention of which is not simply theft or robbery, but sacrilege; that all ecclesiastical persons should be reduced to the primitive poverty of the apostles and first disciples, as of necessity to salvation.

“The advocates of the second extreme view exalt the power of the Papacy to the most extravagant height, declaring that secular power is nothing compared with it; that as all power in heaven and on earth has been given to Christ, so Christ has made it all over to Peter and his successors; hence, that even Constantine only restored to Pope Sylvester what had been his own, before unjustly withheld; that, as *there is no power but of God*, so there is no temporal or ecclesiastical, imperial or regal power, except from the Pope, on whose thigh Christ has written King of kings, Lord of lords; that to dispute his power is tantamount to sacrilege, no one being able to say to him, *What doest thou?* even if he should change, overturn, and bring to ruin all temporal as well as ecclesiastical powers and privileges.

“A section of this party, however, adopt a less lofty tone, conceding to the secular power its own possessions and rights, which the Pope cannot take away at his pleasure, acknowledging that Constantine or other princes bestowed something as proper gifts upon the Church; yet holding that the Chief Pontiff is supreme monarch, not only in things spiritual, but also temporal, having this power immediately from Christ, whereas all other kings and princes receive their right of rule from him, and only *mediately* from Christ. Otherwise, say they, this world would be a monster indeed, having so many heads, not under any one single government, and we should have a return of the Manichean madness of two principles, one of the good and spiritual things, the other of evil and temporal. And therefore as the body is on account of the soul, and by it lives and is governed, so the secular power is on account of the spiritual, from which it derives the lawfulness of its own being.

“Another section of these extremists adopt a yet lower tone, conceding that as, before Peter, true governments existed

among the infidels, as the Scriptures testify, so it is not now necessary, after Peter, that all power, imperial, regal, or any other secular power, should derive its validity immediately from the Supreme Pontiff. But as to ecclesiastical dignities, offices, and goods, these are all to be held subject to the disposal of the Supreme Pontiff, to be changed, transferred, or appropriated according to his good pleasure, even though he should do so without a cause, nay, not without committing sin, though sin, in this matter, it is denied that he can commit, so as to incur the guilt of simony, since all ecclesiastical goods are his own property. It is further held, by these advocates of high papal prerogative, that the Pope is above all law, having the power to deprive another of his right; that there is no appeal from his decision; that he is not subject to a judicial summons; that obedience is not to be withheld from him, the case of heresy excepted, were that at all possible; that he alone has the power to frame a creed, to decide on points of faith, and on other matters of chief moment; that whatever is defined, decreed, or determined as a law or canon by others, is of no effect and invalid; nor can anything which he has once determined in any way be set aside or infringed, save by himself, while he is bound by no constitution whatever framed by others." Gerson adds: "I am deceived, if this theory of papal power had not, up to the meeting of this holy synod of Constance, so occupied the minds of the majority of persons, that an asserter of opposite views would have been spotted, if not condemned for heretical pravity. Here is the proof: After a declaration from the principles of theology clearer than the light, and, what is more to the point, after the determination of this holy synod, men are found who do not shrink from openly asserting such views; so deeply rooted, and, as a creeping cancer, so imbedded in the marrow has been this deadly virus." (*Consid.* xii.)

The third theory asserts the independence of the secular power; the supreme sovereignty in the Church of general councils; to which is ascribed, by the greater number of its advocates, infallibility. Of this view, GERSON himself is one

of the ablest defenders: "The ecclesiastical power of the Papacy," he writes, "does not possess the prerogatives at once of earthly and heavenly dominion, so that it can at pleasure dispose of the goods of the clergy, and much less of

Third theory  
defended by  
Gerson.

the laity, though it must be granted to possess a certain governing, directing, and regulative power. Ecclesiastical power in its plenitude is, IN THE CHURCH, a power the application of which is regulated by the Church herself, or by a general council legally representing her. It is evident that this plenitude of power was given by Christ to Peter for the edification of his Church; as Augustine speaks: *The keys of the Church were given not to one, but to unity — they were given to the Church. . . .* The Pope may be judged and deposed by a council." So also CUSANUS: "If the universal Catholic Church is infallibly guided by Christ's assistance, then it necessarily follows that whatever be its conclusion, with the concurrent consent of all Christians, involving matters necessary to salvation, such conclusion is true. But a universal council, in pronouncing such a conclusion with the consent of all the faithful, by the assistance of Christ, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, pronounces the same truly and infallibly. But all provincial synods, and even the Roman Pontiffs, are not vouchsafed this privilege. . . . Peter's pre-eminence was not a pre-eminence *above*, but *under* the Church." (*De Conc. Cath.* ii. 34.) [No. 42.]

The dogma of the infallibility of general councils found powerful advocacy among theologians after the Council of Constance. GERSON and CUSANUS were among its most earnest defenders. The infallibility of the Universal Church was maintained as an article of faith by others, who repudiated the infallibility of general councils. These, however, were a small minority among the leading divines, and "the doctrine of the infallibility of general councils gradually obtained universal ascendancy among the liberal theologians, as the counterpart to the curialist theory of the infallibility of the Pope." \*

Infallibility  
of general  
councils.

\* Gieseler, iii. 322.

Of this view ALMAINUS may be taken as the exponent: "The Pope may err in pronouncing judicially; (of personal error there is no question, as this is known to all.) The proposition is proved thus: Two Supreme Pontiffs have made opposite decisions, even in relation to matters of faith, therefore one of the two erred judicially. The antecedent is plain in the case of John XXII. and of Nicholas, one of whom determined judicially that Christ and the apostles had nothing, either in common or as their own private possession; the other pronounced an opposite judgment, as may be seen in their Extravagants. Again: Innocent III. and Celestinus pronounced contrary judgments on this proposition: If one of a married pair fall into heresy, the other who abides in the faith may contract a second marriage. The decision of Innocent III. in the negative is found in the chapter headed, *Quanto, De Divortiiis*. The decision of Celestine, as says the gloss in the same chapter, was long since placed in the Decretals: *de conversione conjugatorum*, at the end." Further, some Popes have determined contrary to the gospel, as Pelagius, who made a constitution that all the sub-deacons of Sicily a suis uxoribus abstinerent, whom they had married when in minor orders, or should cease from duty. This decision (as being unjust and contrary to the gospel) Gregory I., his successor, annulled, as appears in 31 Dist., Canon *Ante tricennium*. It is thus sufficiently plain that the Pope may err, in pronouncing in a matter of faith. It follows that the ultimate determination of questions relating to faith is not to be referred to the Supreme Pontiff . . . *A general council cannot err in matters of faith, and thus the final decision in these matters belongs to it.*" (*De Auct. Eccl. et Conc. Gen.* 10.)

The hollow triumph of the papal despotism over the churches of the East at the Council of Florence, brings this darkest period of our history to its fitting close. The form of union promulgated by that assembly embraces the four leading points in dispute between the churches of the Greek and the Latin communion, viz., the procession of the Holy Spirit, the addition of the clause *Filioque* to the Constantinopolitan creed, Purgatory and

Council  
of Florence,  
1439.

the intermediate state, the use of unleavened bread in the holy Eucharist, the jurisdiction of the Roman See and the supremacy of the Pope. Of these questions, now declared definitively settled by the concordant suffrages of the fathers of the East and the West, the "definition" of the last in order, as above named, is couched in these terms:—

Papal  
supremacy  
defined.

determine that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff hold the primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and the true Vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in the blessed Peter, has been committed by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the Universal Church; as is also set forth in the acts of the œcumenical councils, and in the sacred canons. Renewing, moreover, the order handed down in the canons of the other venerable patriarchs, that the Patriarch of Constantinople be second after the most holy Roman Pontiff, the Patriarch of Alexandria the third, of Antioch the fourth, and of Jerusalem the fifth; all their privileges and rights remaining intact." (*Conc. Labbei, etc.*, xiii., p. 510; *Gieseler*, iii. 494.)

## CHAPTER XI.

HARBINGERS OF THE REFORMATION — DOCTRINE OF WYCLIFFE; OF MATTHIAS OF JANOW; OF JOHN HUSS; OF JOHN OF GOCH; OF JOHN OF WESEL; OF JOHN WESSEL.

THE harbingers of the Reformation — WYCLIFFE, MATTHIAS OF JANOW, HUSS, JOHN OF GOCH, JOHN OF WESEL, and JOHN WESSEL — are one and all in substantial agreement in their teaching respecting the nature and powers of the Church. The statements of WYCLIFFE in regard to the distinction between the Church in its idea, and the Church in its outward organization, are clear and precise: — “Holy Church is the congregation of just men for whom Christ shed his blood. All who shall be saved in the bliss of heaven are members of Holy Church, and no more.” He repudiates the theory of the necessity of a *visible* head of the Church: — “Prelates make many new points of belief, and say it is not enough to believe in Jesus Christ and to be baptized — except a man also believe that the Bishop of Rome is the head of Holy Church. But no apostle of Christ ever required any man to believe this of him. And yet they were certain of their salvation in heaven. How then should any sinful wretch constrain men to believe that he is head of Holy Church, while he knows not whether he shall be saved or lost? . . . The Pope is the chief Antichrist, pretending, as he does, to be the immediate Vicar of Christ, and most like Him in life; when the fact generally is that he is the first of sinners. So long as Christ is in heaven, the Church hath in Him the best pope. . . . We dare not put two heads, lest the Church be monstrous.”

Doctrine of  
Wycliffe.  
1324-84.

The clerical office Wycliffe characterizes as, by eminence,

the *preaching* office; holding that, according to primitive institution, the orders in the spiritual office are only two — that of priest, and that of deacon, (*sacerdos atque diaconus.*) (*Dial. lib. iv.; Trialog., lib. iv. 15; De Sacramento Ordinis.*) [*Bibliog. App., No. 28.*]

The precursors of the Reformation directed their efforts not so much to the correction of isolated abuses, as to the renovation of the general spirit of the Church. This was eminently illustrated in the career of the forerunners of Luther in Bohemia. Among these, MATTHIAS OF JANOW, the preceptor of HUSS, is too important to be overlooked. His views are fully expressed in a work only fragments of which have been published, entitled: *De Regulis Veteris et Novi Testamenti.* [No. 29 a.]

Matthias of  
Janow,  
1380-94.

Matthias constantly falls back on the fundamental principle that unity in the Church can only come from adherence to the Word of God:—“It is Jesus Christ Himself, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit ever dwells in his Church, and in each even most insignificant portion of it, holding together, sustaining, and vitalizing the whole and all the parts, directly from within, giving growth outwardly to the whole, and to each, even the most insignificant part. He is, therefore, Himself the spirit and life of his Church, his mystical body. All unity presupposes a reference to some principle. But that which forms the unity of the Church is the one God, one Lord, one Master, one religion, one law, one precept. All Christians who possess the spirit of Jesus the crucified, and who are led by it, are the one Church of Christ, his beautiful bride, his body. Those only ought to be called Christians who are such in reality; merely nominal Christians, whose lives testify against their profession, should rather be called anti-christians: a hoop hung out before a house (in Bohemia the sign of an inn) still does not make the place an inn, if there is no wine in the house.”

Again, “All rules are one; they proceed from one principle, and aim at one end. They do not obtain their authority from themselves, nor are they observed in the Church of God on

their own account; but they are inseparably included in the same holy law of Christ, which is inscribed by the Holy Spirit on the hearts of believers, which binds many widely separated nations in union with one another, and makes all dwell in one set of manners in the house of Jesus the crucified."

The views of Huss are fully developed in a special treatise, *De Ecclesia*. [No. 30.] His definition of the Church assigns a marked prominence to the divine purpose in election: "The one Catholic Church is composed of the predestinate of all times — the whole body of the elect. It would be the height of arrogance for any man to assert, without a special revelation, that he is a member of that holy Church, for none but the predestinate is a member without spot or wrinkle of that Church. Well may we be amazed, therefore, to see with what effrontery those who are most devoted to the world, who live most abominable lives, assert their claims to be heads, or eminent members of the Church, which is the bride of Christ. Christ is the all-sufficient and sole head of the Church. It were enough then to say that the Pope is a representative of Christ; yet the Papacy, by which a visible head is given to the Church, derived its origin from the Emperor Constantine: for until the gift of Constantine, the Pope was but a colleague of the other bishops. As the apostles and the priests of Christ ably conducted the affairs of the Church in all things necessary to salvation, before the office of pope had yet been introduced, so they will do it again, if it should happen, as it is quite possible it may, that no pope should exist, until the day of judgment; for Christ is able to govern his Church after the best manner, by his faithful presbyters, without a pope."

John Huss,  
1369-1415.

Huss distinguishes a threefold form of the Holy Catholic Church: 1. The Church *triumphant*, consisting of those who, having maintained the warfare against Satan, as soldiers of Christ, are at rest in the place of beatitude. 2. The Church *sleeping*, that is, the predestinate suffering in Purgatory. 3. The Church

Threefold  
form of the  
Church.

*militant*, composed of the elect still upon earth, on the way to the better country.

He distinguishes again: 1. The community of the elect. 2. The nominal Church — those who *in name only* belong to the Church. These two are combined in one visible society, of which one part is the Church in the *proper* sense, the other in an improper sense. 3. Those who neither in name nor reality are of the Church, as the pagans. 4. Those who are in reality elect Christians, though they appear to be without the Church, as they are nominally whom the minions of Antichrist condemn, (the reformers, probably of his own time.)

To Huss's friend, NICHOLAS DE CLEMANGIS, (1360–1430,) is ascribed the declaration: "It were possible for the Church, by grace, to preserve its existence in the person of a single woman, even as, in the season of the passion, it is believed to have continued in the Virgin alone."

"Conceiving the unity of the Church in the more free and spiritual manner we have described," says Neander, "Huss was prepared also to understand more clearly the multifarious ways of appropriating Christianity, determined by the various peculiarities of individual character; and it is a fine remark which he makes on this subject when he says: 'Some love Christ more in reference to his divinity, as we suppose to be the case with the evangelist John; others, more in reference to his humanity, as is thought to be true of Philip; others, more in reference to his body, which is the Church; and so in many other relations.' Here we find characterized three different bents of Christian experience — the predominant tendency to the Godlike in Christ, the predominant bent to the Human, and that to the revelation of Christ in the CHURCH."

Among the forerunners of the Reformation, a not undistinguished place is justly assigned to JOHN OF GOCH, (1400–1475,) the founder of a convent of Augustinian nuns at Mechlin. In a work entitled *De quatuor Erroribus circa Legem Evangelicam, etc., Dialogus*, [No. 44,] he traces the doctrine of the Church back to the simple elements which constitute the foundation of his theology. Love, and

John of Goch,  
1400–1475.

liberty, which spontaneously springs from love, are with him *the forming and governing principles of the Church*. "Christianity is the religion of liberty, and as the Church is the manifestation of Christianity, the principle which reigns in the one must reign also in the other. If in Christ, the Church's head, the most perfect liberty is manifested in union with the most perfect love, then must the same spirit which animates the head pervade also the body and all its members. The Catholic Church is Christ's mystical body, of which, perfect in construction, Christ is the head, communicating to all the members life and motion. As Christ's body, perfectly organized, it must needs be duly proportioned with its head. It were impossible for a supremely perfect head to have an imperfect body. In the Catholic Church, therefore, there must be that plenitude of perfection, in virtue of which the human will, according to its limited measure, is conformed in all things to the will of Christ. The chief vocation of the Church, accordingly, consists in *appropriating and propagating the spirit of Christ*, and in *the practical exercise of the evangelical life*. The evangelical law, the law of love and liberty, which has been given to the Church, is all-sufficient for perfection. Why, then, has the Church superadded positive enactments? The Church is the mother of the faithful, and as mothers are characterized by warmth of affection rather than by vigor of intellect, so the Church, in some of her enactments, has had more regard to the furtherance of piety than to the rules of discretion. Her love has carried her beyond the bounds of prudence. Hence, though *the Church militant sometimes errs*, yet her ordinances are in all cases designed to promote the highest good of her children." (*Dialog*. 14-19.)

In regard to the *priesthood* he uses the remarkable language following: "The sacerdotal life is the truly and simply apostolical life, the highest perfection of the Christian religion; the station of the priest being the very highest in the Church militant. As in Christ, the head, the priesthood is the highest of his dignities, since it is as a priest that He legislates for his Church and governs it,

The sacerdotal life.

so in his body the highest place of leadership belongs to the priesthood, whose office it is to preach the Word and administer the sacraments. The consecration of the body and blood of Christ is the highest of all functions; and as the priestly order is empowered to perform this, the highest and noblest act of the Church, it follows that the order of priest is the highest of all orders in the Church. The privileges now accorded to the bishop which are wanting to the priest, such as confirmation and ordination, are the offspring either of custom, or of the appointment of the Church, which have taken away from the order of priests *much that was conferred upon it by Divine institution.*" (*Dial.*, xx. *Gieseler*, iii. 467. *Ullman*, i. 122.)

JOHN OF WESEL, says LUTHER, "ruled the University of Erfurt by his books, and it was out of these that I studied for my master's degree" — a statement from which we may infer

Wesel,  
1420-81.

the extent of Wesel's influence in preparing the way for the German Reformer. His views of the Church and ministry we gather from scattered passages in his work entitled, *De Indulgentiis*, [No. 45,] and more particularly from his treatise *De Auctoritate, Officio, et Potestate Pastorum Ecclesiasticorum*, [No. 46,] of which abstracts are to be found in GIESELER and ULLMAN. "That the Catholic Church is infallible is a mere assertion, in support of which no proof, either from reason or Scripture, is advanced. The word CHURCH is a collective name, and combines the idea of multitude with that of unity. The unity it involves, however, is always particularly specified by some adjunct, as, for example, when it is said, The Church of the Saints. In that case it is the unity of holiness which constitutes the Church. If it were said, the Church of the wicked, then the constituent unity would be wickedness. Or, supposing the expression to be, the Church at Ephesus, then identity of place is the bond of union. These definitions occur in Scripture, but the Church of which we speak, and which we call the *Universal Church*, is not mentioned in Scripture. Universal is synonymous with Catholic, and under this name the Church figures both in the Nicene and in the Apostles' Creed. As the Universal or

Catholic Church we may designate all who believe Jesus to be God and man, and the name Catholic is given to it because the preaching of Christ, by which alone faith is produced, is spread over the whole world. In consonance with this must the proposition that the Catholic Church cannot err be understood. We mean, that inasmuch as the Catholic Church embraces *the* CHURCH of CHRIST, which is founded upon a rock, and against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, and inasmuch as *this* Church — the Christian Church in the stricter sense — is holy and undefiled, (*Eph. v. 27,*) there exists no error in it, none at least that is self-induced, because that would be a spot or wrinkle. In virtue, therefore, of the Church of Christ's being a part of that which is Catholic, the proposition that the Catholic Church does not err is true. The reason of its truth, however, lies in the fact that the proposition is ambiguously expressed, inasmuch as the truth of it holds only in regard to one of its parts. Coexistent with this (partial) truth, however, there is another, namely, *that the Universal Church docs err*, and that she is a sinner, an adulteress, the reason being that she is in part composed of wicked men." (*De Indulg. lii.-liv.*)

WESEL here anticipates the Protestant distinction between the Church visible and invisible. He nevertheless, at his trial for heresy, affirmed that the Roman Church is the head of all churches; that the Pope is the Vicar of Christ, and that one head of the Church is necessary; and that there is a difference between a bishop and a priest.

JOHN WESSEL has been well characterized as pre-eminently the theological forerunner of the Reformation. His teaching on the subject of the Church is contained in several treatises published collectively under the supervision of LUTHER, in the year 1521 or 1522, entitled *FARRAGO WESSELI*, etc. [No. 48.]

Wessel,  
1420-89.

We do not find that he anywhere lays down a precise definition of the Church; but in his work *Quæ sit vera Communio Sanctorum?* there are scattered statements from which it appears that, in his view, "the Church is *the communion of saints*

—of all persons, that is to say, still undergoing the process of sanctification, and of persons already perfected — subject to Christ as their one true Head, a society instituted by God, receiving laws from Him alone, and founded upon mutual love and living faith in Christ. That he conceives the Church as something essentially *internal*, as a fellowship of holy persons, whose unity rests on spiritual grounds, and not upon connection with one visible and supreme head, is evident from the passage following: — ‘All saints are bound together by a true and essential unity, inasmuch as they are connected with Christ by one faith, one hope, and one love; however widely they may be separated by time or place. And this is that society of which it is said in the creed — *I believe in the Communion of Saints*. Hence all our forefathers who were baptized with the same baptism, fed with the same spiritual food, and strengthened with the same spiritual rock as ourselves, are still in connection with us. This unity and fellowship of saints is by no means broken by the difference of their governors, such as obtains in the Greek and in the Western Church — the Greek Christian and the Roman Christian believing one and the same gospel. The unity of the Church under one Pope is therefore only accidental, not necessary, although it may contribute much to the Communion of Saints.

“We must acknowledge a Catholic Church, but we must place its unity in the unity of the faith and of the (celestial) Head, in the unity of the corner-stone, (Christ,) not in the unity of Peter or his successor, as the Church’s governor. It is only the original unity, (*prima unitas*—internal, spiritual unity,) under the one true Head, that is spoken of in the creed.” (*De Sac. Pæn.*)

The position of AUGUSTINE, expressed in the well-known words: “I would not believe the gospel if the authority of the Church did not lead me to believe” — essentially the Romanist position, in so far as it makes the authority of the Scripture dependent upon that of the Church — Wessel directly assails, maintaining the opposite principle, (the anti-Romanist, or Protestant,) that the Church derives its authority only from

the Scriptures: "I believe *with* the holy Church; I do not believe *in* it, but in the Holy Ghost, who determines the rule of faith. *With* the holy Church, and *according to* the holy Church I believe, but not *in* the Church, because faith is an act of worship, which must be offered to God alone."

The doctrine of *the universal priesthood of the faithful* is not obscurely expressed by Wessel in these words: "There is a double priesthood. The one is a matter of rank, and sacramentally communicated; the other is a matter of the rational nature, and common to all. Without the first the second is sufficient. The first, when the second is wanting, involves even guilt; the second of itself brings grace."

The infallibility of the Pope, Wessel explicitly denies: "Even Peter, the first and holiest Pope, erred, that so the Church of after times might know that she is not bound by the decrees of her sovereign pontiffs, but that, in the case of any emergent variance, a believer is entitled, by the example of St. Paul, and in defence of the rule of faith, to withstand the Pope to his face, and to do this, if there be no alternative, even in the presence of all." (*De Indulg.* vii.)

These utterances of the most distinguished of the Reformers before the Reformation are such an anticipation of those of Luther, that, in passing from the one to the other, we are scarcely conscious of a transition. So close, indeed, is the resemblance, that the great Reformer himself declares: "If I had read Wessel sooner, my adversaries would have presumed to say that I had borrowed my whole doctrine from him. Our minds are so consonant to each other."

Anticipation  
of Luther's  
doctrine.

## FOURTH PERIOD.

FROM THE PUBLICATION OF THE AUGSBURG  
CONFESSION, TO THE PUBLICATION OF  
THE "TRACTS FOR THE TIMES."

1530-1840.

---

### CHAPTER XII.

STATEMENTS OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION — ALTERED PHRASEOLOGY OF THE VARIATA — THE PAPAL CONFUTATION FULLY ANSWERED IN THE APOLOGY FOR THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION — LOCI THEOLOGICI — VIEWS OF MELANCHTHON ON CHURCH ORDER — THE EPISCOPAL SYSTEM IN THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH — THE TERRITORIAL SYSTEM — THE COLLEGIAL SYSTEM.

THE closing period of our history dates from the publication of the *Augsburg Confession*, "the groundwork of all the other Protestant symbols." In the seventh article of this venerable formulary, the Church is defined as "a congregation of saints." "We teach," say the Lutheran Reformers, "that one Holy Church shall ever be in the world. But the Church is a congregation of saints (in the *German* version, 'an assembly of all believers,') in which the gospel is rightly taught, (*German*, 'purely preached,') and the sacraments rightly administered. And for the true unity of the Church, it is sufficient that there be agreement concerning the doctrine of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments; nor is it necessary that the same human traditions or rites and ceremonies of human institution be everywhere observed." "Although the Church is properly a congregation of saints," adds the eighth article, "and *the truly believing*, yet since in this life many hypocrites

The Augsburg  
Confession,  
1530.

and wicked men are mixed with them, it is lawful to use the sacraments which are administered by wicked men, according to the word of Christ: *The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat, etc.*; and the sacraments and word are efficacious in virtue of Christ's ordinance and command, although they be ministered by wicked men."

The altered phraseology of the *Variata* (1540) is noteworthy: "The Church of Christ is properly a congregation of the members of Christ, that is to say, The Variata. 1540. of saints, who truly believe and obey Christ; although in this life many wicked men and hypocrites are mingled with this congregation, and will be until the last judgment. But the Church, properly so called, has its signs, namely, the pure and sound doctrine of the gospel, and the right use of sacraments."

The fourteenth article, *Of Church Order*, contains the simple statement, that "no one ought to teach publicly in the Church or administer the sacraments, unless he be rightly called."

"The power of the keys or of the bishops" is described as "consisting in a commission from God to preach the gospel, to remit and retain sins, and to attend to, and administer the sacraments. This power is to be exercised exclusively by preaching the word and administering the sacraments, which are the means of conferring, not corporeal, but spiritual blessings; blessings which can be obtained only through the instrumentality of the office of the ministry. Hence it is not competent to this ministry to interfere in any way with civil polity, which relates to matters wholly different from the gospel, protecting, not the souls of men, but their bodies and possessions against external violence. Hence the civil government and the ecclesiastical ought not to be mingled and confounded."

The feeble attempt of the *Papal Confutation*, (1530,) prepared by order of the emperor, to condemn these statements, is worthy of remark only for its singular lack of argumentative force; scarcely, indeed, rising above the level of a plausible cavil. The Papal Confutation. 1530.

"That the Church is a congregation of saints cannot be

admitted," says the *Confutation*, "without prejudice to the faith, if it be meant that the wicked are separated from the Church. This article was condemned among the articles of John Huss, of accursed memory, at the Council of Constance, and it plainly contradicts the gospel, in which we read that John Baptist compared the Church to a threshing-floor, which Christ will thoroughly purge, etc. But what is meant by the chaff but the wicked, as by the wheat are meant the good? And Christ compares the Church to a net, in which are fishes good and bad; to ten virgins, of whom five were wise and five foolish. . . . When they confess, in the fourteenth article, that no one ought to administer the word of God and the sacraments in the Church unless he be rightly called, it ought to be understood that he is rightly called who is called in due form of law, according to ecclesiastical sanctions, and the decrees everywhere hitherto observed in the Christian world."

These objections, if they may be called such, are fully met in the *Apology for the Augsburg Confession* (1531): "We confess that hypocrites and wicked persons may also be members of the Church in external community of name and office, and that the sacraments may be administered with due effect by wicked men. . . . The Christian Church does not, however, consist only in a system of external signs, but it consists chiefly in the internal communion of faith and the Holy Spirit in the heart. It has, however, external notes by which it may be known, viz., the pure doctrine of the gospel, and the administration of the sacraments in accordance with the gospel. And this Church alone is called *the body of Christ*, because Christ is its head, and he renews, sanctifies, and governs it by his Spirit, as Paul testifies (*Eph. 1*): 'He gave Him to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body, his fulness,' that is to say, the whole congregation, 'of Him who filleth all in all.' Wherefore they who are not led by the Spirit of Christ are not members of Christ. Our adversaries also acknowledge that the wicked are only dead members of the Church; and we cannot

Apology for  
the Confession.

but wonder, therefore, that they should reprehend our definition of it, which speaks of its living members. The same definition is given in the Creed: 'I believe that there is a Holy Catholic Church.' But the ungodly are not the Holy Church. The following clause — *the Communion of Saints* — appears to have been added for the purpose of explaining what is meant by the Church, namely, a congregation of saints united in the fellowship of the same gospel, and of the same Holy Spirit, who renews, sanctifies, and governs them. And the necessity of this article of faith is plain. The dangers which menace the destruction of the Church are, as we see, numberless. The multitude of the impious in the Church itself is wellnigh infinite, so that it might appear to be almost overwhelmed. Hence, in order that we may not despair, but know that the Church will abide — that however great the multitude of the ungodly, the Church nevertheless exists, and that Christ fulfils his promises to his Church, remits their sins, hears their prayers, gives the Holy Spirit — this consolatory article was inserted in the symbol.

Why the Church is an article of faith.

“Although, therefore, hypocrites and wicked men are members of the true Church in the fellowship of external rites, yet, when we give a definition of the Church, we must define that which is *the living body of Christ* — that which is the Church both in name and in reality.”

With these statements framed by MELANCHTHON, and expressly indorsed by Luther and the other leading Reformers in Germany, it will be instructive to compare some of their author's utterances as contained in the later editions of his *Loci Theologici*: “When we think of the Church, let us contemplate the assembly of the called, which is the Church visible; ever keeping in mind the words of Paul: *Whom He predestinated, them He also called*. Let us not dream of any of the elect being elsewhere than in the Church visible itself; for it is God's will neither to be invoked nor acknowledged otherwise than as He has revealed himself; and He has revealed himself only in the

Loci Theologici, 1538-45.

Church visible, in which alone the voice of the gospel is heard. Let us not feign another Church INVISIBLE and dumb, yet composed of men living upon earth; but let us direct our view to the assembly of the called, (*cœtum vocatorum*,) that is to say, of those possessing the gospel, and let us be assured that it is necessary that the word of the gospel be proclaimed among men; that there be a public ministry of the gospel, and public assemblies, and to this company let us unite ourselves; let us be members of this visible society."

Church order. Not less clear and decided are the statements of the *Apology* on the subject of Church Polity:

"In regard to *Church order* we have time and again declared our most earnest desire to maintain the (established) ecclesiastical polity, and the degrees and orders settled in the Church by human authority. But the tyranny and cruelty of the bishops toward our priests prevent them from acknowledging episcopal authority, and have brought about the subversion of that canonical polity which we were most desirous to preserve. And we now again reiterate our protestation that we would gladly preserve the ecclesiastical and canonical polity, if only the bishops would desist from tyrannizing over our churches; a declaration of our mind and will which will exonerate us before God, and among all nations to the latest posterity, from the imputation of subverting the authority of bishops, whenever men shall read or hear that we, deprecating the tyranny of bishops, were unable to obtain justice."

In the exigency thus graphically described by Melancthon, the civil ruler came forward to assume a portion of the episcopal prerogatives. Thus, in a document put forth in the year 1530, Duke Albert of Prussia makes this solemn declaration:

"When we saw many causes of importance in the churches of our dukedom too little cared for or neglected by those whose duty it was to adjudicate and settle them, that all things, as Paul to the Corinthians admonishes, be done decently and in order, *we were compelled to take upon ourselves another's*, that is to say, *the episcopal office*, in order that, in so

far as it could be done, the things needing correction might be changed, and reduced to a better condition." (*Pref. to a Kirchenordnung of 1530.*) "What the duke here designates as compulsion, necessity, was fully approved by the Reformers. It was justified by an appeal to Scripture; civil rulers, it was contended, had been constituted by Christ heads of the Church: 'The prince,' writes CAPITO, in 1537, 'is pastor, father, external head of the Church on earth. Our argument is this: Christ the true and natural head has ascended into heaven that he might fill all things. He has bestowed upon pious princes the gift of government, giving the wisdom to qualify for the office to those whom he constitutes heads of his Church upon earth.'"

Circumstances, however, it is evident, were more influential in calling forth these utterances, than the real convictions and wishes of the Reformers, who expected no better results from the union of spiritual and temporal power in the hands of civil rulers than from their previous concentration in the persons of the bishops. "I behold," says Melanchthon, in 1530, in reference to the overthrow of episcopal government — "I behold in the future a much more intolerable tyranny than has ever obtained before." (*Corpus Reform.* ii. 333.) In a similar strain Brentz complains: "Know you not with what heavy burdens the clergy are oppressed in the reformed dukedoms by the officials and prefects of the princes? That the court should ordain the ministry in the Church is a proceeding far from agreeable to good men." (*Ibid.* 362.)

It was the earnest and constant desire of the Reformers to keep the government of the Church separate from the State, (*Corp. Ref.* vi. 882,) — a desire they were powerless to carry out without the co-operation of the bishops, who were immovable in their determined resistance to reform.

Nothing remained, therefore, but to transfer the episcopal jurisdiction to the civil rulers. (See *Gerhard, Loc. Theol.* xxiv. xxv.) This state of facts explains the possession, on the part of the civil power in Germany, of episcopal prerogatives. A scientific

The Episcopal system in the Lutheran Church.

exposition of the grounds of this possession was first undertaken by MATTHIAS STEPHANI, in a work entitled, *Tractatus de Jurisdictione* (1611) — a formal defence of what was afterward known as *the Episcopal System in the Evangelical Church*. The prince is here declared to possess the temporal power independently, *jure proprio*, but the spiritual power in virtue of the imperial grant, (*concessione imperatoris*;) inasmuch as the emperor has deposited the episcopal jurisdiction, suspended by the Peace of Religion, with the princes, *ad interim*, until the final settlement of religion presupposed in the Peace shall have been effected.

The Episcopal system, as thus defined, has found advocates in many theologians and jurists, such as CARPZOV, (*Jurisprudentia Consistorialis*, fol., Lips., 1655;) STRYCK (*De Principe quolibet Papa in suo Territorio*, 4to, Viteb., 1690; *De jure papali Principum Evangelicorum*, 4to, Halæ, 1694.)

“The Episcopal system,” says Höfling, “has been accused, not unjustly, by the advocates of the Territorial system, of an hierarchical tendency, inasmuch as by an inadequate distinction between church government and church office, it would claim for the clergy, wellnigh exclusively, the *potestas interna*, make the civil magistrate merely the executor of their decrees, and the body of the people (the *status œconomicus*) equally quiescent.” (*Grundsätze Ev. Luth. Kirchenverfassung*, § 35.)

This system soon encountered a host of adversaries, and, at the close of the seventeenth century, a theory was promulgated in opposition to it, which is known as the *Territorial system*, the fundamental principle of which is simply this: That the so-called *Jus Episcopale*, so far as it can be said to exist at all, or so far as it is an ecclesiastical authority, is coincident with the *Jus Reformandi*; that the civil ruler possesses, as a prerogative of his position, the government of the churches within his realm. The characteristic feature of this system consists not so much in the government of the Church by the State, in the control of the Church according to worldly principles, since such a

The  
Territorial  
system.

control actually obtains also according to the two rival systems—the *Episcopal* and the *Collegial*—as in the position that the government of the Church, belonging to the civil ruler, is but a constituent part of his prerogative as lord of the land, and is administered as a branch of the power of the State.

This system was first fully developed by CHRISTIAN THOMASIVS, (1655–1728.) In opposition to the theory of Puffendorf, as put forth in his treatise *on the bearing of the Christian religion upon civil life*, (1687,) that the State rests upon the basis of a compact, while the Church, as a Divine institution, is independent, Thomasius, though not denying the distinct character of the two, subordinated the Church to the State to such an extent as virtually to merge the former in the latter. His theory was further developed by BRENNISEN, one of his pupils, in a dissertation, *De Jure Principis circa adiaphora*, (1695) He was answered by CARPZOV, *De jure decidendi controversias theologicas*, (1695,) conceding to the magistracy only the right of giving external sanction to the decisions of the clergy. Brenneisen replied in a treatise, often reprinted, with additions by Thomasius: *The right of evangelical princes in theological controversies fully discussed, and defended against the Popish teachings of a theologian at Leipsic*, (1696.) A large number of publications in defence of the system followed.

As developed in these writings, the essential principles of the system are these: The prince is bound to preserve external tranquillity and peace among his subjects by proper compulsory measures. But to such external peace unity in religion is not necessary, and the best means of promoting peace is toleration, since even those who have a confession as to *Credenda* do not maintain unity of faith. Every one has to decide for himself in theological controversies. Confessions can force no one's convictions, for every one has a right to make his own confession, and the symbolical books have no higher authority than other books. As it is not the province of the prince to make his subjects virtuous, to convert them to the true faith, or to further their salvation; as no one is authorized

to decide religious disputes, so no prince has the right to force decrees upon any one. To the prince it only belongs to prevent theological controversies from disturbing the public peace; to deprive a minister who teaches false doctrine of his office; the question whether a minister abides by the confession of his church not being a question of theological controversy, but simply a question of fact. The prince can, moreover, forbid the expulsion of an erring member from the Church, can prevent the imposition of new confessions on the people by the clergy, and other things of like sort, for the preservation of external peace. A heretic is liable to no punishment but that of expatriation. (*Jacobson*, in *Hertzog*, vol. xv.)

As the territorial system was called forth by the extravagant claims asserted for the clerical body, so that system in turn occasioned the rise of an opposing theory which restored to a proper recognition the original view of the Reformers: that the government of the Church belongs to the three orders — clergy, laity, and magistracy, (the first named the *status ecclesiasticus*, the second, the *status æconomicus*, third, the *status* or *magistratus politicus*;) but more especially to the laity; and that the magistracy obtained its episcopal rights by means of a transfer on the part of the Church community. This is the so-called *collegial* or *confraternity* system.

The primitive Christians formed what were called *collegia illicita*, and after the age of Constantine *collegia licita*, united with the State, and in civil life subject to it, but differently constituted, and independent in the management of ecclesiastical affairs. State and Church have since remained two distinct institutions, though they have at times usurped each other's functions. The Church of Rome made itself as it were a State, claiming for itself a divine institution, and declaring the State a product of human will, based on a compact. The Reformers contended against both errors, yet not with the most favorable results. As under the Papacy, the Church had become a Church-state, so now the State became a State-church, and the Evangelical Church lost its independence, by

substituting the secular papacy for the hierarchy. An animated controversy on the subject sprang up in France, the Netherlands, some parts of Germany, and elsewhere, both divines and civilians entering the field.

An influential work in this controversy was the treatise of PUFFENDORF already named, *De habitu religionis Christianæ ad vitam civilem*; maintaining that the State rests on a compact, but the Church on a divine appointment; that the Church should appear not as a State, but as a *collegium quod civitati subest*; that the Christianizing of the State has neither deprived the Church of its collegial character nor conferred episcopal powers on the magistracy; that kings were yet *chief members* of the Church, as such having greater responsibilities and rights; that though the New Testament contained no express precept on the subject like the Old, (*Deut. xvii. 18-20*,) yet the prerogative of the king in the Church flowed from the nature of the civil magistracy, and of the Christian religion, or from voluntary transfer on the part of the Church.

This exposition was followed up by CHRISTOPHER MATTHIAS PFAFF in his *Origines Juris Ecclesiastici*, (1719.) What Puffendorf failed to do, this writer accomplished in establishing a general principle in regard to Church government, and this on the basis of Puffendorf's positions. According to Pfaff, the Church is "a free society, not having the form of a civitas or republic," and therefore not admitting of the division into three orders, but consisting of two only, teachers and hearers, the Christian civil magistracy belonging to the latter, and not to the Church, as such. The rights of the civil power in the Church do not belong to it as a member of the Church. It is bound to allow its subjects to form societies among themselves freely, provided they do not injure the State. Over such societies, however, it has certain rights, such as that of approval and ratification, or even of mere toleration, the right of general inspection, etc.

In the special application of this principle to the Church, which is of the nature of a *collegium*, only these three things are to be observed: 1. The civil power cannot forbid Christian

societies; this would be contrary to the divine law. 2. It cannot put such restrictions upon them as impair freedom of conscience. 3. It cannot assume the exercise of the collegial rights, unless the colleges abandon that exercise, or transfer it by tacit or express compact. We must therefore, distinguish the *jura sacrorum magistratica*, belonging to the magistracy as such, from the *jura collegialia*.

Such is the collegial system. Its theory of compact, its fundamental principle, is unsound, leading in the subsequent abstract application of it to the most injurious results.\*

\* Jacobson, *Ibid.*, vol. ii.

## CHAPTER XIII.

VIEWS OF LUTHER — HARMONY OF THE PROTESTANT CONFESSIONS — THE CONFESSIO HELVETICA — THE CONFESSIO SAXONICA — THE CONFESSIO ANGLICANA — THE CONFESSIO BELGICA — THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM — STATEMENTS OF CALVIN — BELIEF IN THE CHURCH — TWO SENSES OF THE WORD — THE MINISTRY — THE CHURCH OF ROME — GRADES OF MINISTERS — FORM OF ORDINATION — ULRICH ZWINGLI — DISTINCTION BETWEEN CHURCH VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE.

THE views of LUTHER on the subject of the Church, its idea, nature, notes, perfections, ministry, etc., are very fully expressed throughout his voluminous works, in a vast variety of forms.\* With him the question of the Church was a fundamental question — *the* fundamental question of the Reformation : — “What is the dispute,” he asks, “between the Papists and us? Answer: *It is the dispute about the true Christian Church.*” “It is not the question, whether we must believe the Church; whether there is a Church; but, which is the true Church? This is the question. On the question whether there be a Church, we are at one with the Pope; but which is the Christian Church? . . . this is the point of difficulty. . . . We must distinguish the true Christian Church, which is the true Church in reality, from the Church which claims to be such, and is not. . . . That is a Christian Church which believes in Christ, and which will be saved by Him, not by our own works and merits.” (*Geist. u. L. Schrift.*, pp. 57, 61.)

Luther's statements are, in substance, coincident with those of Melancthon. In the Larger Catechism (1529, antedating the *Augustana*,) the Church is described, almost in the language of Cyprian, as the mother that bears and nourishes every Christian through the word of God, which the Holy

\* Note N.

Ghost reveals and enforces." . . . "Wherever Christ is not preached, there is no Holy Ghost constituting and assembling the Christian Church. The Creed calls the Church *a communion of saints* — terms perfectly equivalent, meaning, as the clause should be rendered, a Christian community, or congregation, or most appropriately, *a Holy Christendom*. For this clause was added as explanatory of what goes before, defining what the Church is, viz., a holy community on earth, composed only of holy persons, real saints, under one head, Christ, called together by the Holy Ghost, in one faith, mind, and judgment, endowed with various gifts, yet concordant in love, free from heresy and schism."

Holy Chris-  
tendom.

In these definitions, harmonizing as they do with those contained in the symbolical books of all the other churches of the Reformation, we have the first authentic expression of the distinctively PROTESTANT doctrine of the nature of the Church in its earthly essence.

The harmony on this point of the Protestant Confessions, put forth in the Reformation age, is illustrated by the following citations. First in order of time after the *Augustana* is the *Confessio Helvetica*, originally published in the year 1536, with the express indorsement of Luther and other leading Lutheran theologians, and reissued in a revised form in 1566. In the seventeenth article of this formulary we read as follows: "Since God would have all men from the beginning to be saved and to come to the acknowledgment of the truth, there must needs always have been, be now, and exist hereafter, even to the end of the world, a CHURCH, that is, a congregation of faithful men called out or gathered from the world — a communion of saints — of those, namely, who truly know and rightly worship, through the Word and Holy Spirit, the true God in Christ. It is of these — the fellow-citizens of the saints and of the household of God, sanctified by the blood of the Son of God — that the article of the Creed, 'I believe the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints,' is to be under-

The Confessio  
Helvetica,  
1536.

stood. The Church is distinguished, in reference simply to the diversity of its members, into two parts, the Church militant and the Church triumphant, the former yet upon earth, contending against the world, the flesh, and the devil, the latter enjoying the rewards of victory in heaven. These two, however, maintain communion with each other.

“The Church has one only head, and can have no other, Christ. For as the Church is a spiritual body, it must have a spiritual head in congruity with itself. We therefore condemn the doctrine of the Roman clergy, who make their Pontiff the universal pastor of the Catholic Church militant, its supreme head, and Vicar of Christ, who has a plenitude of power, as they call it, and supreme dominion. And as we do not acknowledge any other head of the Church but Christ, so we do not acknowledge any Church to be a true Church in which are not found the marks or notes of a true Church, above all, the pure preaching of the word of God. Moreover, they who are truly in the Church, united in the one Head with all the members of Christ, declare themselves to be Christ’s disciples by persevering in the bond of peace and holy unity: they partake of the sacraments instituted by Christ and handed down by the apostles.”

The *Confessio Saxonica*, drawn up by Melanchthon, (1551,) in article twelfth, has the following statement: “It is the divine purpose that there should always be a congregation in the world possessing the word of the gospel of the Son of God, in which there should be a ministry, instituted and perpetuated by Christ Himself, for the preservation and propagation of his doctrine. But the far greater part of mankind reject the word of God, and in the very assembly itself which is named the Church, many contentions and divisions have always obtained, and the true Church has been assailed by both external and internal foes. When men behold these dissensions, and see that those who embrace other doctrines in conflict with the gospel, surpass the Church in numbers, power, and glory, they doubt whether there is any Church of God, what,

Confessio  
Saxonica,  
1551.

of what kind, and where it is. To the profane the solution of this question is difficult; but the true Church knows, on the divine testimony, the source of all this opposition, and that amidst it all, the Church of God is safe, distinguishing it from all other bodies, and knowing what and where it is. In order, therefore, that the saints might be the more confirmed against these doubts, this article is embodied in the Creed: I believe there is a Holy Catholic Church. By this profession, we affirm that the whole human race has not been cast away by God, but that *there is, and will continue to be a true Church*, that the promises of God have been fulfilled, that the Son of God yet reigns, receives and saves those who call upon Him, and, supported by this consolation, we give thanks to God." . . . "We do not speak of the Church as of a Platonic idea, but we point out the Church which can be seen and heard. We, therefore, say that the Church visible on earth is the congregation of those embracing the gospel, and rightly using the sacraments, in which, through the ministry of the gospel, God regenerates many unto life eternal, in which congregation there are, nevertheless, many who are not saints."

The twentieth of the *Articles of Religion* of the Church of England, (1552; the nineteenth of 1562, 1571): "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

Confessio  
Anglicana,  
1552.

The *Confessio Belgica*: "We believe and confess one Catholic or Universal Church, which is a true congregation of all faithful Christians, who expect all their salvation from one Jesus Christ, having been washed in his blood, and sanctified and sealed by his Spirit. . . . Inasmuch as this holy congregation consists of those who shall be saved, and since out of it there is no salvation, no one ought to withdraw or separate himself from it. On the contrary, all ought to adhere to it, and carefully preserve the unity of the Church, submitting as well to its

Confessio  
Belgica,  
1561.

doctrine as to its discipline, and, as common members of the body of Christ, promoting the edification of the brethren, as God has distributed in each one his several gifts. The true Church is distinguished from the false by these notes: the pure preaching of the gospel, and the lawful administration, according to Christ's ordinance, of the sacraments, and also the right use of ecclesiastical discipline: to embrace all in one word, the performance of all things according to the rule of God's word, and the rejection of whatever is opposed to it—the acknowledgment of the one only Head, Christ. From the true Church, ascertained by these notes, it is not lawful to be separated.”

The *Heidelberg Catechism*: “I believe that the Son of God, from the beginning to the end of the world, gathers to himself out of the whole human race, guards, and preserves, through his Spirit and word, a congregation chosen to eternal life, agreeing in the true faith, and that I am, and will ever continue to be, a living member of that congregation.”

Next to Melanchthon's exposition of the doctrine of the Church, as contained in the apology of the *Augustana*, that of CALVIN, as fully set forth in the fourth book of his *Institutes*, [No. 56,] is worthy of special attention.

Statements of  
Calvin, 1536.

“It is God's will that all his children be gathered into the bosom of the Church, not only to be nourished by her assistance and ministry during their infancy and childhood, but also to be governed by her maternal care, till they attain a mature age, and at length reach the end of their faith. It is not lawful to put asunder what God hath joined together; the Church is the mother of all those who have God for their Father, according to the apostle, who declares the new and heavenly Jerusalem to be ‘the mother of us all.’”

“That article of the Creed in which we profess to believe THE CHURCH, refers not only to the visible Church of which we are now speaking, but likewise to all the elect of God, including the dead as well as the living. The word BELIEVE is used, because it is often impossible to discover any difference

between the children of God and the ungodly. . . . The design of this clause is to teach us, that though the devil moves every engine to destroy the grace of Christ, and all the enemies of God exert the most furious violence in the same attempt, yet his grace cannot possibly be extinguished, nor can his blood have been shed in vain. Here we must regard both the secret election of God, and his internal vocation; because he alone knoweth them that are his. . . . This article of the Creed, however, relates in some measure to the external Church, that every one of us may maintain a brotherly agreement with all the children of God, may pay due deference to the authority of the Church, in a word, may conduct himself as one of the flock. Therefore we add THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS; a clause which well expresses the character of the Church as consisting of the saints united in the fellowship of Christ, and mutually communicating to each other whatever benefits God confers upon them. We believe the Church, in order to have a certain assurance that we are members of it. For thus our salvation rests on firm and solid foundations, so that it cannot fall into ruin, though the whole fabric of the world should be dissolved. . . . We may learn even from the title of *mother*, applied to the Church visible, how necessary it is for us to know her; since there is no other way of entrance into life, unless we are conceived by her, born of her, nourished at her breasts, and continually preserved under her care and government, till we are divested of this mortal flesh and become like the angels. For our infirmity will not admit of our dismissal from her school; we must continue under her instruction and discipline to the end of our lives. Out of her bosom there can be no hope of remission of sins, or any salvation.

“The word *Church* is used in holy Scripture in two senses: the Church which is really such in the sight of God, embracing the true members of Christ, and the Church as composed of all throughout the world who profess to worship one God and Jesus Christ, who are initiated into his faith by baptism, who testify their unity in true doctrine and charity by a partici-

Belief in the  
Church.

pation of the sacred supper, who consent to the word of the Lord, and preserve the ministry which Christ has instituted for the purpose of preaching it. In this Church are included many hypocrites, who have nothing of Christ but the name and appearance. As it is necessary therefore to believe that Church which is invisible to us, and known to God alone; so this Church which is visible to men we are commanded to honor, and to maintain communion with it. The Lord doth distinguish it by certain marks — the word of God purely preached and heard, and the sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ.

Two senses  
of the word.

“The ministry of the word and sacraments we ought to account a perpetual mark and characteristic of the Church. That is to say, wherever *that* exists entire and uncorrupted, no errors and irregularities of conduct form a sufficient reason for refusing the name of a Church. That ministry which maintains the grand doctrine of religion, the points in which all the faithful ought to agree as articles of faith, and which, in regard to the sacraments, upholds the institution of their author, is to be accounted a legitimate ministry. But the ministry which errs in fundamentals, and fails in the use of sacraments, is no mark of the Church. The Church must of necessity fall, if the foundation of it, which is the doctrine of the apostle and prophets, be subverted. And as this is the state of thing under the Papacy, it is easy to judge how much of the Church remains there. Instead of the ministry of the word, there reigns a corrupt government, composed of falsehoods by which the pure light is suppressed or extinguished. An execrable sacrilege has been substituted for the supper of the Lord. The worship of God is deformed by a multifarious and intolerable mass of superstitions. The doctrine without which Christianity cannot exist has been entirely forgotten or exploded. The public assemblies have become schools of idolatry and impiety. In withdrawing from the participation of so many enormities, there is no danger of our separating ourselves from the Church of Christ. . . .

The ministry.

“We refuse not to acknowledge, however, among the Papists of the present day, those vestiges of the Church which it has pleased the Lord should remain among them after its removal. He has preserved, as a testimony of his covenant, among them, baptism, which, being consecrated by his lips, retains its virtue in opposition to all the impiety of men. Other vestiges of the Church also remain through his providence, to keep it from utter destruction. While we refuse therefore to allow the Papists the title of the Church, without any qualification or restriction, we do not deny that there are churches among them. We only contend for a true and legitimate constitution of the Church, which requires not only a communion in the sacraments, which are the signs of a Christian profession, but above all, an agreement in doctrine. We affirm that churches exist even under the tyranny of the Pope—the head of the accursed kingdom of Antichrist in the Western Church. They are churches, inasmuch as God has wonderfully preserved among them a remnant of his people, . . . and as there still remain some marks of his Church.”

“The ministry of men, which God employs in his government of the Church, is the principal bond which holds the faithful together in one body. By means of his ministers . . . Christ dispenses and distributes his gifts to the Church . . . exerting the power of his Spirit in this his institution, that it may not be ineffectual. . . . Light and heat are not so essential to the sun, as the apostolical and pastoral office is to the preservation of the Church in the world.

“Those who preside over the government of the Church, according to the institution of Christ, are made by Paul, first, apostles; secondly, prophets; thirdly, evangelists; fourthly, pastors; lastly, teachers. Of these only the last two sustain an ordinary office in the Church; pastors and teachers being always indispensable to the Church, the latter having no official concern with the discipline, or the administration of the sacraments, etc., but only with the interpretation of Scripture; whereas the pastoral

The Church  
of Rome.

Grades of  
Ministers.

office includes all these things. Besides the ministry of the word, there are two other functions: 'government' and 'the care of the poor.' Governors in the apostolic churches were persons of advanced years, selected from the people to unite with the bishops, elders, or pastors—for these three are in the usage of Scripture interchangeable terms—in giving admonitions and exercising discipline. No other interpretation can be given to that injunction: 'He that ruleth, let him do it with diligence.' The care of the poor was committed to the 'deacons,' who were of two distinct orders, the one whose duty it was to distribute alms, the other composed of those who devoted themselves to the care of the poor and sick, such as the widows mentioned by Paul to Timothy.

"As to the form of ordination, though there is no express precept for the imposition of hands, yet since we find it to have been constantly used by the apostles, such a punctual observance of it by them ought to have the force of a precept with us. This was not the act of the whole multitude, but was confined to the pastors; whether performed, in all cases, by more than one, or whether ever by a single pastor, is not certain. . . . Paul speaks of himself as having laid hands upon Timothy, without any mention of others having united with him. His expression of 'the laying on of the hands of the presbytery,' does not, I apprehend, refer to a *company of elders*, but denotes the ordination itself."

Form of  
ordination.

ZWINGLI'S exposition of the doctrine of the Church gives decided prominence to the distinction between the Church considered as the spotless bride of Christ, and the Church as taken cognizance of by the ungodly world. "Christ is the Rock on which the Church, that is, the community of true believers, is built." Hence the Church is a society composed of men united together by one faith and one spirit. Every real believer in Christ, in other words, every one who places his whole trust in God through Christ, is *in the Church*, in the truest sense; that is to say, he is a member of the body of Christ. Zwingli

Ulrich  
Zwingli,  
1523.

went much beyond Luther and even Calvin in emphasizing this distinction between what he designates the *ecclesia sensibilis*, including all who are found in the outward community of Christians, without respect to moral qualification, and the body or the spouse of Christ, which is necessarily

*Ecclesia  
sensibilis.*

“without spot or wrinkle,” since only those can form a part of it who are vitally one with Christ.

And this, which alone is the true Catholic Church, is the Church which is indefectible, infallible, and imperishable, founded as it is on the word of God: “There is a Church that cannot err, and is directed by the Holy Spirit. This Church is composed of all true believers united in the bonds of faith and charity; but it is visible only to the eye of its Divine founder, who knoweth his own. It does not assemble with pomp, . . . it has no temporal reign; it seeks neither honors nor domination; to fulfil the will of God is the only care by which it is occupied.” (*Conf. with Faber, 1523.*)

---

NOTE.

N.

See *GEIST AUS LUTHER'S SCHRIFTEN, oder Concordantz der Ansichten und Urtheile des grossen Reformators über die wichtigsten Gegenstände des Glaubens, der Wissenschaft und des Lebens. Vier Bände, 8vo, Darmstadt, 1830.*

In the third volume of this invaluable compilation, pp. 47-222, are brought together, from all parts of Luther's multifarious writings, his copious utterances on every topic connected with the CHURCH.

## CHAPTER XIV.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH — ABROGATION OF THE PAPAL SUPREMACY — PAPAL AGGRESSIONS — INDEPENDENCE OF ROME DECLARED — GROUND OF THE DECLARATION — THE XIII. ARTICLES OF 1538 — THE XLII. ARTICLES — THE ORDINAL OF 1549-1552 — NO DISTINCTION IN ORDER BETWEEN BISHOP AND PRESBYTER — CRANMER'S, ETC., DECLARATION OF THE FUNCTIONS, ETC., OF BISHOPS AND PRIESTS — RESOLUTIONS ON THE SACRAMENT OF ORDERS — CRANMER'S MATURE VIEWS, AS EXPRESSED IN SERMON ON THE POWER OF THE KEYS.

THE Church of England entered upon its course of self-reformation by practically asserting a principle which had been recognized by the Church Catholic from the beginning — the principle, namely, that a national church, through the medium of its representative synod, duly convened, has inherent authority from its Divine Founder to correct abuses, whether of doctrine or discipline, within its own jurisdiction. The recovery of this long-lost right was signalized by the first decisive act of reformation — the abrogation of the papal supremacy. “Originally independent of the Latin Church, the Anglican had been gradually drawn into a comparative subjugation. The Roman element in Anglo-Saxon Christianity had overpowered the influence exerted by the surviving British communion and the missionaries from Ireland; till at length a considerable degree of deference, and even of servility was manifested by the king, the clergy, and the people, towards the dominant court of Rome. Anterior to the Conquest, the feeling was that of gratitude and affection, such as we may now trace in the language of the American Church with regard to the Church of England: but when the papal pretensions had grown into the form which they assumed under Gregory VII. and his successors — being developed from a

Abrogation of  
the papal  
supremacy,  
1534.

primacy of order into a supremacy of power — the tone of the English was frequently altered, and symptoms appear in their intercourse with the Popes, of the warm and unflinching nationality which effected the Reformation. From the time of the dispute on the subject of investitures — when ‘the king and his nobles, the bishops also, and others of inferior rank, were so indignant as to assert that rather than surrender the privileges of their forefathers, they would depart from the Roman Church,’ — till the final struggle in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, the encroachments of the Pope had been calling forth a spirited opposition; and if we allow that his interference was in some cases salutary, and as such cordially desired by a large body of the nation, it is impossible to study the civil enactments of the period, without perceiving the growth of that deep exasperation which eventually repelled the papal aggressions, and secured the freedom of the Church.

“These aggressions consisted of the following particulars: (1) A judicial power in matters ecclesiastical, or cases of appeal. (2) A power of granting licenses and dispensations. (3) A liberty to send legatees into England and to hold legatine courts. (4) A power of granting investiture of bishops, of confirming episcopal elections, and of distributing ecclesiastical patronage. (5) A privilege of receiving first-fruits, the tenths of English benefices, and the goods of the clergy who died intestate.” (*Hardwick, Hist. Art.*, p. 26.)

The Church of England, canonically represented in the provincial synods of Canterbury and York, in the year 1534, declared her independence of the papal monarchy, affirming that *the Bishop of Rome has in Holy Scripture no greater jurisdiction within the kingdom of England than any other foreign bishop*. The ground of this declaration is amply set forth in a document published two years later — *The Institution of a Christian Man*: — “I believe that these particular churches, in what place of the world soever they be congregated, be the very parts, portions, or members

Papal  
aggressions.

Independence  
of Rome.

of this Catholic and Universal Church. And that between them there is indeed no difference in superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, neither that any one of them is head or sovereign over the other; but that they be all equal in power and dignity, and be all grounded and builded upon one foundation. . . . And, therefore, I do believe that the Church of Rome is not, nor cannot worthily be called the Catholic Church, but only a particular member thereof, and cannot challenge or vindicate of right, and by the word of God, to be head of this Universal Church, or to have any superiority over the other churches of Christ which be in England, France, Spain, or in any other realm, but that they be all free from any subjection unto the said Church of Rome, or unto the minister or bishop of the same. And I believe also, that the said Church of Rome, with all the other particular churches in the world, compacted and united together, do make and constitute but one Catholic Church or body. . . . As for the Bishop of Rome, it was many hundred years after Christ before he could acquire or get any primacy or governance above any other bishops, out of his province in Italy. Since which time he hath ever usurped more and more, . . . and that under the pretence of the authority committed unto them by the gospel: wherein the said bishops of Rome do not only abuse and pervert the true sense and meaning of Christ's word, but they do also clean contrary to the use and custom of the primitive Church, and also do manifestly violate as well the holy canons made in the Church immediately after the time of the apostles, as also the decrees and constitutions made in that behalf by the holy fathers of the Catholic Church, assembled in the first general councils; and finally they do transgress their own profession, made in their creation. For all the bishops of Rome always, when they be consecrated and made bishops of that see, do make a solemn profession and vow, that they shall inviolably observe and keep all the ordinances made in the eight first general councils, among the which it is specially provided and enacted, that all causes shall be finished and determined within the province where the same be begun,

and that by the bishops of the same province; and that no bishop shall exercise any jurisdiction out of his own diocese or province. And divers such other canons were then made and confirmed by the said councils, to repress and take away out of the Church all such primacy and jurisdiction over kings and bishops, as the bishops of Rome pretend now to have over the same. And we find that divers good fathers, bishops of Rome, did greatly reprove, yea, and abhor, as a thing clean contrary to the gospel, and the decrees of the Church, that any bishop of Rome, or elsewhere, should presume, usurp, or take upon him the title and name of 'the universal bishop,' or of 'the head of all priests,' or of 'the highest priest,' or any such like title. For confirmation whereof, it is out of all doubt that there is no mention made, neither in Scripture, neither in the writings of any authentical doctor or author of the Church, being within the time of the apostles, that Christ did ever make or institute any distinction or difference to be in the pre-eminence of power, order, or jurisdiction between the apostles themselves, or between the bishops themselves; but that they were all equal in power, order, authority, and jurisdiction."

These principles were reaffirmed in the *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*, (1543,) and supported by the same arguments;—the whole going to prove that the Anglican Reformers "were actuated by no spirit of revolution, but proceeded with their critical task upon the principles which they had drawn from the study of Christian antiquity." Nothing, indeed, can be more evident than that the aim of Cranmer and his associates was not to establish a new system, "but to re-establish one which they saw falling to decay; not to depart from the communion of the rest of Catholic Christendom, but to suppress the unlawful jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff—and by following in the steps of the primitive Church, to regain many pure and practical elements of the faith which, in the lapse of the middle ages, had been gradually obscured, distorted, or denied by the dominant class of schoolmen."

Four years after the first triumph of the English Reformation, achieved in the synodical abrogation of the papal supremacy, Cranmer, Tonstal, and other leading English divines, constituting a committee nominated by the king, drew up, in concert with a number of Lutheran theologians, a formulary of doctrine known as *The XIII. Articles of 1538*.

This document, which was first brought to light in 1833, by Dr. Jenkyns, the editor of "Cranmer's Remains," seems to have constituted the groundwork of our "Articles of Religion." As such — serving as a link between the Lutheran and the Anglican formularies — it has for us a special interest. The fifth of the XIII. Articles, entitled *Of the Church*, presents a remarkable deviation from the corresponding article in the *Augustana*, distinguishing, as it does, between the Church considered as the mystical body of Christ, and, as such, composed exclusively of true believers, and the Church considered as the congregation of all the baptized who have not been excommunicated: — "The Church, besides other meanings in Scripture, has two principal ones: first, that in which the Church is understood of the congregation of all the saints and the truly faithful, who truly believe in Christ the Head, and are sanctified by his spirit. But this is the living and truly holy mystical body of Christ, known to God only, who alone knoweth the hearts of men. The other acceptation is that in which the Church is taken for the congregation of all who have been baptized in Christ, and have not openly denied Him, nor been justly excommunicated. This meaning of the Church accords with its state in this life at least, in which the good are mixed with the bad; and it must be known in order that it may be heard, according to the Scripture: 'If he neglect to hear the Church,' etc. It is known by the profession of the gospel and the communion of the sacraments. This is the Church Catholic and Apostolic, which is not circumscribed by the boundaries of the Roman Episcopate, or of any other Church, but embraces all the churches of the whole of Christendom, which together compose the one Catholic Church. In this

The XIII.  
Articles of  
1538.

Catholic Church, no particular Church, whether Roman or any other, can claim for itself, by the institution of Christ, any eminence or authority over other churches. This Church is indeed one, not that it has any one head upon earth, or any one Vicar under Christ, or ever had any such, (as the Roman Pontiff has long claimed to be by divine right, while in reality nothing more is conceded to him by divine right than to any other bishop,) but it is called one inasmuch as all Christians, bound together in the bond of peace, acknowledge one Head, Christ, whose body they profess to be, confess one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all."

Passing into the Edwardine period of the Reformation, we find the Anglican doctrine of the Church, as now definitively settled, set forth in three distinct formularies: the XLII. Articles of 1552, the Catechism of 1553, and the Ordinal of 1549-52.

The twentieth of the XLII. Articles, entitled, *Of the Church*, contains a definition which is an exact reproduction of the Melanchthonian statements as embodied in the *Augustana*, the *Apology*, and the *Confessio Saxonica*: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that, of necessity, are requisite to the same."

The XLII.  
Articles.

This definition receives elucidation from a parallel description of the Church in a well-known passage in the second part of the Homily for Whitsunday: "The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone." And that the Church, thus defined, is "the visible Church of Christ," so designated in the twentieth of the XLII. Articles, is plain from what immediately follows: "And it" — "the true Church, which is a universal congregation," etc. — "hath always three notes or marks" (*external* characteristics) "whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments ministered

according to Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline."

Other articles concerning the Church are the twenty-first, twenty-second, thirty-second, thirty-third, and thirty-sixth. The twenty-first article, "Of the Authority of the Church," while claiming for the Church the prerogative of being "a witness and keeper of Holy Writ," pronounces her incompetent to decree anything at variance with that record.

The twenty-second article, "Of the authority of General Councils," "vindicates the right of the civil power, in con-voking such assemblies, from the later encroachments of the Pope; and maintains that some of the councils reputed 'general' at the time of the Reformation, had actually fallen into error." On the meaning of this article the *Reformatio Legum*, (c. 14,) as Hardwick remarks, "is an excellent commentary. It declares that we reverently accept the four great œcumenical councils, and defer to the decisions of many of the later synods, so far as they upheld the fundamentals of religion."

The thirty-second and thirty-third "relate to the internal discipline and usages of the Church, which had been made the subject of vehement disputation. The former denounces the excommunicate as unfit for the society of Christians; the latter declares that 'traditions,' or ecclesiastical rites and customs, may not be violated by any at the mere impulse of his private judgment."

The thirty-sixth is directed partly against the Romanizing faction who continued to assert the supremacy of the Pope, affirming that "the king of England is supreme head in earth, next under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland;" and that "the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England."

In reference to the *ministry*, the twenty-fourth article, based on the fourteenth of the Augsburg Articles, declares, "It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And 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."

This article, primarily directed against the error of the Anabaptists, that every one who believed (or fancied) himself inwardly called to the work of the ministry is bound to assume the office, in defiance of the authority of the Church, without a regular outward call, receives illustration from the tenth of the XIII. Articles of 1538: "Of the ministers of the Church we teach that no man ought to teach publicly, or to minister the sacraments, unless he be rightly called, that is to say, called by those who have the power in the Church, according to God's word, *and the laws and usages of each particular country*, of calling and admitting to the ministry. And no man, called to the ministry of the Church, even though he be a bishop, whether the Roman bishop or any other whosoever, may claim the power, by divine right, to teach publicly, to minister the sacraments, or exercise any ecclesiastical function in another's diocese or parish; that is to say, no bishop may do so in the diocese of another bishop, and no parish priest in the parish of another priest."

The Anglican doctrine of the constitution of the ministry is further set forth in the authoritative statements following: "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,

The Ordinal  
of  
1549-52.

tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following." (*Preface to the Ordinal, 1549 and 1552*, which continued without alteration down to 1662—a period of one hundred and thirteen years.)

In the office itself of the ordering of priests, the portion of Scripture appointed for the epistle is Acts xx. 17-35: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you OVERSEERS," etc. Or, 1 Tim. iii. 1-16: "This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a BISHOP," etc.

For the gospel is appointed Matt. xxviii. 18-20; or, John x. 1-16; or, John xx. 18-23.

The formula in imposing hands is simply—"Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven: and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained: and be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy sacraments. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

In "the form of consecrating of an archbishop or bishop," the epistle is 1 Tim. iii. 1-7—*part of the same passage appointed for the epistle in the office of "the Ordering of Priests;"* and the gospel is John xxi. 15-17; "or else"—the rubric provides—"out of the tenth chapter of John, *as before in the Order of Priests.*"

The formula of consecration in the imposition of hands is—"Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness."

The facts here calling for special remark are these:—1. In the preface to the ordinal as originally framed, no mention is made of "episcopal ordination," as, in all cases, prerequisite to the performance of ministerial functions "in this Church." Such ordination or consecration is required of him only who is not already a bishop, priest, or deacon; according to what particular

The Episcopate  
and presby-  
terate one order.

form of ordering, whether episcopal or presbyterial, nothing is prescribed.

2. In the two offices of the ordering of priests, and of the consecrating of bishops, the same texts of Holy Scripture are applied to the office of priest and that of bishop, without distinction; the scriptural or apostolic episcopate being thus, as *an order*, identified with the presbyterate.

3. The words used in imposing hands in the consecration of a bishop, "Remember that thou stir up," etc., taken from 2 Tim. i. 6, 7—words here so used for the first time, not being found in any preceding office—are thus applied with marked significance, in full harmony with the other parts of the office. Their import in this connection may be made plain by viewing them in their original connection in the sacred text: In this admonition as addressed to Timothy, the apostle speaks of the gift or grace imparted by the imposition of his own hands, as a gift formerly bestowed. This gift—the gift or grace of orders, a spiritual commission given by the Church, under Christ, to feed and rule the flock of God—now in Timothy's full possession, he is exhorted not to neglect.

In prescribing the use of these words, then, to accompany the laying on of hands in the consecration of a bishop, the framers of this office plainly declare the presbyter about to be consecrated to be, already, in virtue of his ordination to the presbyterate, endowed with the gift or grace of ORDERS, in the strict and proper sense of the expression; no distinction being made in this, or in any part of the formulary, as of scriptural warrant, or of *divine* authority, between the grace of presbyterial and episcopal orders. In the act of imposing hands, the bishop pronounces the words, "Remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is (already) in thee, by imposition of hands," (at thy ordination to the presbyterate,) words plainly presupposing identity of *order* in the two *offices* of the priesthood and the episcopate. In perpetuating the office of the episcopate, our fathers of the Reformation appeal to no one text of Scripture in support of any distinction of order between it and the presbyterate; on the contrary, while refraining from

any use of language that might imply that a grace of orders accompanies consecration to the episcopate, they apply, as we have seen, the same passages to both indiscriminately.

4. In keeping with this identification of presbyteral and episcopal orders throughout the ordinal, are the several titles prefixed to the three offices composing it: *The form and manner of ORDERING of deacons; the form of ORDERING priests; the form of CONSECRATING of an archbishop or bishop.*

A clear light is thrown upon this formulary by a document put forth in 1536 by Cranmer and other leaders of the Reformation, entitled "A Declaration of the functions and divine institution of bishops and priests."

In this paper we find the following statements: "Beside the power of the sword, there should be also continually in the Church militant certain other ministers or officers, which should have spiritual power, authority, and commission, under Christ, to preach and teach the word of God unto his people, and to dispense and administer the sacraments of God unto them; and by the same to confer the grace of the Holy Ghost; . . . to order and consecrate others in the same room, order, and office whereunto they be called and admitted themselves; and, finally, to feed Christ's people like good pastors, etc. This power and ministration is called, in some places of Scripture, a gift and a grace; in some places, the keys, or the power of the keys, whereby is signified a certain limited office. . . . This office was committed and given by Christ and his apostles unto certain persons only, that is to say, unto *priests or bishops*, whom they did elect, call, and admit thereunto by their prayer, and imposition of their hands. . . . The truth is, that *in the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees or distinctions in orders, but only of deacons and ministers, and of priests or bishops*; nor is there any word spoken of any other ceremony used in the conferring of this sacrament (of orders) but only of prayer and the imposition of the bishop's hands."

Cranmer's  
Declaration  
of the function  
of bishops.

The views of Cranmer and his associates on this point further appear from a paper drawn up in 1540, under the eye of

the primate: "The resolutions of several bishops and divines of some questions concerning the sacraments," etc.

Anglican  
divines on  
Episcopacy.

To the tenth question, "Whether bishops or priests were first?" Cranmer makes answer: "The bishops and priests were at one time, and were no two things, but both one office, in the beginning of Christ's religion." Dr. Cox, afterward Bishop of Ely, answers: "Although by Scripture (as St. Hierome saith) priests and bishops be one, and, therefore, the one not before the other, yet bishops, as they be now, were after priests, and therefore made of priests."

Dr. Redmayne, master of Trinity College, Cambridge, thinks "they be of like beginning, and at the beginning were *both one*, as St. Hierome and other old authors show by the Scripture, wherefore *one made another indifferently*."

Dr. Edgeworth "thinks it no inconvenience that the priests in the primitive Church made bishops. Even like as soldiers should choose one among themselves to be their captain, so did priests choose one of themselves to be their bishop, for consideration of his learning, gravity, and good living."

And Bonner, Bishop of London, says: "I think the bishops were first, and yet I think it is not of importance whether the priest then made the bishop, or else the bishop the priest, considering (after the sentence of St. Jerome) that in the beginning of the Church there was none (or if it were, very small) difference between a bishop and a priest, especially touching the signification."

The eleventh question: "Whether a bishop hath authority to make a priest by the Scripture or no? And whether any other but only a bishop may make a priest?" Cranmer answers in these terms: "A bishop may make a priest by the Scripture, and so may princes and governors also, and that by the authority of God committed to them, and the people also by their election; for as we read that bishops have done it, so Christian emperors and princes usually have done it, and the people, before Christian princes were, commonly did elect their bishops and priests."

This judgment is supplemented in the answer given by the primate to the twelfth question: "Whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a bishop and priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient?" "In the New Testament," Cranmer answers, "he that is appointed to be a bishop, or a priest, needeth no consecration by the Scripture, *for election or appointing thereto is sufficient.*" (*Burnet, Records, Part I., b. iii. xxi. Collier, ix., pp. 201-8.*)

A year or two before, in a tract entitled, *Of the Order and Ministry of Priests and Bishops*, Cranmer held the following language: "The priesthood and the order and ministry of bishops, Scripture plainly teaches are of divine institution, not human appointment. . . . And the power, function, or administration of these ministers is very necessary to the Church as long as we here upon earth carry on a warfare against the flesh, the world, and Satan; nor ought it for any reason ever to be abolished. The three leading grounds of this proposition are the following: First, because it is the divine command that this power or function should always be maintained and exercised in the Church, as most clearly appears from various places of Scripture. Second, because God has appointed no other way or means of reconciling us to Himself in Christ, and imparting to us the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and making us heirs of eternal life, than his word and sacraments. Third, because this function and power has annexed to it most sure promises of the most excellent things. For by this administration of the Word and sacraments the Holy Spirit is conferred, the richest gifts of the same Spirit are imparted to believers, and our justification and eternal life are given to us. Moreover, this power or function of ministering the word of God and the sacraments and of performing the other offices which we have named, Christ himself gave to his apostles, and in them and through them delivered the same—not promiscuously to all, but only to some men—namely, bishops and presbyters who are admitted to that office."

After insisting upon the necessity of vigilance and circumspection on the part of the bishop and the priest in the dis-

charge of their respective offices, and more especially in seeing that the flock of God have the pure doctrine of the gospel preached to them, the writer proceeds to guard his readers against the mistake of supposing that the superiority of one bishop over another, such as the jurisdiction of patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and metropolitans, is of divine appointment, in Scripture, stating as a matter of fact that those grades of office are of human appointment. Hence that any power assumed by one bishop over another without men's legitimate consent is not a lawful power, but a usurpation and tyranny. The claim of the Roman Pontiff to be universal bishop and head of the Catholic Church is then shown to be utterly without foundation, either in Scripture or the consent of the Church Catholic; nay, to be in contradiction to the decrees of general councils. The tract concludes with the declaration that "by divine institution the supreme authority, paramount to all others among men, is that of Christian kings and princes, to whom God has committed the care and government of the whole people, (clergy as well as laity,) without any exception whatever." (*Works*, vol. ii. *Appendix*, xv.)

Cranmer's maturest utterance on this subject, as found in the *Sermon of the Authority of the Keys*, incorporated in the CATECHISM of 1548, is to the following effect: "The ministration of God's word, which our Lord Jesus Christ himself did first institute, was derived from the apostles unto  
Sermon on  
the Power of  
the Keys. others after them, by imposition of hands and giving the Holy Ghost, from the apostles' time to our days. And this was the consecration, orders, and unction of the apostles, whereby they, at the beginning, made bishops and priests; and this shall continue in the Church unto the world's end. . . . The sum of the commission which Christ gave to his disciples was this, that they should preach repentance and forgiveness of sins in his name. . . . Wherefore all things that the ministers of the Church do say or do to us ought to be directed to this end, that they may loose us, and declare unto us the forgiveness of our sins, when we truly repent and believe in Christ. But when we do

not repent us of our sins, and forsake the same, or do not believe the gospel, then they ought to bind or reserve sin, and to declare unto us that if we still continue in sin, we shall be damned forever. And when the ministers do thus execute their commission, then they obey God, and whose sins soever they forgive on earth their sins be forgiven in heaven also; and contrariwise, whomsoever they bind in earth, their sins be bound also in heaven. . . . True faith must ever be stayed upon the certain word and work of God. Now God doth not speak to us with a voice sounding out of heaven, but he hath given the keys of the kingdom of heaven and the authority to forgive sin to the ministers of the Church. Wherefore let him that is a sinner go to one of them. Let him acknowledge and confess his sin, and pray him that, according to God's commandment, he will give him absolution, and comfort him with the word of grace and forgiveness of his sins. And when the minister doth so, then I ought steadfastly to believe that my sins are truly forgiven me in heaven. And such a faith is able to stand strong in all assaults of our mortal enemy, the devil; forasmuch as it is builded upon a sure rock, that is to say, upon the certain word and work of God. For he that is absolved knoweth for a surety that his sins are forgiven him by the minister. And he knoweth assuredly also that the minister hath authority from God himself so to do. And, thirdly, he knoweth that God hath made his promise to his ministers, and said unto them, 'To whom ye forgive sins upon earth, to him also they shall be forgiven in heaven.'" (*Catechismus, in Fathers of the English Church, vol. iii.*)

## CHAPTER XV.

CATENA MARTYRUM DE ECCLESIA : TYNDALE ; LATIMER ; RIDLEY ; BRADFORD ;  
HOOPER ; PHILPOT — CATECHISM OF 1553.

**I**T may repay our pains to compare, at this point, the recorded views, on the subject of the Church and ministry, of the leading martyrs of the Anglican Reformation. The remarkable coincidence of statement obtaining among them entitles their united testimony to the highest consideration.

Catena  
Martyrum.

MATTHEW TYNDALE : “ The question whether the Church or congregation be before the gospel, or the gospel before the Church, is as hard to solve as whether the father be elder than the son, or the son elder than his father. For the whole Scripture and all believing hearts testify that we are begotten through the Word. Wherefore if the Word beget the congregation, and he that begetteth is before him that is begotten, then is the gospel before the Church. Though our popish hypocrites succeed Christ and his apostles, and have their Scripture, yet they be fallen from the faith and living of them, and are heretics, and had need of a John Baptist to convert them. And we depart from them unto the true Scripture, and unto the faith and living thereof. And as they which depart from the faith of the true Church are heretics, even so they that depart from the Church of heretics and false feigned faith of hypocrites are the true Church ; which thou shalt always know by their faith, examined by the Scripture, and by their profession, and consent to live according unto the laws of God.” (*Answer to More*, pp. 24, 26, 45.)

LATIMER : “ I confess there is a Catholic Church, to the de-

termination of which I will stand; but not the Church which you call Catholic, which sooner might be termed diabolic. And whereas you join together the Romish and Catholic Church, stay there, I pray you. For it is one thing to say Romish Church, and another thing to say Catholic Church." (*Works*, vol. ii., p. 290.)  
 "Wherefore, as Lyra saith, the Church consists of those persons in whom abideth the true knowledge and confession of faith and verity. Hereunto Chrysostom and Jerome agree." (*Ibid.*, p. 313.)

Latimer,  
1555.

RIDLEY: "The Holy Catholic or Universal Church, which is the communion of saints, the house of God, the spouse of Christ, the body of Christ, the pillar and stay of the truth, this Church I believe, according to the Creed. . . . But the rule of this Church is the word of God. The guide of this Church is the Holy Ghost. The marks whereby this Church is known unto me in this dark world, and in the midst of this crooked and froward generation, are these: the sincere preaching of God's word, the due administration of the sacraments, charity, and faithful observing of ecclesiastical discipline, according to the word of God. And that Church or congregation which is garnished with these marks is in very deed that heavenly Jerusalem which consisteth of those that be born from above. This is the mother of us all, and by God's grace I will live and die the child of this Church. Forth of this, I grant, there is no salvation, and, I suppose, the residue of the places objected are rightly to be understood of this Church only." (Pp. 122-3.)

Ridley,  
1555.

BRADFORD: "The ministry of God's word and ministers is an essential point; but to translate this to bishops and their succession is a plain subtlety. The Church consisteth, as Lyra writeth full well, not in men by reason of secular or temporal power; but in men endued with true knowledge, and confession of faith, and of verity. And in Hilarius' time, you know, he writeth that the Church was 'hidden rather in caves and holes' than 'did

Bradford,  
1555.

glisten and shine in thrones of pre-eminence.'” (Vol. i., pp. 505-6, '29).

“The Church is visible; howbeit none otherwise visible than Christ was here on earth; that is, no exterior pomp or show setteth her forth commonly: and, therefore, to see her we must put on such eyes as good men put on to see and know Christ when he walked here on earth: for as Eve was of the same substance Adam was of, so is the Church of the same substance Christ is of; I mean ‘flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones.’ Look, therefore, how Christ was visibly known to be Christ when He was on earth, (that is by considering Him after the word of God,) so is the Church known.” (Vol. i., pp. 503-4, 551.)

“I would gladly have the Papists show me one place of succession, mentioned in the Scriptures. I am sure that when Paul purposely pointeth out the whole administration of the Church, he neither maketh one head, nor any inheritable primacy; and yet he is altogether in commendation of unity. After he hath made mention of ‘one God the Father,’ of ‘one Christ,’ of ‘one spirit,’ of ‘one body,’ etc., — then he describeth the mean and manner how unity is to be kept; namely, because unto every pastor is grace given, after the measure wherewith Christ hath endowed them. Where, I pray you, is now any title of *plenitudinis potestatis*, ‘of fulness of power?’” (Vol. ii., p. 143.)

HOOPER: “This commonwealth of the true Church is known by these two marks: the pure preaching of the gospel, and the right use of the sacraments. Thus proveth Paul that the

Church is bound unto the word of God: ‘You are builded upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets.’ (*Eph.* ii.; likewise *Isaiah* lix.) Of the right use of sacraments it is taught, (*I Cor.* xi., etc.) Such as teach the people to know the Church by these signs, namely, the traditions of men, and the succession of bishops, teach wrong. Those two false opinions hath given unto the succession of bishops power to interpret the Scripture, and power to make such laws in the Church as it pleaseth them. There is

Hooper,  
1555.

no man hath power to interpret the Scripture. God, for the preservation of his Church, doth give unto certain persons the gift and knowledge to open the Scripture; but that gift is no power bound to any order, succession of bishops, or title of dignity. The princes of the earth give always such power of civil justice by succession; as one is chief justice for the time of his office, to do everything appertaining to the same, so hath always his successor the like.

“The gift of interpretation of the Scripture is the light of the Holy Ghost given unto the humble and penitent person who seeketh it only to honor God, and not unto those persons that acclaim it by title or place, because he is a bishop, or followed by succession Peter or Paul. . . . Remember, therefore, to examine all kind of doctrine by the word of God, and consider whether these injuries, blasphemies, trouble, unquietness, and destruction of God's people by the law of the bishops be to be permitted, though they cry till they be hoarse again, The Holy Church! The Holy Church!” (Vol. i. 81-86.)

“As concerning the ministers of the Church, I believe that the Church is bound to no sort of people, or any ordinary succession of bishops, cardinals, or such like, but unto the only word of God; and none of them should be believed but when they speak the word of God. . . . I am sorry, therefore, with all my heart, to see the Church of Christ degenerated into a civil policy; for even as the kings of the world naturally, by descent from their parents, must follow in civil regiment, rule, and law, as by right they ought, even so must such as succeed in the place of bishops and priests that die, possess all gifts and learning of the Holy Ghost, to rule the Church of Christ, as his godly predecessors had; so that the Holy Ghost must be captive and bondman to bishops' sees and palaces. And because the Holy Ghost was in St. Peter at Rome, and in many other godly men that have occupied bishoprics and dioceses, therefore the same gifts, they say, must needs follow in their successors, although, indeed, they be no more like of zeal nor diligence than Peter and Judas, Balaam and Jeremy, Annas and Caiaphas to John and James.” (Vol. ii., p. 90.)

PHILPOT: "The Church is a congregation of people dispersed through the world, agreeing together in the word of God, using the sacraments and all other things according to the same. I do not precisely define the Church, but declare what I think the Church is. The Church is both visible and invisible. The invisible Church is of the elect of God only; the visible consists both of good and bad, using all things in faith, according to God's word. The Church was Catholic in the apostles' time, yet was it not universally received of the world. But because their doctrine which they received of Christ was perfect, and appointed to be preached and received of the whole world, therefore it is called the Catholic faith, and all persons receiving the same to be counted the Catholic Church. And St. Augustine, in another place, writeth that the Catholic Church is that which believeth aright. 'The Church is called, therefore, Catholic, because it is thoroughly perfect, and halteth in nothing.'

Philpot.  
1555.

"But doth Augustine say, I would not believe the Gospel if the authority of the Church did not move me thereto? I grant that the authority of the Church doth move the unbelievers to believe; but yet the Church giveth not the Word its authority; for the Word hath its authority only from God, and not of men; men be but the disposers thereof. For, first, the Word hath its being before the Church, and the Word is the foundation of the Church; and first is the foundation sure, before the building thereon can be steadfast. . . . I deny 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 to be a good proof for the Catholic Church; but a local succession is nothing available." (Pp. 136-9.)

The Catechism of 1553, the last work of the Reformers of the Edwardine period, "may fairly be understood," as Dr.

Randolph remarks, "to contain, as far as it goes, their ultimate decision, and to represent the sense of the Church of England as then established. In this, according to Archbishop Wake, the complete model of our Church Catechism was laid; and it was also in measure a public work, 'the examination of it having been committed (as the Injunction testifies) to certain bishops and other learned men,' after which it was published by the king's authority."\*

Catechism  
of 1553.

"Of the holy Church" this catechism teaches, that it is "a commonwealth, to the furnishing of which belong all they, as many as do truly fear, honor, and call upon God, wholly applying their mind to holy and godly living; and all those that, putting all their hope and trust in Him, do assuredly look for the bliss of everlasting life. But as many as are in this faith steadfast, were forechosen, predestinate, and appointed out to everlasting life, before the world was made. Witness hereof they have within in their hearts, the Spirit of Christ, the author, earnest, and unfailable pledge of their faith. . . . Canst thou yet further depaint me out that congregation, which thou callest a kingdom or commonweal of Christians; and so set it out before mine eyes, that it may severally and plainly be known asunder from each other fellowship of men, . . . some certain congregation that may be seen?"

"That congregation is nothing else but a certain multitude of men: which, wheresoever they be, profess the pure and upright learning of Christ, and that in such sort, as it is faithfully set forth in the holy Testament by the evangelists and apostles: which in all points are governed and ruled by the laws and statutes of their King and high Bishop, Christ, in the bond of charity: which use his holy mysteries, that are commonly called sacraments, with such pureness and simplicity (as touching their nature and substance) as the apostles of Christ used and left behind in writing. The marks, therefore, of this Church are: first, pure preaching of the gospel; then, brotherly love, out of which, as members of all one body,

\* Enchiridion, p. vi.

springeth good will of each to other; thirdly, upright and uncorrupted use of the Lord's sacraments, according to the ordinance of the gospel; last of all, brotherly correction, and excommunication, or banishing those out of the Church that will not amend their lives. This mark the holy fathers termed discipline. This is that same Church that is grounded upon the assured rock, Jesus Christ, and upon trust in Him. This is that same Church which Paul calleth the pillar and upholding stay of truth. To this Church belong the keys, wherewith heaven is locked and unlocked; for that is done by the ministration of the word: whereunto properly appertaineth the power to bind and loose; to hold for guilty, and forgive sins. So that whosoever believeth the gospel preached in this Church, he shall be saved; but whosoever believeth not, he shall be damned." (*Ibid.*, pp. 41, 44, 45.)

## CHAPTER XVI.

THE XI. ARTICLES OF 1559—JEWEL'S APOLOGY—DEFENCE OF THE APOLOGY  
—NOWELL'S CATECHISM.

IN the interval of thirteen years, which elapsed between the accession of Elizabeth and the year 1571, when subscription to the XXXIX. Articles of Religion was first required by a canon of the Convocation, "another independent test of doctrine," known as the *Eleven Articles*, (1559,) was put forth by the English bishops. Of these articles the *third* "acknowledges that Church to be the spouse of Christ, wherein the word of God is truly taught, the sacraments orderly ministered according to Christ's institution, and the authority of the keys duly used; and that every such particular church hath authority to institute, to change, clean to put away ceremonies, and other ecclesiastical rites, as they be superfluous or be absurd, and to constitute other making more to seemliness, to order, or edification."

The XI.  
Articles of  
1559.

The *fourth* "confesses that it is not lawful for any man to take upon him any office or ministry, either ecclesiastical or secular, but such only as are lawfully thereunto called by their high authorities, according to the ordinances of this realm." The *fifth* asserts the royal supremacy, as expressed in an act of Parliament, and as explained by her majesty's "Injunctions." The *sixth* denies the papal monarchy, on the ground that it is "contrary to Scripture and to the example of the primitive Church."

A semi-symbolical authority attaches to two works of this period, Bishop JEWEL'S *Apology of the Church of England*, (1562,) [No. 60,] and Dean NOWELL'S *Catechism*, (1570, first written in Latin, in 1563, and sanctioned by Convocation.) [No. 70.]

Of the *Apology*, five chapters, ii.–vii., treat of *the Church and ministry*, exhibiting the Anglican doctrine in opposition to that of Rome: “We believe that there is one  
 Jewel’s  
 Apology. Church of God, and that the same is not shut up  
 (as in times past among the Jews) into some corner or kingdom, but that it is Catholic and universal, and dispersed throughout the whole world; so that there is now no nation which can truly complain that they be shut forth, and may not be one of the Church and people of God; and that this Church is the kingdom, the body, and the spouse of Christ; and that Christ alone is the Prince of this kingdom; that Christ alone is the head of this body; and that Christ alone is the bridegroom of this spouse.” (Chap. ii.)

“Furthermore, that there be divers degrees of ministers in the Church; whereof some be deacons, some priests, some bishops; to which is committed the office to instruct the people, and the whole charge and setting forth of religion. . . . There neither is, nor can be any one man, which may have the whole superiority in this universal state; for that Christ is ever present to assist his Church, and needeth not any man to supply his room, as his only heir to all his substance; and that there can be no one mortal creature, which is able to comprehend or conceive in his mind the Universal Church, that is, to wit, all the parts of the world, much less able to put them in order, and to govern them rightly and duly. For all the apostles, as Cyprian saith, were of like power among themselves, and the rest were the same that Peter was. And as Hierome saith, ‘all bishops wheresoever they be, at Rome, at Eugubium, at Constantinople, etc., be all of like pre-eminence and of like priesthood.’ And, as Cyprian saith, ‘there is but one bishopric, and that a piece thereof is perfectly and wholly holden of every particular bishop.’ And according to the judgment of the Nicene Council, we say that the Bishop of Rome hath no more jurisdiction over the Church of God, than the rest of the patriarchs, either of Alexandria or Antiochia, have.

“Moreover, we say that the minister ought lawfully, duly,

and orderly to be preferred to that office, and that no man hath power to wrest himself into the holy ministry at his own pleasure ; . . . that Christ hath given to his ministers power to bind, to loose, to open, to shut, and that the office of loosing consisteth in this point, that the minister should either offer by the preaching of the gospel the merits of Christ, and full pardon to such as have lowly and contrite hearts, and do unfeignedly repent them, pronouncing unto the same a sure and undoubted forgiveness of their sins, and hope of everlasting salvation ; or else, that the minister, when any have offended their brothers' minds with a great offence, and with a notable and open fault, whereby they have as it were banished, and made themselves strangers from the common fellowship, and from the body of Christ, then after perfect amendment of such persons, doth reconcile them and bring them home again, and restore them to the unity and company of the faithful. We say also, that the minister doth execute the authority of binding and shutting, as often as he shutteth up the gate of heaven against the unbelieving and stubborn persons, denouncing unto them God's vengeance and everlasting punishment ; or else when he doth quite shut them out from the bosom of the Church by open excommunication. Out of doubt, what sentence soever the minister of God shall give in this sort, God himself doth so well allow of it, that whatsoever here on earth by their means is loosed and bound, God himself will bind and confirm the same in heaven.

“ And touching the keys, wherewith they may either shut or open the kingdom of heaven, we with Chrysostom say they be ‘ the knowledge of the Scriptures ; ’ with Tertullian we say they be ‘ the interpretation of the law ; ’ and with Eusebius we call them ‘ the word of God.’

“ Moreover, that Christ's disciples did receive this authority . . . to the end they should go, they should teach, they should publish abroad the gospel, and be unto the believing a sweet savor of life unto life, and unto the unbelieving and unfaithful a savor of death unto death. Seeing then the key, whereby

the way and entry to the kingdom of God is opened unto us, is the word of the gospel, . . . we say plainly, where the same word is not, there is not the key. And seeing one manner of word is given to all, and one only key belongeth to all, we say that there is but one only power of all ministers, as concerning opening and shutting."

In the *Defence of the Apology*, JEWEL affirms that "great and worthy is the authority of the Church of God; yet is not the truth of God's gospel always known by the name of the Church; but, contrariwise, the true Church is always known by the gospel." (Vol. iii., p. 326.) "It is not sufficient to claim succession of place, it behoveth us rather to have regard to the succession of doctrine. So saith St. Augustine: 'The outward mark or right of a bishop many give to wolves, and be wolves themselves.' Therefore the ancient father Irenæus giveth us this good counsel: 'It becometh us to obey those priests in the Church which have their succession from the apostles; and together with the succession of their bishoprics, according to the good will of God the Father, have received the undoubted gift of the truth.'" (*Id.*, p. 349.)

NOWELL'S *Catechism*, in its exposition of "the fourth part of the Creed," gives the following "definition of the Church": "The Church is the body of the Christian commonweal; that is, the universal number and fellowship of all the faithful, whom God through Christ hath before all beginning of time appointed to everlasting life." . . . "The holiness of the Church is not yet full and perfectly finished, but yet very well begun. But when it shall be fully joined to Christ, from whom she hath all her cleanness and pureness, then shall she be clothed with innocency and holiness, in all points fully and perfectly finished, as with a certain snowy white and most pure garment."

This Church is Catholic or universal as comprising "the universal number of the faithful, that have lived, and shall live in all places and ages, since the beginning of the world,

that there may be one body of the Church, as there is one Christ, the only head of the body.

“These two — ‘the holy Church’ and ‘the communion of saints’ — belong all to one thing, and are very fitly matched and agreeing together. For this parcel doth somewhat more plainly express the conjoining and society that is among the members of the Church, than which there can none be nearer. For, whereas God hath as well in all coasts and countries as in all times and ages, them that worship him purely and sincerely, all they, though they be severed and sundered by divers and far distant times and places, in what nation soever, or in what land soever they be, are yet members most nearly conjoined and knit together, of one and of the selfsame body, whereof Christ is the Head; such is the communion that the godly have with God and among themselves. For they are most nearly knit together in community of spirit, of faith, of sacraments, of prayers, of forgiveness of sins, of eternal felicity, and, finally, of all the benefits that God giveth his Church through Christ. Yea, they are so joined together with most strait bonds of concord and love, they have so all one mind, that the profit of any one and of them all is all one; and to this endeavor they do most bend themselves, how they may with interchange of beneficial doings, with counsel and help, further each other in all things, and specially to attaining of that blessed and eternal life. But because this communion of saints cannot be perceived by our senses, nor by any natural kind of knowledge or force of understanding, as other civil communities and fellowships of men may be, therefore it is here rightly placed among these things that lie in belief. . . .

“But may the Church be otherwise known than by believing — by faith? Here in the Creed is properly entreated of the congregation of those whom God by his secret election hath adopted to himself through Christ, which Church can neither be seen with eyes nor can continually be known by signs. Yet there is a Church of God visible, or that may be seen, the tokens or marks whereof he doth show and open unto us. . . . The visible Church is nothing else but a certain

multitude of men, which, in what place soever they be, do profess the doctrine of Christ, pure and sincere, even the same which the evangelists and apostles have, in the everlasting monuments of holy Scriptures, faithfully disclosed to memory, and which do truly call upon God the Father in the name of Christ, and moreover do use his mysteries, commonly called sacraments, with the same pureness and simplicity (as touching their substance) which the apostles of Christ used and have put in writing. . . . The sincere preaching of the gospel — that is to say, of the benefits of Christ, invocation and administration of the sacraments — these are indeed the chief and the necessary marks of the visible Church, such as without the which it cannot be indeed, nor rightly be called, the Church of Christ. But yet also in the same Church, if it be well ordered, there shall be seen to be observed a certain order and manner of governance, and such a form of ecclesiastical discipline, that it shall not be free for any that abideth in that flock publicly to speak or do anything wickedly or in heinous sort without punishment; yea, and so that in that congregation of men all offences (so far as is possible) be avoided. But this discipline since long time past, by little and little decaying, as the manners of men be corrupt and out of right course, specially of the rich and men of power, which will needs have impunity and most free liberty to sin and do wickedly, this grave manner of looking to them and of chastisement can hardly be maintained in churches. But in whatsoever assembly the word of God, the calling upon Him, and his sacraments are purely and sincerely retained, it is no doubt that there is also the Church of Christ.

“Are not, then, all they that be in this visible Church of the number of the elect to everlasting life?”

“Many, by hypocrisy and counterfeiting of godliness, do join themselves to this fellowship, which are nothing less than true members of the Church. But, forasmuch as wheresoever the word of God is sincerely taught, and His sacraments rightly ministered, there are ever some appointed to salvation by Christ, we count all that whole company to be the Church of

God, seeing that Christ also promiseth that himself will be present with two or three that be gathered together in his name.

“Why dost thou, by and by, after the Church, make mention of the forgiveness of sins?”

“First, because the keys, wherewith heaven is to be shut and opened, that is, the power of binding and loosing, of reserving and forgiving sins, which standeth in the ministry of the word of God, is by Christ given and committed to the Church, and properly belongeth unto the Church. Secondly, because no man obtaineth forgiveness of sins that is not a true member of the body of Christ, that is, such a one as doth not earnestly, godlily, holily, yea, and continually and to the end embrace and maintain the common fellowship of the Church.

“Is there, then, no hope of salvation out of the Church?”

“Out of it can be nothing but damnation, death, and destruction. For what hope of life can remain to the members when they are pulled asunder and cut off from the head and body? They, therefore, that seditiously stir up discord in the Church of God, and make division and strife in it, and trouble it with sects, have all hope of safety by forgiveness of sins cut off from them, till they be reconciled and return to agreement and favor with the Church.”

## CHAPTER XVII.

THE TRIDENTINE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH — CREED OF PIUS IV. — CATECHISM OF THE COUNCIL — THE CHURCH TRIUMPHANT AND THE CHURCH MILITANT DEFINED — THE FOUR NOTES OF THE CHURCH — “THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS” — SACRAMENT OF ORDER — ORDER DEFINED — THE PRIESTHOOD — PRIESTLY FUNCTIONS — DEGREES IN THE PRIESTHOOD — THE MINISTER OF THE SACRAMENT — EFFECTS OF THE SACRAMENT.

THE DECREES of the Council of TRENT, put forth in 1564, contain no definition of the Church. The Creed of Pope PIUS IV., (1564,) and the CATECHISM of the Council, (1566,) [No. 63,] supply the deficiency. In the former

1545-1563.

document — a brief epitome of the chief heads of Tridentine doctrine, universally received as an accurate summary of the Romish faith — is the following article:  
Creed of Pius IV. “I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Rome to be the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, successor of the prince of the apostles, St. Peter, and the vicegerent of Jesus Christ.”

The statements of the *Catechism* are clear and ample; of these I here cite only the more important: “The Church, according to St. Augustine’s definition, is the body of the faithful, dispersed throughout the world;” a definition not sufficiently comprehensive, inas-

Catechismus Romanus.

much as “the Church consists principally of two parts, the one called the Church triumphant, the other, militant. The Church triumphant is the most glorious and happy assemblage of blessed spirits, and of those who have triumphed over the world, the flesh, and the devil, and who, now free and secure from the troubles of this life, enjoy everlasting bliss. . . . But the Church militant is the society

The Church Triumphant.

of all the faithful who still dwell on earth, and is called militant because it wages eternal war with those most implacable enemies, the world, the flesh, and the devil. We are not, however, to infer that there are two churches; but there are two constituent parts of the same Church. In the Church militant there are two classes of persons, The Church  
Militant. the good and the bad; and the bad profess the same faith, and partake of the same sacraments, differing in life and morals. Who they are that are good may be conjectured, but cannot be known with certainty. Of this part of the Church, therefore, we are not to suppose Christ our Saviour to speak, when he refers us to the Church, and commands us to obey her; for, unknown as is that portion of the Church, how can any one be certain to whose decision he should recur, whose authority obey?

“Thus is the Church known, and is compared to a city set upon a hill, and seen from every side; for as all must yield obedience to her authority, it is necessary that she be known. . . . But although both the good and the bad belong to the Church, yet it is to be explained to the faithful — that very different is the condition of each class. For the wicked are contained in the Church as the chaff is mingled with the grain on the threshing-floor, or as dead members sometimes remain attached to a (living) body.

“Hence only three classes of persons are excluded from her pale: first, infidels; next, heretics and schismatics; and lastly, the excommunicated: infidels, because they never belonged to, and never knew the Church, nor were ever made partakers of the sacraments, in the communion of a Christian people; (this class includes pagans, Mohammedans, and Jews;) heretics and schismatics, because they have severed themselves from the Church. They are still, however, subject to the power of the Church, seeing that they may be cited before her tribunal, punished and condemned by anathema. Finally, excommunicated persons also, because excluded by her sentence from the Church, belong not to her communion, until they repent. As to the rest, although shameful and wicked

persons, there is no doubt that they still continue in the Church; and of this the faithful are frequently to be informed, in order that they may have the assurance that even were the lives of her ministers debased by crime, they are still included within her pale, and forfeit, on that account, none of their prerogatives.

“The first distinctive character of the true Church consists in its unity. So vast a multitude, although scattered far and wide, is called one, for the reasons named by St. Paul — *One Lord, one faith, one baptism*. This Church has, also, one ruler and governor, the invisible, Christ, whom the eternal Father *hath made* head over all the Church, which is his body; but the visible is he who, the legitimate successor of Peter, the prince of the apostles, occupies the See of Rome.

“That this visible head was necessary to establish and preserve the unity of the Church, is the unanimous reasoning and opinion of the Fathers. . . . Should any one object that the Church, content with one head and spouse, Jesus Christ, requires no other beside, an answer is readily found, for, as we have Christ not only the author of all the sacraments, but also their inward minister — for He it is that baptizes and absolves; and yet he appoints men as external ministers of the sacraments — so has he placed over his Church, which He governs by his most inward spirit, a man to be the vicar and minister of his power; for as a visible Church requires a visible head, our Saviour appointed Peter head and pastor of all the faithful, when, in the most ample terms, He committed to his care the feeding of his sheep, so as that He willed his successor to have the very same power of ruling and governing the whole Church.”

The Church is also called one as being animated by one and the same Spirit, “who imparts grace to the faithful, as the soul imparts life to the members of the body; as all being called to one hope, viz., eternal life;” and as all holding and professing one faith, and one baptism, which is the sacrament of the Christian faith.

Notes of the  
Church:

I. Unity.

“As to the second distinctive mark of the Church — *holiness* : The Church is called holy because *she is consecrated and dedicated to God*, . . . as under the old law, vessels, vestments, altars, when appropriated to divine worship, are called holy. The Church, although containing many sinners, is called holy; . . . the faithful, though offending in many things, are called holy, because they have been made the people of God, or have consecrated themselves to Christ by faith and baptism. Hence, St. Paul calls the Corinthians sanctified and holy, although there were some amongst them whom he sharply rebukes as carnal, and even charges with grosser crimes. She is also to be called holy, because, as the body, she is united to her head, Christ the Lord, the fountain of all holiness, from whom flow the graces of the Holy Spirit, and the riches of the divine bounty. Yet further, the Church alone has the legitimate worship of sacrifice, and the salutary use of the sacraments, by which, as by the efficacious instruments of divine grace, God effects true holiness; so that *who-soever are really holy cannot be outside this Church*.

II. Sanctity.

“The third distinctive mark of the Church is, that she is called Catholic, that is universal — as embracing in the bosom of her love all mankind;” . . . and as comprehending “all the faithful who have existed from Adam up to the present day, or who shall exist to the end of time.”

III.  
Catholicity.

“We may also know the true Church from her origin, which she derives, under the revelation of grace, from the apostles; for her doctrines are truths neither novel nor of recent origin, but delivered of old by the apostles, and diffused throughout the whole world. . . . Wherefore, that all might know the true Catholic Church, the Fathers, guided by the spirit of God, added in the Creed the word APOSTOLIC. For the Holy Ghost, who presides over the Church, governs her by no other than apostolic ministers; and this Spirit was first imparted to the apostles, and has, by the supreme goodness of God, always remained in the Church.”

IV.  
Apostolicity.

“Being thus divinely guided, this one Church cannot err in delivering the discipline of faith and morals; but all other societies, calling themselves churches, guided as they are by the spirit of the devil, are necessarily sunk in the most pernicious errors both of doctrine and morals.”

In answer to the question, how belief in the Church belongs to the Articles of Faith? the explanation is, that although the Church, so far as it is a community of men consecrated to Christ, is a visible body, and, as such, not apprehended by faith, yet the *mysteries*, that is, the sacraments of the Church, belong to the sphere of faith; and it is “by faith that we understand that to the Church have been committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven; the power of remitting sins; of excommunicating; and of consecrating the real body of Christ.”

“The last clause of this article—‘the communion of saints,’ is a sort of explanation of the preceding one; and is mainly to be understood as expressing that participation which all the members of the Church have in her sacraments. But although common to all the (seven) sacraments, because they all unite us to God, and render us partakers of Him whose grace we receive; this word *communion* belongs in a more special manner to the Eucharist, which accomplishes this communion itself.

The  
Communion  
of Saints.

“But there is another communion in the Church: every pious and holy deed performed by one appertains to all, and becomes profitable to all, through charity: as in the human body, according to the image so often used in Scripture to illustrate the constitution of the Church: ‘if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it.’”

“But they only who lead a Christian life in charity . . . enjoy the participation of so many and so great blessings. The dead members, men, that is to say, who are bound in the thralldom of sins, and estranged from the grace of God, although not deprived of the advantage of continuing to be members of this body, yet, as dead members, lack the spiritual fruit which is communicated to just and pious men. However, as they

are in the Church, they are assisted in recovering lost grace and life, by those who live by the Spirit; and they enjoy those fruits which are, we cannot doubt, denied to such as are utterly cut off from the Church." (*Chap. x., Qucs. 1-25.*)

Of the Sacrament of ORDER the Tridentine doctrine, as set forth in the twenty-third session of the council, is fully exhibited in the seventh chapter of the second part of the Catechism. The leading points of this exposition are embraced in the following brief abstract :

Sacrament  
of Order.

"The appellation *Order*, understood in its strict and proper acceptation, is the disposition of superior and inferior things, which are so well adapted to each other as to stand in reciprocal relation. Comprising, as the ministry does, many gradations and various functions, and disposed, as all these are, with regularity, it is appropriately called the sacrament of *Order*.

What is  
Order?

"The power conferred by God on his Church and her ministers is twofold: of order and of jurisdiction. The power of order has reference to the real body of Christ our Lord in the holy Eucharist; that of jurisdiction, altogether to his mystical body, embracing the government and guidance of the flock of God.

"The power of order includes not only the prerogative of consecrating the Eucharist, but also of preparing the souls of men for its reception, and embraces whatever else has reference in any way to the Eucharist.

"Whereas a sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing, and as the external forms used in this consecration are significant of the grace and power conferred on him who is consecrated, it follows that order is truly a sacrament. Hence the bishop, handing to him who is being ordained priest a cup containing wine and water, and a paten with bread, says: *Receive the power of offering sacrifice*, etc.; by which words the Church hath always taught that, whilst the matter is presented, the power of consecrating the Eucharist is conferred, a character being impressed upon the soul, to

Order a  
sacrament.

which is attached grace for the due discharge of this ministry, as the apostle declares, *2 Tim.* i. 6, *sq.*

“The number of orders of ministers, according to the arrangement of the Church, is seven: porter, reader, exorcist, acolyte, sub-deacon, deacon, priest. Of these orders the last three are greater, called *holy*, the first four are lesser, called *minor orders*.

“The third and highest degree of all the holy orders is the priesthood. The ancient fathers distinguish persons endued with the priesthood by two names: *presbyters*, or elders, and *priests*, (sacerdotes,) because they are consecrated to God, and because to them it belongs to administer the sacraments, and to handle sacred things.

“There is a twofold priesthood: the *internal*, to which all the faithful belong, offering, as they do, spiritual sacrifices unto God, (*Rev.* i. 5, *1 Pet.* ii. 5, *Rom.* xii. 1, *Ps.* l. 19;) and the *external*, which is confined to certain men who, consecrated to God by the lawful imposition of hands, and the solemn ceremonies of the Church, are devoted to some particular sacred office of the ministry.

“The office of the priest is to offer sacrifice unto God, and to administer the sacraments of the Church. . . . By the rites used at his consecration he is constituted an interpreter and mediator between God and man, which must be deemed the principal function of the priesthood; and he has, moreover, bestowed upon him the celestial power of remitting and retaining sins.

“The priesthood, although one order, has yet different degrees of dignity and power. The *first* is that of *priests*, already explained. The *second* is that of *bishops*, who are placed over their respective sees, to govern not only the other ministers of the Church, but the faithful people, and with supreme care and vigilance to watch over their salvation. . . . Bishops are frequently in Scripture called *the pastors of the sheep*. (*Acts* xx. 28.) They are also called *pontiffs*, a name borrowed from the ancient Romans, and used by them to designate their chief-priests. The *third*

degree is that of *archbishops*, who preside over several bishops, and who are also called *metropolitans*, because placed over the metropolis of the province. *Patriarchs* occupy the *fourth* place, and are, as the name imports, the first and supreme fathers in the episcopal order. Formerly, besides the Supreme Roman Pontiff, there were but four patriarchs in the Church, whose dignity, however, was not the same; for the Patriarch of Constantinople was first in rank, next of Alexandria, third of Antioch, fourth of Jerusalem. Beyond all these, the Catholic Church has ever revered the Sovereign Pontiff of Rome, whom Cyril of Alexandria denominated, in the Council of Ephesus, the chief bishop, father, and patriarch of the whole world. And whereas he sitteth in that chair in which it is certain that Peter, the prince of the apostles, sat to the close of life, the Catholic Church recognizes in his person the highest degree of dignity, and the amplitude of jurisdiction; a dignity and a jurisdiction not based on any synodal, or other human constitutions, but given from on high. Wherefore, as successor to Peter, and the true and legitimate vicar on earth of Christ the Lord, he presides over the Universal Church, the father and governor of all the faithful, of bishops, and of all other prelates, be their office and power what it may."

"To the bishop and the bishop alone it belongs as his proper office to confer holy orders; for subdeacons, deacons, and priests are ordained by one bishop only, but according to an apostolic tradition, which has always been preserved in the Church, a bishop is consecrated by three bishops.

The minister of the sacrament of order.

"Though primarily instituted with reference to the advantage of the Church, the sacrament of order imparts to the soul of him who receives it sanctifying grace, by which he is qualified to discharge with propriety the duties of his office, and to administer the sacraments; even as the grace of baptism qualifies for the reception of the other sacraments. By this sacrament, also, is conferred a special power in reference to the most holy Eucharist, a power full and perfect in the priest, who alone can consecrate the

Effects of the sacrament.

body and blood of our Lord ; but in the other subordinate ministers, greater or less in proportion to their nearer approximation to the sacred duties of the altar. This power is also denominated a spiritual character, because, by a certain interior mark impressed on the soul, those who have received holy orders are distinguished from the rest of the faithful, and devoted to the divine service." (1 *Tim.* iv. 13; 2 *Tim.* i. 6.)

Such, in a brief abstract, is the teaching of the Roman Catechism in regard to the Christian ministry, based on the decrees of the twenty-third session of the Council of Trent. But while the decrees contain the doctrinal statements of the council, in a positive form, it is in the canons anathematizing the opposite views, that the points of difference between the Romish and the Protestant teaching are most clearly brought to light.

Thus the eight canons of the twenty-third session anathematize any one who may affirm, I. That there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood ; or that there is not a power of consecrating and offering the body and blood of the Lord, and of remitting and retaining sins ; but that there is only the bare office and ministry of preaching the gospel ; or that those who do not preach are no priests at all ; II. That there are not in the Catholic Church both the lesser and greater orders, through which, as by divine degrees, the priesthood is attained ; III. That ordination is not a sacrament, truly and properly such, instituted by Christ, or that it is only a rite by means of which ministers of God's word and sacraments are elected ; IV. That by means of ordination the Holy Spirit is not given, and hence that the bishop speaks the words, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, without effect ; or that by it a character is not impressed ; or that he who has once been a priest may again become a layman ; V. That the holy unction and other ceremonies used in ordination are not only unnecessary, but also pernicious and to be contemned ; VI. That there is not in the Catholic Church a hierarchy instituted by divine appointment, consisting of bishops, presbyters and ministers ; VII. That bishops are not superior to presbyters, or that they

have not the power of confirming and ordaining ; or that they have it in common with presbyters ; or that orders conferred by them without the consent or call of the people, or of the secular power, are invalid ; or that those who have neither been rightly ordained, nor sent by ecclesiastical and canonical power, but in some other way, are lawful ministers of the word and sacraments ; VIII. That bishops who are constituted by the authority of the Roman Pontiff are not lawful and true bishops, but a human figment.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

THE GREEK AND GREEK-RUSSIAN CHURCH — DEFINITION OF THE CHURCH — THOUGH VISIBLE, AN OBJECT OF FAITH — THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH — COMMUNION OF SAINTS — INVOCATION OF SAINTS — HOLINESS OF THE CHURCH — CATHOLICITY — INDEFECTIBILITY — EXCLUSIVENESS — PECULIAR PRIVILEGES OF THE EASTERN CHURCH — APOSTOLICITY — THE HIERARCHY — AUTHORITY OF ŒCUMENICAL COUNCILS — SACRAMENT OF ORDERS.

WITH the doctrine of Trent let us compare that of the modern Greek, or Greek-Russian Church, as authentically set forth in the *CATECHISM of the Orthodox Catholic, Eastern Church*. [No. 724.]

“ Q. What is the Church ?

The Church  
defined.

“ A. The Church is a divinely instituted community of men, united by the orthodox faith, the law of God, the hierarchy, and the sacraments.

“ Q. What is it to believe in the Church ?

Belief in  
the Church.

“ A. It is piously to honor the true Church of Christ, and to obey her doctrine and commandments, from a conviction that grace ever abides in her, and works, teaches, and governs unto salvation, flowing from her One only everlasting Head, the Lord Jesus Christ.

“ Q. How can the Church, which is visible, be the object of faith, when faith, as the apostle says, is ‘ the evidence of things not seen ’ ?

The object  
of faith.

“ A. First, though the Church be visible, the grace of God which dwells in her, and in those who are sanctified in her, is not so ; and this it is which properly constitutes the object of faith in the Church.

“ Secondly, the Church, though visible so far as she is upon earth, and contains all orthodox Christians living upon earth,

still is at the same time invisible, so far as she is also partially in heaven, and contains all those that have departed hence in true faith and holiness.

“*Q.* On what may we ground the idea that the Church is at once upon earth and in heaven?

“*A.* On the following words of the Apostle Paul, addressed to Christians: ‘Ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,’ etc. (*Heb.* xii. 22-24.)

“*Q.* Why is the Church ONE?

“*A.* Because she is one spiritual Body, has one Head, Christ, and is animated by one Spirit of God. Unity.  
*There is one Body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all.* (*Eph.* iv. 4-6.)

“*Q.* Are we still more expressly assured that Jesus Christ is the one only Head of the one Church?

“*A.* The Apostle Paul writes, that for the Church, as *the building of God, other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.* (*1 Cor.* iii. 10, 11.) Wherefore the Church, as the Body of Christ, can have no other Head than Jesus Christ.

“The Church, being to abide through all generations of time, needs also an ever-abiding Head; and such is Jesus Christ alone.

“*Q.* How does it agree with the unity of the Church, that there are many separate and independent churches, as those of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Russia?

“*A.* These are particular churches, or parts of the one Catholic Church: the separateness of their visible organization does not hinder them from being all spiritually great members of the one body of the Universal Church, from having one Head, Christ, and one spirit of faith and grace. This unity is expressed outwardly by unity of Creed, and by communion in Prayer and Sacraments.

“*Q.* Is there likewise unity between the Church on earth and the Church in heaven?

“*A.* Doubtless there is, both by their common relation to one Head, our Lord Jesus Christ, and by mutual communion with one another.

Communion  
of Saints.

“*Q.* What means of communion has the Church on earth with the Church in heaven?

“*A.* The prayer of faith and love. The faithful who belong to the Church militant upon earth, in offering their prayers to God, call at the same time to their aid the saints who belong to the Church in heaven; and these, standing on the highest steps of approach to God, by their prayers and intercessions purify, strengthen, and offer before God the prayers of the faithful living upon earth, and by the will of God work graciously and beneficently upon them, either by invisible virtue, or by distinct apparitions, and in divers other ways.

Invocation  
of Saints.

“*Q.* On what is grounded the rule of the Church upon earth to invoke in prayer the Saints of the Church in heaven?

“*A.* On a holy tradition, the principle of which is to be seen also in holy Scripture. For instance, when the prophet David cries out in prayer, *O Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, our fathers*; he makes mention of saints in aid of his prayer, exactly as now the Orthodox Church calls upon *Christ our true God*, by the prayers of his most pure Mother and all his Saints. (See 1 Chron. xxix. 18.)

Ground of  
the practice.

“*A.* Because she is sanctified by Jesus Christ through his passion, through his doctrine, through his prayer, and through the sacraments. *Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it*, etc. (Eph. v. 25-27.)

“*Q.* Why is the Church HOLY?

“*A.* Because she is sanctified by Jesus Christ through his passion, through his doctrine, through his prayer, and through the sacraments. *Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it*, etc. (Eph. v. 25-27.)

Holiness.

“*Q.* How is the Church holy, when she has in her sinners?

“*A.* Men who sin, but purify themselves by true repentance, hinder not the Church from being holy; but impenitent sinners, either by the visible act of Church authority, or by the invisible judgment of God, are cut off from the body of the Church; and so she is in respect of these also kept holy. *Put away*, etc. (1 Cor. v. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 19.)

“*Q.* Why is the Church called *Catholic*, or, which is the same thing, *Universal*?

“*A.* Because she is not limited to any place, or time, or people, but contains true believers of all places, times, and peoples. Catholicity.

“*Q.* What great privilege has the Catholic Church?

“*A.* She alone has the sublime promises that *the gates of hell shall not prevail against her*; that the Lord shall *be with her, even to the end of the world*; that in her shall abide *the glory of God in Christ Jesus throughout all generations for ever*; and, consequently, that she shall never apostatize from the faith, nor sin against the truth of the faith, or fall into error. Indefectibility.

“‘We undoubtingly confess, as sure truth, that the Catholic Church cannot sin, or err, nor utter falsehood in place of truth; for the Holy Ghost, ever working through his faithful ministers, the fathers and doctors of the Church, preserves her from all error.’ (*Missive of the Eastern Patriarchs on the Orthodox Faith*, art. xii.) Infallibility.

“*Q.* If the Catholic Church contains all true believers in the world, must we not acknowledge it to be necessary for salvation that every believer should belong to her?

“*A.* Exactly so. Since Jesus Christ, in the words of St. Paul, is the Head of the Church, and He is the Saviour of the body, it follows that to have part in his salvation we must necessarily be members of his body, that is, of the Catholic Church. (*Ephes.* v. 23.) Exclusiveness.

“*Q.* What thoughts and remembrances should we associate with the name of the *Eastern* Church?

“*A.* In Paradise, planted in the East, was founded the first Church of our parents in innocence; and in the East, after the fall, was laid a new foundation of the Church of the redeemed, in the promise of a Saviour. In the East, in the land of Judea, our Lord Jesus Christ, having finished the work of our salvation, laid the foundation of his own proper Christian Church; from thence she spread herself over the whole universe; and to this day the Peculiar privileges.

Orthodox Catholic Œcumenical faith, confirmed by the seven Œcumenical Councils, is preserved unchanged in its original purity in the ancient churches of the East, and in such as agree with them, as does, by God's grace, the Church of Russia.

“Q. Why is the Church called *Apostolic*?

“A. Because she has from the apostles, without break or change, both her doctrine and the succession of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, through the laying on of consecrated hands. In the same sense the Church is called also *Orthodox*, or *Rightly-believing*. *Ye are no more strangers and foreigners*, etc. (*Ephes. ii. 19, 20.*)

“Q. What ecclesiastical institution is there through which the succession of the apostolical ministry is preserved?

“A. The Ecclesiastical *Hierarchy*.

The  
Hierarchy.

“Q. Whence originates the Hierarchy of the Orthodox Christian Church?

“A. From Jesus Christ Himself, and from the descent of the Holy Ghost on the apostles; from which time it is continued in unbroken succession through the laying on of hands, in the sacrament of orders. *And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets*, etc. (*Ephes. iv. 11.*)

“Q. What hierarchical authority is there which can extend its sphere of action over the whole Catholic Church?

“A. An Œcumenical Council.

General  
Councils.

“Q. Under what hierarchical authority are the chief divisions of the Catholic Church?

“A. Under the Orthodox Patriarchs, and the most Holy Synod.

“Q. Under what ecclesiastical authority are lesser orthodox provinces and cities?

“A. Under Metropolitans, Archbishops, and Bishops.

“Q. What rank in the hierarchy is held by the most Holy Synod?

“A. The same rank with the most Holy Orthodox Patriarchs.

“Q. If any one desire to fulfil his duty of obedience to the Church, how may he learn what she requires of her children?

“A. This may be learned from holy Scripture, from the

canons of the holy Apostles, the holy Œcumenical and Provincial Councils, and the holy Fathers, and from the books of ecclesiastical rules and rubrics."

The Catechism teaches that "orders are a sacrament, in which the Holy Ghost, by the laying on of the bishop's hands, ordains them that be rightly chosen to minister sacraments, and to feed the flock of Christ; that of orders there are three necessary *degrees* — those of *bishop*, *priest*, and *deacon*;" that the difference between them is indicated by their respective functions: "The deacon serves at the sacraments; the priest hallows the sacraments in dependence on the bishop; the bishop not only hallows the sacraments himself, but has power also to impart to others, by the laying on of his hands, the gift and grace to hallow them." (On the ninth and tenth articles of the Creed.)

Sacrament  
of Orders.

## CHAPTER XIX.

RISE OF THE PURITAN CONTROVERSY — ADMONITION TO THE PARLIAMENT — CARTWRIGHT AND WHITGIFT — POINTS IN CONTROVERSY — SIR F. KNOLLYS' EXCEPTIONS TO WHITGIFT'S STATEMENTS CONCERNING EPISCOPACY — BELLARMINE'S STATEMENT OF THE ROMAN DOCTRINE — THE CHURCH MILITANT — NOTES OF THE CHURCH — PAPAL INFALLIBILITY — FOUR DISTINCT OPINIONS — BELLARMINE'S EXPOSITION — COMPARATIVE AUTHORITY OF THE POPE AND A GENERAL COUNCIL.

THE year 1572 is marked by the rise of the great Puritan controversy. The discussion was opened by the publication of "An Admonition to the Parliament, for the Reformation of Church Discipline," [No. 74;] setting forth what was called "the Platform of a Church," — the manner of electing ministers, their prerogatives and duties, and arguments to prove their equality in government, the alleged corruptions of the hierarchy, and a petition to Parliament for the establishment by law of a scriptural (presbyterial) discipline.

Rise of the  
Puritan contro-  
versy, 1572.

The authorship of this production, famous as originating a debate which has extended through three centuries, down to our own day, is to be ascribed to John Field and Thomas Wilcocks, the prime leaders of the Puritan movement at its first rise. CARTWRIGHT, who speedily became the acknowledged coryphæus of the Puritan cause, first came forth in the same year, as the author of *A Second Admonition to the Parliament*, [No. 75,] reinforcing the argument of the first. This was promptly followed by *An Answer*, [No. 76,] from the pen of Dr. JOHN WHITGIFT, written by the appointment and under the direct supervision of the primate.

Cartwright and  
Whitgift.

1573. CARTWRIGHT rejoined in a volume entitled *A Reply to an Answer made of M. Dr. Whitgift, etc.*,

[No. 77,] by T. C. The year following appeared Whitgift's very able and elaborate apology in behalf of the Anglican, as against the Genevan discipline, entitled *The Defence of the Answer to the Admonition*, etc. [No. 79.] 1574.

Prior to this, and probably intended as an introduction to Whitgift's bulky folio, was the publication of a small volume (anonymous) entitled *A Defence of the Ecclesiastical Regiment in England, defaced by T. C. in his Reply against Dr. Whitgift*, [No. 78,] and, following close upon the appearance of the *Defence of the Answer to the Admonition*, came out a volume of like dimensions, without the author's name, but known to be from the pen of Cartwright, under the title of *An Examination of Mr. D. Whitgift's Censure, entitled "The Defence,"* etc. [No. 80.]

A year later, the great Puritan, now in exile, put forth *The Second Reply of Thomas Cartwright against Master Dr. Whitgift's Second Answer touching the Church Discipline*, [No. 81,] a quarto volume, printed in a rude black letter, evidently the issue of a foreign press. In completion of the work, the *Second Part of the Second Reply* appeared two years after the first, in 1577. [No. 82.] 1575.

The leading points discussed in this disputation — memorable as the first in the long series of the Puritan Discipline debates — were the following: I. The standard of final appeal. According to Whitgift, while the Scriptures constitute the perfect Rule of *Faith*, they furnish no unchangeable rule for the government of the Church; this being in its nature changeable, and subject to the regulation of the civil authority. Since no form of church polity is prescribed in the New Testament, no one form can claim to be of *divine right*. "There are two kinds of government in the Church," he writes, "the one invisible, the other visible; the one spiritual, the other external. The invisible and spiritual government of the Church is, when God, by his Spirit, gifts, and ministry of his word, doth govern it, by ruling in the hearts and consciences of men, and directing them in all things necessary to everlasting life; this kind of government indeed is necessary to

Points in  
dispute.

Standard  
of judgment.

salvation, and it is in the Church of the elect only. The visible and external government is that which is executed by man, and consisteth of external discipline, and visible ceremonies practised in that Church, and over that Church, that containeth in it both good and evil, which is usually called the visible Church of Christ." . . . "But to be short, I confess that in a Church collected together in one place, and at liberty, government is necessary in the second kind of necessity;" — that is, as before explained, not "that without which a thing cannot be," but "*that without the which it cannot so well and conveniently be* — but that any one kind of government is so necessary that without it the Church cannot be saved, or that it may not be altered into some other kind thought to be more expedient, I utterly deny; and the reasons that move me so to do be these :

Reasons why  
the Church is  
not tied to one  
kind of gov-  
ernment.

"The first is, because *I find no one certain and perfect kind of government prescribed or commanded in the Scriptures* to the Church of Christ; which, no doubt, should have been done if it had been a matter necessary unto the salvation of the Church.

"Secondly, because the essential notes of the Church be these only: the true preaching of the word of God, and the right administration of the sacraments; for, as Master Calvin saith, . . . 'Wheresoever we see the word of God truly preached, and God according to the same truly worshipped, and the sacraments without superstition administered, there we may, without all controversy, conclude the Church of God to be.' The same is the opinion of other godly and learned writers, and the judgment of the Reformed Churches, as appeareth from their confessions. So that, notwithstanding government, or some kind of government, may be a part of the Church, touching the outward form and perfection of it, yet is it not such a part of the essence and being but that it may be the Church of Christ without this or that kind of government; and therefore the 'kind of government' of the Church is not 'necessary to salvation.' "

Cartwright, on the other hand, contended that the Scriptures

constitute the exclusive rule alike of church-government and doctrine; that *everything* pertaining to the Church must be drawn from the word of God.

II. As to the election of ministers, Whitgift maintained that the power of election and appointment, as well as of ordination, vested of right (*jure humano*, i. e. as by law in England established, not *jure divino*) in the bishop: "I condemn no churches that have appointed any order for the electing of their pastors which they think to be agreeable to their state, and most profitable for them; for, therefore, I say that no certain manner or form of electing ministers is prescribed in the Scripture, because every church may do therein as it shall seem to be most expedient for the same. . . . In the apostles' time there were divers manners of ordaining and electing ministers. For sometime one alone did choose and ordain, sometime many; sometime ministers only, and sometime the people also." (i., pp. 369, 428, *sq.*)

Election of  
ministers.

Cartwright contended for the exclusive right, *jure divino*, of the congregation to elect, according to primitive usage.

III. In regard to *Church officers*, while Whitgift advocated the cause of the hierarchy, as established in England, his opponent denounced it as destitute of authority in Scripture or apostolic precedent.

Church  
officers.

IV. *Clerical habits* — "cap, gown, and tippet" — stigmatized, in the *Admonition*, as popish and antichristian, are defended by Whitgift, as appointed by the magistrate, for order and decency.

Habits.

V. The churchman contended for the temporal headship over the Church, in the realm of England, of the prince; the Puritan, for the sole headship of Christ.

Authority of  
the magistrate.

VI. *Confirmation*, branded by the Puritan as popish, is defended by Whitgift — distinguishing the Protestant from the Romish ceremony, as agreeable to Scripture.

Confirmation.

VII. *Diocesan Episcopacy* is repudiated by Cartwright as

destitute of authority in Scripture or primitive use: "In the primitive Church there was one bishop in every congregation; now one is over a thousand congregations. Then every bishop had a distinct church, where he preached and ministered the sacraments; now he hath none. Then he ruled one church, in company with its elders; now he ruleth a thousand by himself, shutting out the ministers to whom the government belongs. . . . The bishops, contrary to the word of God, have got into their hands both the pre-eminence over ministers and the liberties of the Church of God."

"The superiority of bishops," says Whitgift, "is God's own institution, and it hath a necessary use in the Church of God." . . . "And although Hierome confess that by Scripture *presbyter* and *episcopus* is all one, (as indeed they be *quoad ministerium*,) yet doth he acknowledge a superiority of the bishop before the minister. . . . No doubt this is Jerome's mind, that a bishop in degree and dignity is above the minister, though he be one and the selfsame with him in the office of ministering the word and sacraments; and therefore he saith, '*Presbyter continetur in episcopo*;' because every bishop is presbyter, but every presbyter is not bishop." (Vol. ii., p. 254.)

Whitgift's utterances on this point gave deep offence to Sir FRANCIS KNOLLYS, of the Queen's Privy Council, who pronounced them so injurious to the civil government — as involving a denial of the sovereign's supremacy over the Church — that the author of them should be called upon to make an open recantation. The views of this influential member of the Government ("a downright Erastian," says Collier) are fully expressed in a letter addressed to Sir Francis Walsingham:

"Concerning the superiority of bishops, I must needs say unto you, that my lord archbishop (Whitgift) and the rest take a dangerous course against her majesty's supreme government, for they do claim a superiority of government to be knit to their bishoprics *jure divino* directly. Although they do grant that all the superiority that they have as bishops,

Sir F. Knollys  
vs.  
Whitgift.

that they have the same by way of mediation of her majesty, and their meaning is, that because her majesty doth make them bishops, whereunto their superiority is knit, (as they suppose,) therefore they do grant it by way of mediation, they have their superiority of the Queen's majesty, nevertheless when they are once made bishops by her majesty, then they do claim their said superiority to be due unto them as knit unto their bishoprics directly *jure divino*, how weak soever their reasons be to maintain their claimed superiority. But my lord treasurer (Burghley) is partly persuaded that the bishops do not deny that their superiority is holden by them as a grant given unto them directly from her majesty, and that they do not claim their said superiority directly to be given unto them when they are bishops *jure divino*, that is to say, directly from the word of God. But I must needs say, that my lord archbishop of Canterbury, (Whitgift,) and my lord bishop of Winchester, have protested and plainly avowed unto me, that the bishops of England have a superiority over their inferior brethren, directly *jure divino*, and prove their said claim of superiority to be knit to their bishoprics directly *jure divino*. And moreover, the archbishop of Canterbury's book against Cartwright doth manifestly declare the said archbishop's opinion in that behalf in many places of the said book. Nevertheless, if my lord treasurer would, in her majesty's name, demand of the said bishops, whether they would claim any such superiority directly *jure divino*, to be due unto them to the prejudice of her majesty's supreme government, then I do verily think that they durst not stand to their claimed superiority, unless it be upon hope that her majesty would yield unto them their claimed superiority, to the prejudice of her supreme government, and to the light regard of the opening the highway to popery; to be made by the Jesuits to follow upon the same." (*Collier*, vol. ix., p. 351.)

In the lull of this debate, two important works appeared on the Continent, one at Geneva, the other at Rome; the former from the pen of the renowned DU PLESSIS MORNAY, entitled *Traité de l'Eglise*, etc., [No. 84.] in English,

*A Notable Treatise of the Church*, 1579—a production which established the reputation of its author as an able defender of the

Bellarmino. Protestant cause; the latter, BELLARMINI *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianæ Fidei adversus hujus temporis Hæreticos*. Vol. i. ii., 1531–82. [No. 85.] Of this great work, which occupies the same place in dogmatics that

1581. *Baronii Annales* does in Church history, the latter half of the first volume treats *Of the Roman Pontiff*: of the primacy of Peter; of the succession of the Roman Pontiff in the primacy; of Antichrist, showing that he has nothing in common with the Pope; of the power of the Pope in the spiritual causes; and of his temporal dominion.

The second volume is devoted to the discussion of the great subject of the Church, under four general heads: I. *De Conciliis et Ecclesiâ*; under this (a) of the nature, causes, power, etc., of councils; (b) of the nature, properties, and notes of the true Church. II. *De membris Ecclesiæ*: (a) of the clergy, and priesthood, monks, etc.; (b) of the laity, and particularly, of the civil magistrate. III. *De Ecclesia quæ purgatur in locis subterraneis*: of Purgatory, its reality, place, duration, pains, etc. IV. *De Ecclesia quæ triumphat in cælis*: of beatitude, and the worship of saints, of relics, and images, basilicas, saints' days, and other things by which the memory of the saints is honored.

The Church militant is defined by Bellarmine as “a body of men united in the profession of the same Christian faith, and communion of the same sacraments, under the government of lawful pastors, and particularly of the Roman Pontiff, Christ's only vicar on earth.” (*De Eccles. Milit.*, c. 2.)

“The difference between our definition of the Church and other definitions is this, that all others make internal virtues requisite to constitute membership in the Church, while we maintain that in order to constitute a part of the true Church, internal virtue is not requisite. For the Church is a company of men as visible and palpable as the Roman people,” etc. . . . “We see then a company of men who are the Church, but

that this company is itself the true Church of Christ, we do not see, but believe."

In apparent disregard of the Tridentine precedent, Bellarmine enumerates *fifteen* distinct Notes of the Church, viz.:

1. The name of the Catholic Church and of Christians. (Two names of different import are made to constitute a single note.)
2. Antiquity.
3. Duration.
4. Am-  
plitude, or multitude and variety of believers.
5. Succession of bishops in the Roman Church from the apostles to the present.
6. Agreement in doctrine with the ancient Church.
7. Union of the members among themselves and with the head.
8. Sanctity of doctrine.
9. Efficacy of doctrine.
10. The holiness of life of the authors of our religion.
11. The glory of miracles.
12. The light of prophecy.
13. Confession of adversaries.
14. Unhappy end of enemies.
15. Temporal felicity divinely bestowed on those who have defended the Church.

Notes of  
the Church.

On the question of *the infallibility of the Pope*, Bellarmine pronounces thus: "1. All agree in this, that the Pope, even as Pope, and with his assembly of counsellors, or with a general council, may err in particular disputed matters of fact which chiefly depend upon human testimony. 2. All, moreover, are agreed that the Pope, as a private doctor, may err, even in universal questions of right, as well of faith as of manners, and this too from ignorance. 3. All Catholics are agreed (*a*) that the Pope with a general council cannot err in framing decrees of faith, or general precepts of morals. 4. Catholics are agreed (*b*) that the Pope alone, or with his particular council, determining any doubtful point, whether he may err, or not, is to be obediently deferred to by all the faithful.

Papal  
Infallibility.

"There are four distinct opinions, of which the *first* is, that the Pope, even as Pope, though defining a point with a general council, may be a heretic himself, and teach others heresy, and that this as a matter of fact has occurred. This opinion is *heretical*.

Four  
opinions.

"The *second* opinion is that the Pope, even as Pope, may be

a heretic, and teach heresy, if he define without a general council. This opinion is not properly heretical, for those who hold it are still tolerated by the Church. It appears nevertheless to be altogether erroneous, and very nearly akin to heresy (*heresi proxima*)." This, as we have seen, is the doctrine of the Gallican Church, 'as it is that of GRATIAN (*Dist. xix.*) and the Parisian doctors, GERSON and his associates.

"The *third* opinion is that the Pope cannot in any way be a heretic, nor publicly teach heresy, even though he alone should define any point. This opinion of Pighius is probable, though not certain.

"The *fourth* opinion is that the Pope, whether he can be a heretic or not, cannot by any means determine anything heretical, to be believed by the whole Church. This is the most common opinion, as it is the most certain, and that which is to be maintained. (The doctrine of AQUINAS.)

"These different views are not irreconcilable, for those who hold them all equally affirm that it is not possible that the Pope should determine any point rashly. He who promised the end, (the infallibility of the Pope's judgment,) without doubt promised also the means.

"To place this doctrine in a clear light, we lay down a few propositions: I. The Pope, when teaching the whole Church in matters pertaining to faith, cannot err by any possibility.

Bellarmino's exposition. The promise of Christ is, 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.' There was no reason why he should twice pray for Peter's perseverance.

Something special was obtained for Peter. Mediately, at least, Christ here prayed for all the apostles, that is, for some gift to be communicated to Peter for the behoof of the rest. The gift here obtained for Peter pertains also to his successors, for the benefit of the Church, which always needs some one by whom it may be confirmed, and whose faith cannot fail. The Lord obtained two privileges for Peter: *first*, that he should never lose the true faith; *second*, that as Pontiff, he should never teach anything against the faith; or, that in his see no one should ever be found who would teach against the

true faith. The former privilege has not perhaps descended to his successors; the latter unquestionably has descended to them. It were not inadmissible to apply the expression, 'When thou art converted'—to be interpreted primarily of the conversion of Peter—to others whom he should see tempted and wavering. To be converted from sin belongs to a private person, but to confirm the brethren belongs to the head and prince of others.

"Matt. xvi., Peter with his successors is named PETRA, and the foundation of the Church which shall not fail: therefore, neither Peter himself nor his successors can fail (*rueret*) or err. The Pope is the pastor of the Church, and if he err, the whole Church will err; nor are the sheep able to judge whether the shepherd errs or not, whether the Pontiff rightly teaches or not.

"The same point is proved by a twofold fact: the Roman See alone has never departed from the faith; and the Pope has condemned many heresies, without a general council.

"Proposition II. Not only is the Roman Pontiff incapable of error in the faith, but the particular Roman Church also. This is to be understood of the personal error of all, so that the whole Church should become apostate. This proposition is most true, if understood of the Roman Church while it continues the Apostolical See. But if it be so understood as if the Apostolic See could never be transferred from Rome to some other place, it is a pious and very probable opinion. It is, however, by no means so certain as to be *de fide*.

"Proposition III. The supreme pontiff cannot err in precepts of morals which are enjoined upon the whole Church, nor in things necessary to salvation, or in those which are good or evil *per se*. God has commanded the Church to follow the Pope; otherwise the Church could not be truly called holy. If the Pope should err by enjoining the practice of vice or prohibiting virtue, the Church would be bound to believe that vice is good, and virtue evil.

"Proposition IV. It is probable, and piously to be believed, that the supreme pontiff, even as a particular person, cannot

be a heretic, by obstinately believing anything against the faith. Hitherto no Pope has been a heretic; certainly of none can it be proved that he was a heretic." (Rashly uttered: three Popes, Agatho, Leo II., and Hadrian II., pronounced Honorius a heretic. See *Père Gratry's Letters to the Abp. of Malines.*) (*Disput. De Contr.*, vol. i., p. 801, ed. 1620.)

On the question of *the comparative authority of the Pope and a general council*, Bellarmine pronounces in favor of the Pope: "On this question there are three opinions of the doctors: *First*, that a council is above the Pope. *Second*, that the Pope is indeed above a council, but that he can, nevertheless, subject himself to a council, and then ought to acquiesce in its judgment. The *third* opinion is that commonly received, that the Pope is so far above a council that he cannot even subject himself to its judgment as a matter of obligation. The Roman Pontiff is pastor and head, not only of all particular churches, but also of the whole Universal Church, having been immediately constituted such by Christ." (In another place, however, Bellarmine writes: "That the Roman Bishop, because he is the Roman Bishop, is Peter's successor, originated in the act of Peter in establishing his see at Rome, and not in Christ's first institution.") (*De Summo Pontif.* ii. 12.)

"The supreme pontiff is simply and absolutely above the Universal Church, and above a general council, so that he may not acknowledge any tribunal (judicium) on earth above himself. This proposition is almost *de fide*.

"The supreme pontiff cannot commit to a council or to any man a coactive judicial power over himself, but only a *judicium discretivum*." (*Disputat.*, vol. ii., p. 53.)

To Bellarmine, a Jesuit, belongs the honorable distinction, freely accorded to him by his Protestant opponents, of stating the positions of his adversaries with fairness; at the same time that he gives candid expression to the Romish doctrine, without the least reserve, or equivocating gloss; in this respect presenting a favorable contrast with the later leading controversial writers of the Roman communion, such as

Comparative  
authority of  
the Pope and  
Council.

Bossuet, Mœhler, and Wiseman. It is from Bellarmine, and not from the more recent advocates of Romanism, that we are to learn the real doctrine and tendency of the Romish system. "He embellishes nothing, and conceals nothing; nor does he take pains to give prominence to the points of agreement between Romanism and Protestantism, or to reduce to a minimum the differences between them. He makes no attempt to find philosophical grounds for the Romish dogmas. Bossuet's delineation is that of his own form of Romanism, and of that which obtained among the cultivated French clergy of his own day. So also Mœhler's exposition is that of the Catholicism of Mœhler himself, and of the Romanist theologians of Germany of the present day, inspired by the Protestant scientific spirit." \*

Unquestionably Bellarmine still remains the great expounder of the modern Roman system, in its purity and integrity.

\* *Thiersch, in Hertzog.*

## CHAPTER XX.

VIEWS OF THE BROWNISTS—JOHN RAYNOLDS: CONFERENCE WITH HART—ARGUMENT AGAINST PETER'S ROMAN EPISCOPATE—SIX CONCLUSIONS ON SCRIPTURE AND THE CHURCH—ARGUMENT IN VERSE—THE CHURCH AN ARTICLE OF FAITH—BANCROFT'S SERMON AT PAUL'S CROSS—SIR F. KNOLLYS' EXCEPTIONS—BANCROFT'S ANSWER TO EXCEPTIONS—RAYNOLDS' REVIEW OF THE SERMON.

THE year 1580 is marked by the rise in England of a sect of separatists whose extreme views in reference to church discipline provoked a long and heated controversy. ROBERT BROWN, from whom the sect received its name, a presbyter of the Church of England, of honorable descent, published in 1582 an exposition of his peculiar opinions, in *A Treatise of Reformation without Tarrying for any Man*, etc., [No. 89,] the main object of which was to promote separation from the Church of England, and the formation of *independent* societies, wholly free from the authority of the civil magistrate. Among the numerous publications, on either side, to which this disputation gave rise, special mention may be made of *A Brief Discovery of the False Churches*, wherein the rights of the Christian Church are further asserted by the Holy Scripture, (1590,) [No. 121,] by HENRY BARROWES, to whom the Brownists are indebted for the denomination of Barrowists.

The peculiar views of the Brownists are set forth in an authentic form in a publication put forth in the year 1599, containing a recapitulation of their objections against the Church of England, under the heading, "Anti-Christian Abominations yet retained in England." The charges here brought together, *fifty-five* in number, embrace all the exceptions that have ever been taken, it would seem, to the Anglican Church, by its non-

Peculiar  
views.

Romanist assailants. The list is given in full in the *Biographia Britannica*, vol. ii., p. 619. The leading principle of this body of separatists is, "That every particular church, with its pastor, stands immediately under Christ, the Arch-Pastor, without any other ecclesiastical power intervening, whether it be of prelates, of synods, or any other invented by man." In assuming this position, these sectaries placed themselves in antagonism, not only with the upholders of Episcopacy, but also with the great body of the non-conformists, who firmly held to the principle of synodical authority. In the Brownist system, each congregation is independent of every other; hence the origin of the terms Congregationalism and Independentism. Equally opposed to Episcopacy and Presbytery, they maintained that "the Church ought not to be governed by popish canons, courts, classes, customs, or any human inventions, but by the laws and rules which Christ has appointed in the New Testament; that a particular form of church government is prescribed in the word of God; that no other form ought to be tolerated; and that the Church of God ought to be governed by elders."

Eminently entitled to a place in this record is the name of Dr. JOHN RAYNOLDS, president of C. C. Coll., Oxford, the fellow-collegian, "contemporary, and friend," of HOOKER. Few theologians of any age have exerted a more decided influence upon the thinkers of their own time, and contemporary writers seem to have thought no <sup>John Raynolds,</sup> praise too high for Raynolds, whether as a man, <sub>1549-1607.</sub> a scholar, or a divine. Those who knew him best speak of him as "the very treasury of erudition, a living library, and a third university, of a memory and reading near to a miracle, and for probity, piety, and sanctity of life so eminent and conspicuous, that, as Nazianzen said of Athanasius, it might be said of him, to name Raynolds is to commend virtue itself." His claim to our attention at present rests upon his very able conduct of a debate with a Romanist, <sup>Conference</sup> mainly on the subject of the supremacy of the Pope. <sub>with Hart.</sub> Of this a faithful report is contained in a volume entitled

*The Sum of a Conference between John Raynolds and John Hart, touching the Head and the Faith of the Church. [No. 91.]*

As a specimen of this great man's manner of argumentation, take the following, (he is proving that St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome): "Generally, a bishop is an overseer. In which signification it reacheth to all who are put in trust with oversight and charge of anything; as Eleazar is called bishop of the tabernacle, (*Num. iv. 16,*) and Christ the Bishop of our souls. But in our common use of speech it noteth him to whom the oversight and charge of a particular church is committed; such as were the bishops of Ephesus, of Philippi, and they whom Christ calleth the angels of the churches. Now Peter was not bishop after this latter sort; for he was an apostle, and the apostles were sent to preach to all the world. Wherefore when the Fathers said he was a bishop, either they meant it in the former sense, or ought to have meant it. . . . Irenæus nameth Linus the first bishop of Rome; Cletus the second, etc. Eusebius nameth Euodius the first bishop of Antioch; Ignatius the second. Whereby they declare that in their judgment, although Peter preached at Antioch and Rome both, yet he was neither bishop of Antioch nor Rome, as usually that name is taken. Yea, they distinguish the bishops and the apostles therein purposely. For Irenæus saith that the two apostles, namely Peter and Paul, when they had founded and taught the Roman Church, committed the bishoply charge thereof to Linus. And he repeateth often in reckoning up the bishops, as doth Eusebius also, that they were such and such in order, and number, *from the apostles.* And Ruffinus writeth that Linus and Cletus were bishops while Peter lived. . . . Which is confirmed by Epiphanius, who, though he say that Peter and Paul were both apostles and bishops in Rome; yet he saith withal, that there were other bishops of Rome while they lived; because that the apostles went often into other countries to preach Christ, and the city of Rome might not be without a bishop. As if he should have said, a bishop's duty doth bind him to attend the church

Peter's  
Episcopate at  
Rome.

whereof the Holy Ghost hath made him overseer. Now, though the apostles Peter and Paul did perform that duty to the Church of Rome, while they abode there, yet because it was the charge of their apostleship to preach to others also, therefore they went thence to other coasts and nations, and left the Roman charge to the bishops of Rome. And so you may learn by the Fathers themselves that when they termed any apostle a bishop of this or that city, as namely St. Peter of Antioch or Rome; they meant it in a general sort and signification; because he did attend that church for a time; and supplied that room in preaching of the gospel which bishops did after. But as the name of bishop is commonly taken for the overseer of a particular church, and pastor of a several flock, so Peter was not bishop of any one city, and therefore not of Rome.

“The bishops of Rome did succeed Peter (then) as bishops an apostle; and they did succeed him in Rome, as other bishops did in other cities. Wherefore if the Bishop of Rome, by this succession, have right to the supremacy, what hath the Bishop of Antioch? For he succeeded Peter too.” (Pp. 218, 219.)

Four years before the publication of the *Sum of the Conference*, Raynolds gave to the world a smaller work, entitled, *Six Conclusions touching the Holy Scripture and Church*, “Proposed, expounded, and defended in public disputations at Oxford: 1. The Holy Scripture teacheth the Church all things necessary to salvation. 2. The militant Church may err, both in manners and in doctrine. 3. The authority of the Holy Scripture is greater than the authority of the Church. 4. The holy Catholic Church which we believe is the whole company of God's elect and chosen. 5. The Church of Rome is not the Catholic Church, nor a sound member of the Catholic Church. 6. The reformed churches in England, Scotland, and France, Germany, and other kingdoms and commonweals, have severed themselves lawfully from the Church of Rome.”

Six  
Conclusions.  
1580.

These theses contain a clear exposition, in condensed form,

of this great master's views concerning the doctrine of the Church, polemically stated as against the Romanists. To each thesis is prefixed its own argument in verse; to the *fourth* the following:

Argument in  
verse.

“He who the sea, the earth, the skies made by his word of nought,  
Who by eternal power doth guide and rule all things he wrought,  
Did choose from out the sons of men before the world was pight,  
Such as with blessed angels aye should joy his blissful sight.  
The Jews are not the only men that make this holy band,  
But they are soldiers chosen out of every tongue and land:  
Where on the South the mighty prince of Abissines doth reign,  
Where on the North the coasts do lie that look to Charles's wain;  
Where Phœbus with his glistering beams doth raise the dawning light,  
And sinking in the Western seas doth bring the darksome night.  
The flesh cannot by nature's light such hidden truths pursue;  
But Christian faith by light of grace this Catholic Church doth view.”

“The holy Catholic Church, whereof we profess in our Creed that we believe it, is the whole company of God's elect and chosen. Which is termed a Church, that is, a company of men, and an assembly of people called together: *holy*, because God hath chosen this company, and sanctified it to himself: *Catholic*, for that it consisteth not of one nation, but of all, spread through the whole world. For God, to the intent that he might impart the riches of his glorious grace unto mankind, did choose, from everlasting, a certain number of men, as a peculiar people, who should possess with him the kingdom of heaven prepared for them from the foundations of the world. And although this people be sundered by the distance of places and times, for the several persons and members thereof, yet hath he joined and knit them all together by the bond of his Holy Spirit, into the fellowship of one body, and a civil, or rather a spiritual communion, as it were into one city, . . . *the heavenly, new and holy Jerusalem*, the city of the living God: the King is God Almighty, . . . the laws are God's word; . . . the citizens are the saints, even all and singular holy men. In this Church the faithful all are comprehended that either be, or have been, or shall be to the end, from the beginning

The Church  
defined.

of the world. Which is termed in Scripture *the Church of the firstborn* who are written in heaven; which *God did predestinate to be adopted to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.*

“You marvel, perhaps, why I propose this article of the Christian faith to be discussed by disputation; as though either any man stood in doubt of it, or things not doubtful were to be handled as doubtful. But if you consider that the true meaning thereof which I have opened, . . . is condemned and accursed by the standard-bearers of the Church of Rome, you will cease to marvel. For in the Council of Constance, in which they condemned JOHN HUSS for a heretic, they condemned these two sayings as heretical, to be burned with him:—that there is one holy, Universal Church, which is the whole company of them that are predestinate; and, that the Church as it is taken in this sense, for the company of them that are predestinate, is the article of our faith. Which sayings of his to be counted ungodly, it seemed strange to me; and so much the more, because I perceived that the Fathers . . . did use the same square to measure out the Catholic Church by. For Clemens Alexandrinus doth expressly call it *the company of the elect, into which are gathered the faithful and just, whom God did predestinate before the creation of the world.* (*Strom., lib. vii.*) Likewise, Ambrose, having said that *the honor of God the Father is in Christ and in the Church,* defineth the Church to be *a people which God hath vouchsafed to adopt to himself.* (*Ep. ad Eph.*) Furthermore, Gregory the Bishop of Rome affirmeth that *all the elect are contained within the compass and circuit of the Church, all the reprobate are without.* (*Moral. in Job. l. 28, 9.*) And Bernard declares the Church to be *the company of all the elect, which company was predestinated before the world began.* (*In Cant. Serm. 78.*) As for Austin, . . . he neither acknowledgeth any city of God but this elect Church; . . . saying that *all the holy and sanctified men which are, which have been, which shall be, are citizens of this heavenly Jerusalem.*” (*De rudib. cat. 20.*)

An article  
of faith.

“But the prelates of the Romish Church wrest *the Holy Cath-*

*olic Church* of the Creed from the right meaning: they apply it, not to the Catholic Church, but to the *militant*; nor to that as it is chosen, but as it is visible, mingled with hypocrites and ungodly persons. The cause why they do so, is, that all Christians, by reason they believe the Holy Catholic Church, may be induced to think that the visible Church must be held for Catholic, and a visible monarchy must be in the visible Church, and the Pope is prince of the visible monarchy, and all Christians must be subject to him as prince. For that this be the mark whereat the Popes shoot, is as clear as the light by the very *Extravagants*, as they are termed, of the canon law, in that royal decree of Boniface the Eighth, beginning with these words: *One Holy Catholic Church*, where, from one Catholic Church, without the which there is no salvation, he creepeth up to the head of the Church, even Jesus Christ, and from Christ the head he slippeth down by stealth unto Christ's Vicar, one and the same head (as he saith) with Christ, even the Pope of Rome: whom yet to be head of the Catholic Church, not himself would say, (unless perhaps in a dream,) for then he should be head of the triumphant Church, which is a part of the Catholic; but he would be *head of the visible Church*, which he nameth *Catholic*, thereby the more easily to deceive the simple, who being astonied and snared with that name, the fowler shutteth up the net, and concludeth that *every earthly creature, if he will be saved, must of necessity be subject to the Pope.*" (*Id.*, p. 593-643.)

The year 1588 is rendered noteworthy in the history of this controversy by the publication of a tract bearing the title of *A Brief Discovery of the Untruths and Slanders against the true Government of the Church of Christ, in a Sermon.*

Bancroft's  
Sermon at  
Paul's Cross,  
1588.

[No. 99.] This sermon, preached at Paul's Cross, January 12, 1588,\* by Dr. RICHARD BANCROFT, chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift, contains a labored delineation of Puritanism, from the point of view of one of its bitterest opponents, with the view of

\* The authority for this date is STRYPE, *Life of Whitgift*, p. 272. See NEAL, *Hist. Puritans*, i. 186.

showing its tendency to subvert the monarchy as well as the hierarchy. It is customary to speak of this discourse as the first public expression, on the part of an Anglican divine, of the doctrine of Episcopacy *by divine right*; plainly a misapprehension, in whatever sense the expression *divine right* be understood. If by the expression "Episcopacy by divine right" be meant such a divine institution of a threefold order in the ministry as renders it, regularly derived, by tactual succession, from the apostles, indispensably necessary to the validity of the Christian ministry, or to the very being of a Church—this, certainly, is not found in the printed sermon. If the expression, *by divine right*, again, be taken to mean, simply, divine appointment, whether *immediate*, by CHRIST Himself, or *mediate*, through the apostles—this, as we have seen, had already been asserted by Whitgift.

Sir Francis Knollys, who heard the sermon delivered, took the same exception to its teaching that he had taken, fifteen years before, to that of Whitgift on the same point, and upon the same ground, viz., its incompatibility with the regal prerogative; in other words, its tendency (as alleged) to render the ecclesiastical authority independent of, or paramount to, the civil power.

Sir F.  
Knollys'  
exceptions.

"I do not deny," says he, "that bishops may have lordly authority and dignity, provided they claim it not from a higher authority than her majesty's grant. If the bishops are not under governors to her majesty of the clergy, but superior governors over their brethren, by God's ordinance, (i. e. *jure divino*,) it will then follow that her majesty is not supreme governor over her clergy." This argument he produced in syllogistic form: "Whosoever doth maintain that any subject of this realm hath superiority over the persons of the clergy, otherwise than from and by her majesty's authority, he doth injury to her majesty's supremacy. The preacher upon Sunday, the 12th of January, 1588, maintained that the bishops of this realm had superiority over the inferior clergy, otherwise than by and from her majesty's authority, namely, *jure divino*. Ergo, the preacher therein did injury to her majesty's

supremacy; unless he can better expound this saying than I can imagine.”

Bancroft's answer, too long for quotation, is in substance to this effect: that the argument is no better than a sophism, inasmuch as the prince's authority may, and very often does, confirm and corroborate that which is instituted primarily by the law of God. He moreover briskly retorts upon his adversaries, the presbyterian disciplinarians, their own argument — assuming it to be theirs: “their arguments return on themselves far more dangerously than any way upon me; I pleading *jus divinum* whereto her majesty's laws concur; they also pleading *jus divinum*, but resisting also her majesty's laws, as contrary to the laws of God.”

These exceptions, it would appear, were taken to the sermon as delivered, and not yet published; for the preacher says in his reply: “For my sermon, thanks be to God, *it is forthcoming*, when it shall be called for. In the mean season, I put myself to the testimony of all the honorable, worshipful, and other sincere hearers and noters of the same.”

Not relying wholly, it would seem, on his own judgment, Knollys wrote to Dr. Raynolds, of Oxford, the oracle in divinity of his day, for his opinion of the doctrine of Bancroft's sermon, on the point in question, viz., that “the superiority of bishops over the clergy is God's ordinance;” stated, not indeed, “in express words, yet by necessary consequence;” “and affirming their opinion to be heresy who impugned their superiority.”

Dr. Raynolds' letter, written in answer, [No. 100,] has been preserved as a document of weight in this controversy, and as such I here reproduce it: “Though Epiphanius says that Aerius's assertion (that there is no difference between a priest and a bishop) is full of folly, he does not disprove his reasons from Scripture; nay, his arguments are so weak, that even Bellarmine confesses they are not agreeable to the text. As for the general consent of the Church, which, the doctor says, condemned

Bancroft's  
answer.

Raynolds'  
review.

Aerius' opinion for heresy, what proof does he bring for it? It appears, he says, in Epiphanius; but I say it does not; and the contrary appears by St. Jerome, and sundry others who lived about the same time. I grant that St. Austin, in his book of heresies, ascribes this to Aerius for one; that he said there ought to be no difference between a priest and a bishop, because this were to condemn the Church's order, and to make a schism therein. But it is quite a different thing to say that, *by the word of God, there is a difference between them*, and to say that it is *by the order and custom of the Church*; which is all that St. Austin maintains. When Harding, the Papist, alleged these very witnesses to prove the opinion of bishops and priests being of the same order to be heresy, our learned Bishop Jewel cited to the contrary Chrysostom, Jerome, Ambrose, and St. Austin himself, and concluded his answer with these words: 'All these, and other more holy fathers, together with the apostle Paul, for thus saying, by Harding's advice, must be held for heretics. Michael Medina, a man of great account in the Council of Trent, adds to the forementioned testimonies, Theodorus, Primarius, Sedulius, Theophylact, with whom agree Cæcumenius, the Greek scholiast, Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, Gregory, and Gratian; and after them, how many?—it being once enrolled in the canon law for Catholic doctrine, and thereupon taught by learned men.'

"Besides, all that have labored in reforming the Church for five hundred years have taught that all pastors, be they entitled bishops or priests, have equal authority and power by God's word: as first the Waldenses, next Marsilius Patavinus, then Wycliffe and his scholars, afterwards Huss and the Hussites; and, last of all, Luther, Calvin, Brentius, Bullinger, and Musculus. Among ourselves we have bishops, the Queen's Professors of Divinity in our Universities, (Drs. Humphreys and White,) and other learned men, consenting herein, as Bradford, Lambert, Jewel, Pilkington, Humphreys, Fulke, etc. But what do I speak of particular persons? It is the common judgment of the reformed churches of Helvetia, Savoy, France, Scotland, Germany, Hungary, Poland, the Low Coun-

tries, and our own. I hope Dr. Bancroft will not say that all these have approved that for sound doctrine which was condemned by the general consent of the whole Church for heresy in a most flourishing time; I hope he will acknowledge that he was overseen when he avouched the superiority which bishops have among us over the clergy to be by God's own ordinance.

“As for the doctor's saying that St. Jerome and Calvin, from him, confessed that bishops have had the said superiority ever since the time of St. Mark the Evangelist, I think him mistaken, because neither Jerome says it, nor does Calvin seem to confess it on his report; for bishops among us may do sundry other things, besides ordaining and laying on of hands, which inferior ministers or priests may not; whereas St. Jerome says, ‘What does a bishop, except ordination, which a priest does not?’—meaning, that in his time bishops had only that power above priests; which Chrysostom also witnesses in Hom. xi., on 1 Tim. Nor had they this privilege alone in all places, for in the council of Carthage it is said that the priests laid their hands, together with the bishops’, on those who were ordained. And St. Jerome having proved by Scripture, that in the apostles’ time bishops and priests were all one, yet granted that afterwards bishops had that peculiar to themselves somewhere; so that St. Jerome does not say, concerning the superiority in question, that bishops have had it ever since St. Mark's time.

“Nor does Calvin confess it; he says that in old time ministers chose out one of their company in every city, to whom they give the title of bishop; yet the bishop was not above them in honor and dignity, but as consuls in the senate propose matters, ask their opinions, direct others by giving advice, by admonishing, by exhorting, and so guide the whole action, and by their authority see that performed which was agreed on by common consent, the same charge had the bishop in the assembly of ministers: and having showed from St. Jerome that this was brought in by consent of men, he adds that it was an ancient order of the Church, even from

St. Mark; from whence 't is apparent that the order of the Church he mentions has relation to that above described, in which he affirms that 'the bishop was not so above the rest in honor as to have rule over them.' It follows, therefore, that Calvin does not so much as seem to confess of St. Jerome's report, that ever since St. Mark's time bishops have had a ruling superiority over the clergy."

## CHAPTER XXI.

SARAVIA ON DEGREES IN THE MINISTRY — BISHOPS NECESSARY TO THE CHURCH — PRESBYTERS CAN ORDAIN, *NECESSITATE COGENTE* — KEBLE'S GLOSS AMENDED — SUTCLIFF ON PRESBYTERY — QUERIMONIA ECCLESIE — BANCROFT'S SURVEY OF THE PRETENDED HOLY DISCIPLINE — LAY ELDERSHIP — BEZA'S VIEW — TENURE OF THE OFFICE — CARTWRIGHT CORRECTED.

THE views of ministerial order so earnestly advocated by Bancroft in a sermon *ad populum*, were soon after defended in a learned treatise, by HADRIAN SARAVIA, entitled, "*Of the Different Degrees of Ministers of the Gospel as they were instituted by the Lord, and delivered on by the apostles, and confirmed by constant use of all churches.*" [No. 114.] Saravia, best known as the friend of Hooker, "one of the prebends of Canterbury," says Walton, "a German by birth, and sometimes a pastor both in Flanders and Holland," claims to have held the views expressed in his book, a full quarter century before its publication, or since 1564, when he lived at Ghent. The explicitness, not to say boldness, of his utterance on the question of Episcopal prerogative may be thought characteristic of the foreigner, or the proselyte. "Our Fathers," he writes, "and all the old theologians believed that the controlling prudence of one man was divinely appointed in the church of each city or province, for avoiding schism and repressing the rashness of the many. There are some (the Erastians) who think that all control of manners is to be left entirely to the control of the civil magistrate, and confine the ministry of the gospel to bare preaching of the word of God and administering the sacraments; which being impossible to be made out by the word of God, or by any example of the Fathers, I wonder that such a thought could

Hadrian  
Saravia,  
1590.

Episcopacy.

ever enter into the mind of a theologian. Others there are who assign the power of church censures to bishops and to presbyters, who are both called and really are such, (the Anglican as opposed to the Genevan,) with that authority which God gave to the apostles, and to those who after them should be bishops of the Church.

“The third sort are those who, rejecting the order of bishops, join to the pastors elders chosen for a time, to whom they commit the whole government of the churches and discipline ecclesiastical.” Then, after enumerating the several forms of *civil* polity, he continues: “To no nation did God ever appoint any certain and perpetual form of government, which it should be unlawful to alter according to place and times. But of this government whereof we are now discoursing the case is different; for since it came immediately from God, men cannot alter it at their own free will. Nor is there any occasion to do so. For God’s wisdom hath so tempered this polity, that it opposes itself to no form of civil government. *Bishops I consider to be necessary to the Church*, and that discipline and government of the Church to be the best, and divine, which religious bishops, with presbyters truly so called, (i. e. episcopally ordained,) administer by the rule of God’s word and ancient councils.” (*De Div. Min. Ev. Grad.*) [No. 114.]

Episcopacy  
essential.

Taking these statements by themselves, we might be led to acquiesce in Keble’s conclusion, that “Saravia is a distinct and independent testimony to the doctrine of *exclusive* divine right in bishops,” (Pref. to Hooker, p. xxxiv., Am. ed.,) and to assign him the distinction of being the first Anglican divine to give distinct expression to that doctrine. Keble’s quotations stop at this point; had he further quoted what follows, his readers would have been furnished with the means of forming a juster judgment of Saravia’s position:—“In our fathers’ memory, Luther, Bucer, Æcolampadius, and others had no other calling than that which they had received in the Church of Rome; and when it happened to them to be called before Cæsar, no question respecting their calling could ever be justly

raised ; and if it had been, they had an answer ready more fit in my judgment than that which was made at the Conference at Poissy. . . . For although all who had assembled there before the king had not the same kind of ordination, and some were ordained by bishops of the Church of Rome, *others by the Reformed Churches, none of them ought to have been ashamed of his ordination.* They might, so far as I can see, without any danger, have professed that they had been ordained and called, some by bishops of the Church of Rome, *others by orthodox presbyters*, in the order received in the Churches of Christ, after an examination of their morals and doctrine, and with the authority of the magistrate and consent of the people, with the imposition of hands and prayer. Although I am of opinion that ordinations of ministers of the Church properly belong to bishops, yet necessity causes that when they are wanting and cannot be had, *orthodox presbyters can, in case of necessity, ordain a presbyter*; which thing, although it is not in accordance with the order received from the times of the apostles, yet is excused by the necessity of the case, which causes that in such a state of things *a presbyter may be a bishop.* Moreover, although the act is out of the usual order, the calling is not to be considered extraordinary." Then, after saying that no one ought to receive orders from a heretical bishop, and that the Romish bishops are all heretics, he adds: "This also is true, that in such a state of confusion in the Church, when all the bishops fall away from the true worship of God unto idolatry, without any violation of the government of the Church, the whole authority of the Episcopal ecclesiastical government is devolved upon the pious and orthodox presbyters, *so that a presbyter clearly may ordain presbyters.* . . . The difference there is between presbyters and pastors of the Church of Christ consists in the authority of ecclesiastical government. And this is not violated, when the higher orders being in any way removed, those who are of the lowest grade alone remain, with whom, consequently, *the whole power of the keys of the Church then resides.* . . . But where all the bishops are become impious heretics, the orthodox

presbyters are freed from their jurisdiction, and ought to vindicate to themselves the power of the keys which they have received in their ordination. . . . I certainly know not by what necessity Master Beza should have been compelled to resort to an extraordinary calling. For I do not think that either he or Nicholas Galasius, or any other that may have been then present, not ordained by Romish bishops, took upon themselves the ministry of the word without a legitimate calling received in the Churches of Christ." (*Defens. Tract. de Div. Min., etc.*, c. ii., pp. 32, 33.) [No. 115.]

It thus appears that Saravia is in full agreement with HOOKER, on the question of *the divine right* of Episcopacy; and that while we may hence adopt the statement of Keble respecting this agreement, as expressing the truth *in terms*, we must reject it in Keble's meaning, as directly opposed to the truth. That statement is this: "Since Saravia was afterwards in familiar intercourse with Hooker, and his confidential adviser when writing on nearly the same subjects, we may with reason use the recorded opinions of the one for interpreting what might seem otherwise ambiguous in the other." Keble's gloss amended.

The same year, the minister of the Italian Church in London having published a book in defence of the holy discipline, Dr. MATTHEW SUTCLIFFE, afterwards dean of Exeter, printed a Latin tract concerning the form and essentials of the Catholic Church, and a number of treatises in both Latin and English, in this and the year following, Dr. Sutcliffe, 1590. against the Puritan discipline. [No. 118-19.] The tone of these writings may be judged of by the following complaint of PENRY (Petition to the Queen, 1590 or '91): "Matt. Sutcliffe hath openly in Latin defaced foreign churches of whom D. Whitgift and others have always written honorably. Whereby it is likely there will arise as dangerous troubles to the churches about discipline as hath grown by the question of consubstantiation." On Presbytery. "In his Latin book (*De Presbyterio*) he attacked presbytery," says Collier, "with a great deal of force, pressed

a little upon the quarter of Geneva, and mentioned Beza in the controversy. This minister, thinking himself ill-used because mentioned without approbation, complains of the affront in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and calls Sutcliffe a petulant railer. For this freedom he was not only called to an account by Saravia, in his *Replication*, but the archbishop sent him a reprimanding answer for interesting himself in the disputes touching religion in England. He let him know he had been much too forward and decisive, and occasioned no small disturbance. Beza, perceiving that the archbishop and Saravia were likely to prove an over-match, retired from the combat, and left the English Puritans to shift for themselves. And to do something by way of reparation for his intermeddling, he writes to the archbishop in terms of respect, acquainting him that, in his writings concerning Church government, he only opposed the hierarchy of Rome, but never had any intention to reflect upon the English ecclesiastical polity, nor to press conformity to the Genevan discipline. He grants that, provided there was an agreement in the doctrine, churches might differ defensively enough in other matters. And here he throws in a very serviceable limitation, that, 'in this latitude, nothing unwarranted by antiquity should be indulged; and that there might be a better harmony amongst the reformed in Christendom, he hopes the sacred episcopal college would always continue and manage their privilege with equity and moderation.'" (vii. 128.)

The writings of Sutcliffe — "an acute and amusing, but not always very scrupulous controversialist" — were speedily followed by a publication entitled *Querimonia Ecclesie*, in which, it would seem, "Hooker was suspected of having some concern."

Speaking in the person of "Ecclesia," the writer names the want of discipline as the second of four grave defects, by which our Western reformation has been generally blemished. Of episcopacy and those who had cast it off he writes:

"They have cut the nerves of that most excellent discipline which has so often secured my safety, the shameless violators,

I mean, of the episcopal authority. Christ is our Prince, and though he has not prescribed all parts of discipline, yet he has laid down common rules, which ought always to be observed in the government of the Church." And in enumerating things which the whole Church of God observes, which were instituted by the apostles or by apostolic men, and in all time are profitable to the Christian society, which therefore are everywhere to be religiously retained, he specifies Lent, the holidays of our Saviour, different offices in the Church, and degrees in the ministry, including not only diocesan bishops, but archbishops, primates or metropolitans, and patriarchs.

Dr. BANCROFT, not yet bishop, further signalized his zeal in the anti-Puritan controversy, now daily waxing more embittered, by the publication of two books, entitled, respectively, *A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline*, etc., [No. 132,] purporting to give a full exposition, from the original sources, of the Presbyterian system, and *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings published and practised within this Island of Great Britain, under pretence of Reformation, and for the Presbyterian Discipline.*" [No. 133.]

1593.

*Dangerous*Bancroft's  
Survey.

Of the thirty-five chapters into which the *Survey* is divided, two (the thirteenth and fourteenth) are occupied with the discussion of topics of present interest in the Presbyterian communion: "Whether their elders be ecclesiastical men or laymen?" and "the continuance of their elders in office."

As these are questions which yet await a definitive solution, and are now, after the lapse of wellnigh three centuries, mooted afresh,\* it will be interesting to note the manner in which they were handled in an age so near that of the birth of Presbytery.

Lay eldership.

On the former question: Whether the presbyterian ruling elders, so called, are laymen? our author quotes Cartwright to the following effect: "Forasmuch as they (elders) are church-officers, and over the people in matters pertaining to God, and such as watch over the souls of men, though they

\* See Nos. 589, 716, 793 a, in Bibliographical Appendix.

were no pastors to preach the Word, *yet they were no laymen*, (as they term them,) but ecclesiastical persons. Which if any man will deny, let him deny also that two and two make four." And saith the *Counterpoison*: "Whosoever is called with due examination and trial, with the consent of those to whom it appertaineth, and are with fasting and prayers, or with prayers only and with imposition of hands separated or put apart to that office, *they are ecclesiastical persons, and not laymen*, (as they term them.)" (P. 130.)

"But Beza, as I take it, is plain in this point, and to our men very opposite. For saith he, in proof of his elders: 'Surely except some men *chosen out of the body of the whole assembly*

Beza's view. should sit in that company by whom the whole Church is governed, the general name of THE CHURCH would scarcely agree to that company; with which name notwithstanding it is adorned, because through that means, *men being chosen out of all the parts of the whole Church*, they might represent the whole Church.'\* By which words his meaning must needs be, either that for the better representation of the whole Church, there must be as well laymen, (as we call them,) of the eldership, as ministers; or that their elders ought to be chosen out of the company of men of every trade and vocation: which cannot in any wise agree to the practice of Geneva, where men of the state and councillors are only chosen. Now if upon their choice, as being idiots (*idiotæ*) before, they are become wise; so of laymen they are presently made ecclesiastical persons: then the representation of both the estates is drowned; by which means their eldership might lose the name of Church, or at the least scarcely continue it."

Beza is then further quoted as in opposition both to himself and "all his abettors in the erection of their eldership:' 'When Christ used these words, *Tell the Church*, etc., He understood in the person of his disciples a lawful senate or company assembled together in the name of the Church.' (*Ib.*, p. 53.) And: 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven were

\* *De Excom.*, p. 112.

given to all true elders, (including ruling elders,) in the person of the apostles.' Which opinion of his," continues Bancroft, "first overthroweth his collection, that there must needs be unpriestly elders for the said representation by him devised. For here we see the Church represented sufficiently, in his judgment, (*Matt.* xvi. 19 and 18,) by Christ's disciples and apostles; they being all of them ministers of the word and sacraments to whom Christ there spake. Secondly, if the apostles in receiving the keys sustained the person of all true priests, and if Peter, when Christ said unto him, *Unto thee will I give the keys*, sustained the person of the apostles; it followeth that ONE man may sustain the person of all Beza's true elders or eldership; and so, consequently, it is not against the word of God, if we say, *Tell the Church*, that is, *Tell the bishops*, viz., ONE MAN."

On the other point — the tenure of office on the part of the eldership — a like diversity of sentiment is developed: "At Geneva their elders are simply chosen but for a year. In the French Church in London they are elected (as I hear) for three years. It was thus ordered in the national council of the Belgic Churches at the Hague, 1586: 'Let the elders and deacons serve two years; and the half of them shall be changed every year,' etc. Scotland followeth the Geneva order, and doth retain them but for a year; and then every man as he was before. A prelate, Christ's vicar, a bishop, an archbishop, an ecclesiastical man this year; and a plain dauber, a thatcher, a tailor, a cobbler, and a tinker, the next year. . . . But what will you think if now the matter begin to be called in question, whether Geneva first, and then after, whether other Reformed churches of the Low Countries and Scotland have done well, in making these elders but temporal officers, rather than ministers of the Word? Certainly a learned man of that humor told me plainly, that both Geneva and the rest were thought by divers grave men to have done amiss therein. And peradventure by degrees you shall see some alteration about that matter. For the brethren of England, in their subscribed Discipline, do

Tenure of  
the office.

begin to make some qualification that way (as it seemeth unto me) when they say: '*Let not the elders be perpetual, nor yet easily removed.*' They must not be perpetual; but yet no time is prescribed; so that they may continue elders by this rule, through the strength of one ordination, twenty years, if the rest of their company be so pleased. And *Carolus Gallus*, in his book of Discipline, is already come to the point, affirming directly, that *it is not lawful for an elder of the Church after two or three years to give over his charge, but he must continue the same until his death.* . . . With whom agreeth *Bannosius*, (*De Polit. Civit. Dei*, etc., c. 71,) alleging this old canon, which provideth, *Ne bis presbyter ordinetur*, etc.; *that a priest or elder be not twice ordained.* For ordination (saith he) is the consecration of a perpetual function. This surely draweth deeply. I am persuaded that whilst Beza liveth it will never be admitted at Geneva. For so if their twelve elders did see their authority to be of such continuance, they might peradventure hold the six ministers noses to the grindstone. Whereas, now, they knowing their kingdom to be of such small continuance, even as they please the ministers, do suffer them to reign and do what they list; fearing what after-claps might light upon them the year after, if they should do otherwise."

In another place, speaking of the patristic authority "falsely alleged for pretended parish-bishops and elders," Bancroft exclaims loudly against the impudence of such a pretence: "Is Cartwright able to find his parish-bishops and his counterfeit lay-elders (which two points are in effect all with him) in the ancient fathers and primitive Church? He may say as truly that the sun shines at midnight. But yet he saith that *Ignatius and Cyprian's bishops were but as our pastors or parsons* in every parish. For his unministering elders he alleged the same *Ignatius and Cyprian*; and for a surcharge he bringeth in also *Tertullian, Jerome, Possidonius, and Socrates*. I was once purposed to have set down the places which they so violently pervert, to bolster out such their apparent falsehood, and to have answered them; but then I remembered how effectually that had been

Cartwright  
called to  
account.

done already by divers learned and worthy men, and of late more fully and largely by *two special persons*, whose books, one of them is in printing, (probably Bishop BILSON'S *Perpetual Government*, etc.,) and the other presently coming to the press, (*The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*,) and thereupon I altered my mind." (Chap. xxx.)

"Can it be showed out of any ancient Father, out of any council, either general or provincial, or out of any ecclesiastical history, for the space of one thousand five hundred and odd years, even from the apostles' time till of late, that in the ordinary distribution of Church officers, (since that time ever used,) into *episcopos, presbyteros, et diaconos*, (bishops, priests, and deacons;) whether can it (I say) be showed that this word *episcopus*, that is, bishop, was at any time taken there and used by the churches in any country, for a common and usual name to all ministers of the word and sacraments, without distinguishing thereby any one of them from another, or was it not ever, within the time limited, taken and used only in the said distribution, for one amongst the ministers of the word and sacraments, that governed the rest both of the ministers and people within their circuits limited unto them?"

Parochial  
bishops.

"This question was sent to Master Doctor Raynolds, in Oxford, to the intent he might return his opinion of (it,) which he forbore at the time to do, in respect of certain other business that he had in hand; howbeit Master Dr. Robinson, (his especial and most familiar friend,) being acquainted, as it seemeth, with the said question, hath written in this sort upon another occasion, not dissenting therein, as I take it, from Master Dr. Raynolds.

Raynolds  
appealed to.

"'I am persuaded,' saith he, 'that the angel of the Church of Ephesus, to whom St. John writeth, was *one minister set over* the rest. For, seeing there were many pastors there, why should St. John write to the angel of the Church of Ephesus, and not rather to the angels, if there had been no difference amongst them? And if this presidency had had that fault which is reproved in Diotrephes, our Saviour, who by his

servant reproveth those disorders which he found in the seven churches, would not have passed over *this* great fault in silence. Therefore, as Titus was left to reform the churches throughout the whole island of Crete, so I am persuaded that in other places some of that order of pastors and teachers which is perpetual in the Church, even in the time of the apostles, had a prelacy amongst their brethren, and that this pre-eminence is approved by our Saviour. And if we come any lower, though the word *episcopus* signify that care which is required of all, and in Scripture be applied to all that have charge of souls, yet I do not remember any one ecclesiastical writer, that I have read, wherein that word doth not import a greater dignity than is common to all ministers. Neither do I think that any old writer did, under the name of bishop, mean the pastor of every parish. When the emperors were persecutors, we read of several elders, but never of more than one bishop at once, in Rome; the like is to be said of other great cities and the churches near adjoining.'

"Thus far Dr. Robinson, with whom if Master Dr. Raynolds do agree, I see not whither the factioners will turn them, for (as I take it) they will not reject his opinion. They have bragged much of him, indeed, and of his judgment, in sundry of their writings, as though he were wholly on their side, and that they held nothing but he would justify it. Howbeit, they have done him therein, I doubt not, exceeding great injury. For requital whereof I would wish him never to seek any other revenge but to turn them to his book against HART, [No. 91,] where he hath written his mind, as touching this point now in hand.

"'In the Church of Ephesus,' saith Dr. Raynolds, 'though it had sundry elders and pastors to guide it, yet amongst those sundry was there one chief, whom our Saviour calleth the angel of the church, and writeth that to him which by him the rest should know. And this is he whom afterwards in the primitive church the Fathers called bishop. For . . . the name bishop, common (before) to all elders and pastors of the

church, was then by the usual language of the Fathers appropriated to him who had the presidentship over elders.'

"Here then you have two for Oxford, touching the language of the ancient Fathers when they speak of bishops. Now you shall have a Cambridge man's opinion. . . . Master Dr. FULKE, in his confutation of the Rhemish notes upon the New Testament, writeth thus: 'Amongst the clergy, for order and seemly government, there was alway one principal, to whom, by long use of the Church, the name of bishop, or superintendent, hath been applied; which room Titus exercised in Crete, Timothy in Ephesus, and others in other places. Therefore, although in the Scripture a bishop and an elder is of one order and authority, in preaching the word and administration of the sacraments, (as Jerome doth often confess,) yet *in government, by ancient use of speech, he is only called a bishop*, which is in the Scriptures called *προιστάμενος, προεστώς, or ἡγοούμενος*, (*Rom. xii, 1 Tim. v. 17, Heb. xiii. 17,*) that is, chief in government, to whom the ordination or consecration by imposition of hands, was always principally committed,' etc. Again, 'It appeareth by many places of Wycliffe's works, and namely in his Homily upon Phil. i., that he acknowledgeth the distinction of bishops and priests for order and government, although for doctrine and administration of sacraments they are all one.' Again, 'In the Fathers, *episcopus* and presbyter, bishop and priest, are two distinct degrees.'" (*Ibid.*)

"It is most apparent, and cannot be denied, but that Irenæus, Cyprian, Tertullian, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and divers other ancient writers, do call bishops *the apostles' successors*; in so much as some of them, especially the authors of the ecclesiastical histories, do draw long catalogues of the particular bishops' names that succeeded the apostles and other apostolical men whom they made bishops. Which catalogues and manner of speech of the said Fathers being used by them very fitly against such heretics as did rise up in their days, have since, in our time, been greatly abused by the Papists. Unto whom the learned men that have stood for the truth against them, by writing, have continually answered,

that the Fathers' arguments, drawn from the said personal succession by bishops, were very effectual, *so long as the succession of the apostles' doctrine did concur therewithal*; and that the Fathers, in urging of the first, had ever an especial eye to the second, some point of doctrine being ever called in question by the said heretics." (*Ibid.* xxvii.)

## CHAPTER XXII.

BILSON'S PERPETUAL GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH—SCOPE OF THE WORK—  
APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION THROUGH BISHOPS AFFIRMED—HOOKER—LAWS OF  
ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY—THE NUCLEUS OF THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE  
PRELATISTS AND PURITANS—THREE VIEWS—HOOKER'S CONDUCT OF THE  
ARGUMENT—HIS ELEVATED AIM—DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE CHURCH  
MYSTICAL AND VISIBLE—CHURCH AND STATE ONE SOCIETY—THEORY IDENTICAL  
WITH THAT OF LOCKE—EPISCOPACY A DIVINE INSTITUTION—ORDINATION  
WITHOUT A BISHOP—PRESBYTERIAN ORDERS—KEBLE'S GLOSS.

SOON after the publication of the *Survey*, in the same year, came forth a volume of enduring value: *The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church*, [No. 134,] by Dr. THOMAS BILSON, afterward Bishop of Winchester, *vir magni in Ecclesia nominis*, as Pearson justly styles him. "The argument of this work," says its latest editor, "has ever been held to be unanswerable: an opinion the justness of which is best established by the fact, that no one has been found who has attempted to answer it." "Of the many treatises written on the whole subject," says Bishop Ellicott, this is "one that may be especially recommended to the student."\*

Bilson's  
Perpetual  
Government,  
1693.

As a defence of the episcopal polity, in opposition to presbytery, it is unsurpassed, alike for cogency of argument and wealth of learning. On the question of a twofold eldership, as broached by Calvin, and maintained by Beza, it is particularly full, clear, and convincing. The scope of the work is well set forth by the author in the introductory epistle. "I have been very unwilling to enter into these controversies of discipline, that have now some space troubled the Church of England; . . . yet when I saw the peace of God's Church violated by the sharpness of

Scope of the  
work.

\* *Com. in I Tim.* iii.

some men's humors, and their tongues so intemperate that they could not be discerned from open enemies, I thought as in a common danger, not to sit looking till all were on fire, but rather by all means to try what kind of liquor would re-stinguish the flame.

“The main supports of their (the Presbyterian) new-devised discipline are the general equality of all pastors and teachers, and the joining of lay elders with them to make up the *presbytery*, that shall govern the Church. On this foundation they build the power of their consistory, that must admonish and punish all offences, etc. Against these false grounds, I show the Church of God from Adam to Moses, from Moses to Christ, and so downward under patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, hath been always governed by an inequality and superiority of pastors and teachers amongst themselves: and so much the very name and nature of government do enforce.

“Some of our new platformers . . . confess it to be an essential and perpetual part of God's ordinance, for each *presbytery* to have a chief amongst them; and yet, lest they should seem to agnize or admit the ancient and approved manner of the primitive Church retained amongst us, which is, to  
 New Platformers. appoint a fit man to govern each diocese, they have framed a running regency, that shall go round to all the presbyters of each place by course, and dure for a week, or some such space, for the device is so new, that they are not yet resolved what time this changeable superiority shall continue. . . . They pronounce this only to be God's institution, and this overseer or bishop to be apostolic; all others they reject as human; that is, as invented and established by man against the first and authentic order of the Holy Ghost.

“Thus far we join, that to prevent dissension and avoid confusion, there must needs, even by God's ordinance, be a president or ruler of every presbytery; which conclusion, because it is warranted by the grounds of nature, reason, and truth, and hath the example of the Church of God, before, under, and after the law, to con-

Point of agreement.

firm it, we accept as irrefutable, and lay it as the goundwork of all that ensueth. But whether this presidentship did in the apostles' times, and by their appointment, go round by course to all the pastors and teachers of every presbytery, or were by election committed to one chosen as the fittest to supply that place, so long as he discharged his duty without blame, *that is a main point in question betwixt us.*"

Point of  
difference.

The other "main point" is stated thus: "Certain great writers, greatly misliking in the government of the Church, the Romish kind of monarchy, and on the other side shunning as much popular tumult and anarchy, preferred *a middle course* betwixt them of *aristocracy*, thinking the Church would then be best guided, when neither one for danger of tyranny, nor all, for fear of mutiny, did bear the sway, but a number of the gravest and sincerest undertook the managing of all matters incident to the ecclesiastical regiment." Hence, "they compounded their presbyteries partly of pastors and partly of lay elders, whom they named *governing presbyters*."

"To proclaim this as a fresh device of their own, would be somewhat odious, and therefore they sought by all means, as well with examples as authorities, to make it seem ancient, for the better accomplishing of their desire. . . .

"The power of the keys was first settled in the apostles before it was delivered unto the Church; and the Church received it from the apostles, not the apostles from the Church. . . . The authority of their first calling liveth yet in their succession, and time and travail joined with God's graces bring pastors at this present to perfection; yet the apostles' charge to teach, baptize, and administer the Lord's Supper, to bind and loose sins in heaven and in earth, to impose hands for the ordaining of pastors and elders: these parts of the apostolic function are not decayed, and cannot be wanted in the Church of God. There must either be no Church, or else these must remain; for without these no Church can continue. . . . As the things be needful in the Church, so the persons to whom they were first com-

Apostolic  
succession.

mitted cannot be doubted. . . . The service must endure as long as the promise ; to the end of the world. . . . Christ is present with those who succeed his apostles in the same function and ministry forever." (Pp. 104-7.) " Things proper

to bishops, that might not be common to them with presbyters, were singularity in succeeding, and superiority in ordaining. . . . The singularity of one pastor in each place descended from the apostles and their scholars in all famous churches in the world, by a perpetual chain of succession, and doth to this day continue, but where abomination or desolation, I mean knavery or violence, interrupt it."

Through the  
Episcopal  
line.

The Perpetual Government proved the harbinger of a greater work: *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Eight Books.* By RICHARD HOOKER. [No. 135.] The great question discussed

1594.

by Hooker, the *nucleus* of the whole controversy between the prelatists and the Puritans, was the question of Church authority: not so much, as Keble points out, the question as to the reach and limits of that authority,

The question  
in dispute.

as the question with whom does Church authority reside? " On this point, in Hooker's time, as now, the Christian world in Europe (speaking largely) was divided into three great parties. The first, that of the ultra-montane Romanists, who deny to the civil government any further prerogative in Church matters, that is, as they interpret, in all matters of conscience, than that of executing the decrees of popes and councils.

Three views.

The second party, that of the Ghibellines in the Empire, of the prerogative lawyers in the kingdom of France, of Henry the Eighth in England, and generally of all in every country who maintain more or less expressly the claims of the local governments against the Papacy, adopt the principle (with numberless shades of difference, some of them very deeply marked,) that Church laws and constitutions are on the whole left by Providence to the discretion of the civil power. To this latter party, whether on principle or on account of the exigency of their position, most of the early Reformers attached

themselves. Its theory is implied in the *general* course of proceeding of the Lutherans, the Zuinglians, and the Anglicans under the lead of Cranmer.

“To these two parties, which had subsisted in much the same form, at least down from the age of Gregory VII., the events of the Genevan Reformation and the character and views of Calvin had added a third, about thirty years after the rise of Luther; a party which agreed with the Romanists in acknowledging a Church authority independent of the state, but differed from them as to the persons with whom such authority was intrusted; assigning it, not to the successors of the apostles as such, but to a mixed council of presbyters, lay and spiritual, holding their commission, not as an inward grace derived from our Lord by laying on of hands, but as an external prerogative, granted by positive enactment of Holy Scripture.

“There were predisposing circumstances which made England in the Elizabethan period, a promising field for the efforts of the foreign presbyterians. Some of these are touched on by Hooker himself in his Preface, and by G. Cranmer in his Letter on the Discipline.” Others are specified by Keble. But the most noteworthy is the fact that “not only in the parliaments of Elizabeth, but also in her cabinet, at least for the first thirty years of her reign, there existed a very strong bias in behalf of the Puritan party. Not only Knollys and Mildmay, who were Calvinists and Low Churchmen on principle, and Leicester, who may be suspected of looking chiefly to the spoils which any great church movement might place at his disposal; but even Burghley and Walsingham, it is well known, were continually finding themselves at issue with the archbishop of the day in reference to the degree of discouragement due to the Reformers.” The latter was the especial patron of Raynolds, the former of Walter Travers, the antagonist of Hooker and author of the book *De Disciplina Ecclesiastica*. [No. 83.]

The advocates of the presbyterian polity claimed, as we have seen, to deduce their scheme of discipline exclusively

from the Scriptures. Their reverence for the Word of God was associated, as Hallam remarks, with a singular narrowness of view "on the great themes of natural religion and the moral law, as deducible from reason and sentiment." These, as most of the various families of their descendants continue to do, they greatly slighted, or even treated as the mere chimeras of heathen philosophy. If they looked to the Mosaic law as the standard of criminal jurisprudence, if they sought precedents from Scripture for all matters of temporal policy, much more would they deem the practice of the apostles an unerring and immutable rule for the discipline of the Christian Church.

To encounter these adversaries, "Hooker took a far more original course than the ordinary controvertists, who fought their battle with conflicting interpretations of Scriptural texts or passages from the Fathers. He inquired into the nature and foundation of law itself as the rule of operation to all created beings, yielding thereto obedience by unconscious necessity, or sensitive appetite, or reasonable choice; reviewing especially those laws that regulate human agency, as they arise out of moral relations, common to our species, or the institutions of politic societies, or the intercommunity of independent nations; and having thoroughly established the fundamental distinction between laws natural and positive, eternal and temporary, immutable and variable, he came with all this strength of moral philosophy to discriminate by the same criterion the various rules and precepts contained in the Scriptures.

Hooker's conduct of the argument.

"It was a kind of maxim among the Puritans, that Scripture was so much the exclusive rule of human actions, that whatever, in matters at least concerning religion, could not be found to have its authority, was unlawful. Hooker devotes the whole second book of his work to the refutation of this principle. He proceeds afterwards to attack its application more particularly to the Episcopal scheme of Church government, and to the various ceremonies or usages which the Puritans treated as either absolutely superstitious, or at least

as impositions without authority. He maintains, not only that ritual observances are variable according to the discretion of ecclesiastical rulers, but that *no certain form of polity is set down in Scripture as generally indispensable for a Christian Church*. Far, however, from conceding to his antagonists the fact which they assumed, he contended for Episcopacy *as an apostolical institution*, and always preferable, when circumstances would allow its preservation, to the more democratical model of the Calvinistic congregations." \*

The elevation of this great writer's aims in the conduct of this controversy, the native nobleness of spirit displayed throughout his work, in dealing with a bitter and unrelenting foe, may be best illustrated by quoting his own lofty words: "If we did seek to maintain that which most advantageth our own cause, the very best way for us and the strongest against them were to hold, even as they do, that in Scripture there must needs be found some particular form of Church polity which God hath instituted, and which for that very cause belongeth to all churches at all times. But with any such partial eye to respect ourselves, and by cunning to make those things seem the truest, which are the fittest to serve our purpose, is a thing which we neither like nor mean to follow." (iii. x. 8.)

Disdain of  
subterfuge.

The distinction is broadly drawn by Hooker between the Church mystical and the Church visible. Wisely ignoring the expression "invisible Church," he expresses that which later writers mean by it, when he describes "that Church of Christ, which we properly term his body mystical," as being necessarily one, and not to be sensibly discerned by any man, inasmuch as the parts thereof are some in heaven, and the rest that are on earth, although their natural persons be visible, we do not discern under this property, whereby they are truly and infallibly of that body. Only our minds by intellectual conceit are able to apprehend, that such a real body there is, a body collective, because it containeth an huge

Church  
mystical and  
visible.

\* *Const. Hist.* iv.

multitude; a body mystical, because the mystery of their conjunction is removed altogether from sense. Whatsoever we read in Scripture concerning the endless love and the saving mercy which God showeth towards his Church, the only proper subject thereof is *this* Church.

“And as the promises belong to the mystical Church, even so, on the other side, when we read of any duty which the Church of God is bound unto, the Church whom this doth concern is a sensibly known company. And this visible Church in like sort is but one, continued from the first beginning of the world to the last end; . . . being divided into two moieties, the one before, the other since the coming of Christ, . . . all making but *one body*.” The unity of this visible Church consists in “outward profession of those things which supernaturally appertain to the very essence of Christianity, and are necessarily required in every particular Christian man. . . . If by *external profession* men be Christians, then are they of the visible Church of Christ: and Christians by external profession they are all, whose mark of recognizance hath in it those things which we have mentioned, yea, although they be impious idolaters, wicked heretics, persons excommunicable, yea, and cast out for notorious improbity. Such withal we deny not to be the imps and limbs of Satan, even as long as they continue such.

“For lack of diligently observing the difference, first between the Church of God mystical and visible, then between the visible sound and corrupted, sometimes more, sometimes less, the oversights are neither few nor light that have been committed.” (iii., c. i., s. 2, 3, 4, 7.)

While thus teaching that the essential unity of the Church visible consists in, and is known by an external profession of Christianity, without reference to “moral righteousness” on the part of any of its members, Hooker further maintains, in opposition to the Puritan premise — that the Church and the State are distinct and originally independent societies — that the Church existing in any particular country, and the State, are one

Church and  
State one  
society.

and the same society, contemplated in two different relations: "A commonwealth we name it simply in regard of some regiment or policy under which men live; a Church for the truth of that religion which we profess. . . . When we oppose the Church, therefore, and the commonwealth in a Christian society, we mean by the commonwealth that society with relation unto all the public affairs thereof, only the matter of true religion excepted; by the Church, the same society with only reference unto the matter of true religion, without any other affairs besides; when that society, which is both a Church and a commonwealth, doth flourish in those things which belong unto it as a commonwealth, we then say, 'the commonwealth doth flourish;' when in those things which concern it as a Church, 'the Church doth flourish;' when in both, then 'the Church and commonwealth flourish together.'" (viii., c. i., s. 5.)

It was by thus *identifying the Church with the commonwealth* that Hooker essayed to vindicate the prince's supremacy over the Church. But as, according to this view, every member of the State is also a member of the Church, and as such — according to Hooker's theory of a social compact — entitled to a part in its government, (by choice of pastors or otherwise,) Hooker endeavors to show, through the medium of the original compact of civil society, that the sovereign had received this, as well as all other powers, at the hands of the people. "Laws being made among us are not by any of us so taken or interpreted, as if they did receive their force from power which the prince doth communicate unto the parliament, or unto any other court under him, but from power which the whole body of the realm being naturally possessed with, hath by free and deliberate assent derived unto him that ruleth over them so far forth as hath been declared; so that our laws made concerning religion do take originally their essence from the power of the whole realm and Church of England." Hooker's theory of civil government, it is thus obvious, is absolutely coincident with that of Locke; deriving the origin of government, as it does, both in right and in fact,

from a primary contract; “ without which consent there were no reason that one should take upon him to be lord or judge over another; because although there be, according to the opinion of some great and judicious men, a kind of natural right in the noble, wise, and virtuous, to govern them which are of servile disposition; nevertheless, for the manifestation of this their right, and men’s more peaceable contentment on both sides, the assent of them who are to be governed seemeth necessary. . . . The lawful power of making laws to command whole politic societies of men, belongeth so properly unto the same entire societies, that for any prince or potentate of what kind soever upon earth to exercise the same of himself, and not by express commission immediately and personally received from God, or else by authority received at first from their consent upon whose persons they impose laws, it is no better than mere tyranny. Laws they are not, therefore, which public approbation hath not made so. But approbation not only they give, who personally declare their assent by voice, sign, or act; but also when others do it in their names, by right originally, at the least, derived from them. As in parliaments, councils, and the like assemblies, although we be not personally ourselves present, notwithstanding our assent is by reason of other agents there in our behalf. And what we do by others, no reason but that it should stand as our deed, no less effectually to bind us, than if ourselves had done it in person. . . . In all societies . . . what severally each shall be bound unto, it must be with all their assents ratified. Against all equity it were that a man should suffer detriment at the hands of men, for not observing that which he never did either by himself or others mediately or immediately agree unto. . . . I cannot choose but highly commend their wisdom, by whom the foundation of the (English) commonwealth hath been laid; wherein though no manner of person or cause be unsubject unto the king’s power, yet so is the power of the king over all, and in all limited, that unto all his proceedings the law itself is a rule. The axioms of our regal government are these: *Lex facit regem* — the king’s grant of

any favor made contrary to the law is void; — *Rex nihil potest nisi quod jure potest* — what power the king hath he hath it by law: the bounds and limits of it are known, *the entire community giveth general order by law, how all things publicly are to be done*; and the king as the head thereof, the highest authority over all, causeth according to the same law, every particular to be framed and ordered thereby. The whole body politic maketh laws, which laws give power unto the king; and the king having bound himself to use according to law that power, it so falleth out that the execution of the one is accomplished by the other.”

It is thus plain, as Hallam has pointed out, that in the judgment of Hooker, “absolute monarchy is both pernicious in itself and contrary to the fundamental laws of the English commonwealth.”

For *Episcopacy* Hooker claims *a divine institution*: — “A thousand five hundred years and upward the Church of Christ hath now continued under the sacred regiment of bishops. Neither for so long hath Christianity been ever planted in any kingdom throughout the world but with this kind of government alone; which to have been *ordained of God*, I am for mine own part even as resolutely persuaded, as that any other kind of government in the world whatsoever is of God. . . . A bishop is a minister of God, unto whom with permanent continuance there is given not only power of administering the word and sacraments, which power other presbyters have; but also a further power to ordain ecclesiastical persons, and a power of chieftly in government over presbyters as well as laymen, a power to be by way of jurisdiction a pastor even to pastors themselves. . . . The first bishops in the Church of Christ were his blessed apostles; for the office whereunto Matthias was chosen the sacred history doth term ἐπισκοπήν, an episcopal office. . . . Bishops they were at large. Apostles, whether they did settle in any one certain place, as James, or else did otherwise, as the apostle Paul, episcopal authority either at large or with restraint they had and exercised; and all others

Episcopacy  
a divine  
institution.

who have it after them in orderly sort are their lawful successors, whether they succeed in any particular church, where before some apostle, as Simon succeeded James in Jerusalem; or else be otherwise endued with the same kind of bishoply power, although it be not where any apostle before hath been. For to succeed them, is after them to have that episcopal kind of power which was first given to them. . . . From whence it may haply seem to have grown, that they whom we now call bishops were usually termed at the first apostles." (vii., c. i., s. 4; c. ii., s. 3; c. iv., s. 1, 3.)

"There are two main things observed in every ecclesiastical function, power to exercise the duty itself, and some charge of people whereon to exercise the same; the former of these is received at the hands of *the whole visible Catholic Church*. For it is not one particular multitude that can give power, the force whereof may reach far and wide indefinitely, as the power of order doth, which whoso hath once received, there is no action which belongeth thereunto but he may exercise effectually the same in any part of the world without iterated ordination. They whom the whole Church hath from the beginning used as her agents in conferring this power, are not either one or more of the laity, . . . only persons ecclesiastical, and they in place of calling, superiors both unto deacons and unto presbyters; only such persons ecclesiastical have been authorized to ordain both, and to give them the power of order in the name of the whole Church. Such were the apostles, such was Timothy, such was Titus, such are bishops. Not that there is between these no difference, but that they all agree in pre-eminence of place above both presbyters and deacons, whom they otherwise might not ordain.

"Now whereas hereupon some do infer, that no ordination can stand but only such as is made by bishops, which have had their ordination likewise by other bishops before them, till we come to the very apostles of Christ themselves: . . . to this we answer, that *there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop.*

Ordination  
without a  
bishop.

“The whole Church visible being the true original subject of all power, it hath not ordinarily allowed any other than bishops alone to ordain: howbeit, as the ordinary course is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways.

“Men may be extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways admitted unto spiritual functions in the Church. One is, when God himself doth of himself raise up any, whose labor he useth without requiring that men should authorize them; but then he doth ratify their calling by manifest signs and tokens himself from heaven. Another extraordinary kind of vocation is, when *the exigence of necessity doth constrain* to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep: where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain; *in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give, place.* And therefore we are not simply and without exception to urge a lineal descent from the apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination. These cases of inevitable necessity excepted, none may ordain but only bishops.” (vii., c. xiv. 10, 11.)

“Although I see that certain reformed churches, the Scottish especially, and the French, have not that which best agreeth with the sacred Scripture, I mean the government that is, by bishops, . . . this their defect and imperfection I had rather lament in such case than exagitate, considering that men oftentimes, without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regiment which is best.” (iii., c. xi. 14.)

To break the force of this admission, Keble calls attention to three facts: first, “the exact conditions of *extreme* necessity, *unwilling* deviation, *impossibility* of procuring a bishop to ordain, with which he limits his concession; second, the concession itself was manifestly inserted to meet the case of the foreign Protestants, not gathered by the exercise of independent judgment from the nature of the case or the judgment of antiquity; third, Hooker might feel him-

Presbyterian  
orders.

Keble's gloss.

self biassed by his respect for existing authority; numbers having, nearly up to the time when he wrote, been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England, with no better than Presbyterian ordination."

"At the same time," as Keble is here obliged to confess, "it is undeniable, that here and in many other passages we may discern a marked distinction between that which now perhaps we may venture to call the school of HOOKER, and that of LAUD, HAMMOND, and LESLIE, in the two next generations." But the distinction is at once reduced to a *minimum*, in these characteristic sentences: "He, as well as they, regarded the order of bishops as being immediately and properly of divine right; he as well as they laid down principles, which, strictly followed up, would make this claim exclusive. But he, in common with most of his contemporaries, shrunk from the legitimate result of his own premises, the rather, as *the fulness of apostolical authority on this point had never come within his cognizance*; whereas the next generation of divines entered on the subject, *fresh from the discovery of the genuine remains of Ignatius!* He did not feel at liberty to press unreservedly, and develop in all its consequences, that part of the argument which they, taught by the primitive Church, regarded as the most vital and decisive: *the necessity, namely, of the apostolical commission to the derivation of sacramental grace, and to our mystical communion with Christ.* Yet on the whole, considering his education and circumstances, the testimony which he bears to the bolder and completer view of the divines of the seventeenth century is most satisfactory." (*Pref.*, p. xxxviii.)

On the point here made of Hooker's want of acquaintance with "the fulness of apostolical authority," as developed in the genuine remains of Ignatius, it may suffice to remark that the Epistles of Ignatius, in the larger Greek recension, were familiar to Hooker and Hooker's contemporaries, Bilson and Field, as appears from quotation and reference in their works; and it cannot be shown that either he or they entertained a doubt as to the genuineness of the Ignatian testimony to the divine institution of Episcopacy, as that testimony came before them in the Pseudo-Ignatius.

## CHAPTER XXIII.

FIELD: OF THE CHURCH — DEFINITION — *IN AND OF THE CHURCH* — NOTES — ORDERS — PRESBYTERIAL ORDINATION — CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY; PROCEEDINGS IN 1604-1606; CANONS OF — BISHOP OVERALL'S CONVOCATION BOOK.

HOOKER'S great work, fitly following Bilson's *Perpetual Government*, was no less worthily followed by "the very learned" FIELD'S treatise, *Of the Church, Five Books*. [No. 140.] The high place which this work has ever held from the day of its publication to the present, seems to have been anticipated by its author, "when, in reply to a friend who would have dissuaded him from the undertaking, on the ground that he was inviting a controversy of which it would be difficult to foresee the end, he said, '*I will so write as they shall have no great mind to answer me.*'" "This one volume," writes Coleridge to his son, "thoroughly understood and appropriated, will place you in the highest ranks of doctrinal Church of England divines, (of such as now are,) and in no mean rank as a true doctrinal historian." In the Romish controversy this work stands as the counterpart to Hooker's in the Puritan contest.

Richard Field,  
1606.

Of the five books into which this treatise is divided, the *first* treats of "the name, nature, and DEFINITION of the Church; and *the different sorts* of them that do pertain unto it; the *second*, of the NOTES of the Church; the *third* showeth which is the TRUE CHURCH demonstrated by those notes; the *fourth* is of the *Privileges* of the Church; the *fifth*, of the *divers degrees, ORDERS, and callings* of those men to whom the government of the Church is committed."

Field defines the Church as "the multitude and number of those whom Almighty God severeth from the rest of the

world by the work of his grace, and calleth to the participation of eternal happiness, by the knowledge of such supernatural verities as concerning their everlasting good He hath revealed in Christ his Son, and such other precious and happy means as He hath appointed to further and set forward the work of their salvation. So that it is the work of grace, and the heavenly call, that give being to the Church." (i. vi.) "They that are partakers of the heavenly calling, and sanctified by the profession of divine truth, and the use of the means of salvation, are of very divers sorts;" *first*, they "that profess the truth delivered by Christ, but not *wholly* and *entirely*, as heretics;" *second*, they "that profess the whole saving truth, but not in *unity*, as schismatics;" *third*, they "that profess the whole saving truth in unity, but not in *sincerity*, and singleness of a good and sanctified mind, as hypocrites and wicked men, not outwardly divided from the people of God;" and *fourth*, they "that profess the whole saving truth in unity, and sincerity of a good and sanctified heart." (*Id.*, vii.)

"The name of the *orthodox* Church is applied to distinguish right-believing Christians from heretics; the name of the *Catholic* Church, men holding the faith *in unity*, from schismatics; the name of the *invisible* Church, 'the Church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven,' the mystical body of Christ—to distinguish the elect from the rest. . . . When we say, therefore, none but the elect of God are of the Church; we mean not that others are not at all, nor in any sort of the Church, but that they are not principally, fully, and absolutely;—not of that especial number who partake and communicate in the most perfect work, force, and effect of saving grace. This was the meaning of Wiclyffe, Huss, and others, who define the Church to be the multitude of the elect." (vi. vii.)

Field indorses the distinction of Augustine between "them that are *IN* the Church and them that are *OF* the Church: 'Some are in such sort *in* the house of God, that they also *ARE* the house of God; and some are so in the house of God, that

they pertain not to the frame and fabric of it. . . . Of them that are IN the Church there are three sorts: some only in external profession; some in profession and affection; some in profession and affection, with never <sup>In the Church and of it.</sup> altering resolution, joining themselves to the company of believers, and having their hearts knit unto God forever. (*Id.*, ix.) Hence it cometh that we say there is a *visible* and *invisible* Church, not meaning to make two distinct churches, as our adversaries falsely and maliciously charge us, though the form of words may serve to insinuate some such thing, but to distinguish the divers considerations of the same Church; which though it be *visible* in respect of the profession of supernatural verities revealed in Christ, use of holy sacraments, order of ministry, etc., yet in respect of the benefits of saving grace wherein only the elect do communicate, it is *invisible*." (x.)

Of the NOTES of the Church Field treats with great fulness and exhaustive learning, fairly confronting the great contemporary Romish advocates, Bellarmine and Stapleton. "The notes which perpetually distinguish the true Catholic Church from all other societies of men and <sup>Notes.</sup> professions of religion, are three: First, the entire profession of those supernatural verities, which God hath revealed in Christ his Son: Secondly, the use of such ceremonies and sacraments as he hath instituted, etc.: Thirdly, an union of men in this profession . . . under lawful pastors and guides." (ii., c. ii.)

On the subject of ORDERS, FIELD and HOOKER are perfectly at one. To the question, "Whether the power of ordination be so essentially annexed to the order of bishops, that none but bishops may in any case ordain?" Field makes answer: "The power of sacred order, that is, the power and <sup>Orders.</sup> authority to intermeddle with things pertaining to the service of God, and to perform acts . . . tending to the eternal good of men, *is equal and the same in all those whom we call presbyters*: — and that *only for order's sake*, and the preservation of peace, *there is a limitation of the use and exer-*

*cise of the same.* Hereunto agree all the best learned amongst the Romanists themselves, freely confessing that that wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter, *is not a distinct and higher order, or power of order*, but a kind of dignity and office or employment only." Their proof is this: "A presbyter that was never ordained deacon, may notwithstanding perform all acts pertaining to the diaconate, because the higher order doth always imply in it the lower and inferior, in an eminent degree: but a bishop ordained *per saltum*, that never had the ordination of a presbyter, can neither consecrate and administer the sacrament of the Lord's body; nor ordain a presbyter, himself being none; nor do any act peculiarly pertaining to presbyters. Whereby it is most evident, that that wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter, is not a distinct power of order, but an eminence and dignity only, especially yielded to one above all the rest *of the same rank*, for order sake, and to preserve the unity and peace of the Church. Hence it followeth, that many things which in some cases presbyters may lawfully do are peculiarly reserved unto bishops, as Hierome noteth: 'Rather for the honor of their ministry than the necessity of any law.'\* And therefore, we read, that presbyters in some places, and at some times, did impose hands, and confirm such as were baptized. . . . And who knoweth not, that all presbyters in cases of necessity may absolve and reconcile penitents; a thing in ordinary course appropriated unto bishops? *And why not, by the same reason, ordain presbyters and deacons in cases of like necessity?* . . . If they (bishops) become enemies to God and true religion, 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 work of the ministry pertains to them likewise. . . . There is no reason to be given, but that in case of necessity, wherein all bishops were extinguished by death, or, being fallen into heresy, should refuse to ordain any to serve God in his true worship, but that presby-

Presbyters may  
ordain.

\* *Contra Lucif.*

ters, as they may do all other acts, whatsoever special challenge bishops in ordinary course make upon them, might do this also. *Who, then, darè condemn all those worthy ministers of God that were ordained by presbyters, in sundry churches of the world, at such times as bishops, in those parts where they lived, opposed themselves against the truth of God, and persecuted such as professed it? Surely the best learned in the Church of Rome in former times did not pronounce all ordinations of this nature to be void. For, not only Armachanus, but, as it appeareth by Alexander of Hales, many learned men in his time and before, were of opinion that in some cases presbyters may give orders, . . . though to do so, not being urged by extreme necessity, cannot be excused from over-great boldness and presumption.*" (iii., c. xxxix.)

No inconsiderable light is thrown, from time to time, upon the state of opinion in the Church of England, by the proceedings in the Convocation of Canterbury, a body which appears to have assumed its present form about the close of the fourteenth century. Summoned by the archbishop's writ, under the king's direction, the convocation regularly assembles at the same time with the Parliament, to which it bears analogy, both in its constituent parts and in its primary functions. It consists, since the Reformation, of the suffragan bishops, forming the upper house; of the deans, archdeacons, a proctor or proxy for each chapter, and two from each diocese, elected by the parochial clergy, who constitute together the lower house. Before the Reformation, in addition to the power of granting subsidies to the crown, it possessed the right of enacting ecclesiastical canons; a right virtually surrendered by its recognition of the royal supremacy. It was now deprived by statute of the power to enact new canons without the king's license; and, even subject to this condition, its power is further limited by later acts of Parliament. For more than a century this assembly had little business but to grant subsidies, and this practice was silently discontinued in 1664; and from this

Convocation  
of  
Canterbury.

time the clergy have been taxed at the same rate and in the same manner with the laity.

The proceedings of convocation of most interest and importance, as illustrating the state of feeling and opinion on Church questions in England during a most eventful period, are those of the years 1604-6, 1640, and 1700. Some account of these, severally, may not therefore be beside our purpose.

The see of Canterbury being now vacant, Bancroft, Bishop of London, presided in convocation by commission. In the  
 Canons.  
 1604. eleventh session the president delivered to the prolocutor of the lower house a book of CANONS, which, after considerable discussion in both houses, were unanimously agreed upon. These canons, in number *one hundred and forty-one*, form the only body of ecclesiastical law by which the Anglican Church is still governed. According to Collier, they were collected and arranged by Bancroft, who selected them from "the articles, injunctions, and synodical acts passed and published in the reigns of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth," to which some new ones were added. Not having been ratified by act of Parliament, though sanctioned by the royal assent, they are held not to bind the laity *proprio vigore*, that is, not by virtue of their own enactment, but only so far as they confirm already existing law.

The *first* canon asserts the royal supremacy in causes ecclesiastical, and requires all the clergy to make a public declaration of it at least once a year. The *second* is also directed against impugners of the supremacy; and the *third* affirms the Church of England to be a true and apostolic Church. The next *five* relate to the impugners of the worship, the articles, the rites and ceremonies of the Church, "the government of the Church of England under his majesty by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons," etc., and the ordination service; and the remaining *four* canons of this first division (set aside by the Act of Toleration) are directed against schismatics and maintainers of conventicles.

The second division, entitled *Of Divine Service and Administration of the Sacraments*, comprises eighteen canons. The

thirteenth enjoins the celebration of divine service on Sundays and other holy-days, and not only attendance on public worship, but also the visiting of the poor and sick, and the use of all godly and sober conversation. The fourteenth enjoins the use, on Sundays and holy-days, of the prescript form of divine service. The fifteenth directs the Litany to be read on Wednesdays and Fridays. The eighteenth enjoins that "when in the time of divine service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as it hath been accustomed." The thirtieth explains the lawful use of the cross in baptism.

The third division, entitled *Ministers, their ordination, function, and charge*, contains *forty-seven* canons, relating to the times for ordination, the titles, qualifications, and examination of ministers. The thirty-first appoints "for the making of ministers" the Sundays immediately following the Ember weeks; and the thirty-second that none be made deacon and minister both in one day. The thirty-sixth requires subscription to three articles affirming the royal supremacy, the scriptural character of the Book of Common Prayer, and of the thirty-nine articles. The body of the canons under this division relate to a great variety of subjects: institution, simony, pluralities, residence, beneficed preachers, beneficed men not preachers. When these canons were framed many were ordained to the ministry who were not qualified to preach; and to meet the case of these persons the Homilies had been prepared, while special license was given to those who were qualified.

The last division of the canons, the only one calling for further remark, relates to the *authority of synods*. A national synod is named *the Church representative*, and it is declared that "the sacred synod of this nation, in the name of Christ and by the king's authority assembled, is the true Church of England by representation;" to which body it is, therefore, alone competent (we may add, though the canons do not, but leave it to be inferred,) to legislate for the whole Church of England.

The convocation of the following year is rendered noteworthy by its sanction of Bishop OVERALL'S *Convocation Book*, the discussion of which was the great business of the assembly.

1605, 1606.

The object of Overall in its compilation, it would appear, was "to establish the divine right of kings and bishops, in opposition to the divine right of any bishop or bishops to be above kings, and in opposition to the divine right of the Presbyterian discipline." Though solemnly sanctioned by the Church in convocation, the book, on account of its not having received the royal confirmation, is held as possessing no legal authority; yet there is no room to doubt that it was designed to be received as an authentic exposition of the mind of the Anglican Church on the subjects of which it treats.

Bishop Over-  
all's Convoca-  
tion Book.

Some of its more important statements demand our attention: The three creeds are affirmed as containing a summary of Christian truth; while the creed of Pope Pius IV. is repudiated. The *eleventh* chapter of the second book has this title: "That there is no more necessity of one visible head of the Catholic Church than of one visible monarch over all the world;" and contains the following important statements: "It is certain and manifest, that as the Catholic Church is resembled in the Scriptures to an host well ordered, to a human body, to a kingdom, to a flock of sheep, to an house, and to a ship; so Christ only is intended thereby to be her only general, her only head, her only king, her only shepherd, her only householder, her only pilot. Neither can any other thing be enforced from the words mentioned of one faith and one baptism, but that as we are only justified through a lively faith in Christ, so there is but one baptism ordained, whereby we have our first entrance into his spiritual kingdom, and are made particular members of his Catholic Church." The third and last book contains a sketch of the papal usurpations to the time of the full establishment of the popedom. This work, preserved in manuscript for eighty-four years, was first given to the world by Archbishop Sancroft in 1690, professedly with a view to promote the non-juring interest. In one

remarkable instance it produced the directly opposite effect. Dr. WILLIAM SHERLOCK, who shared Sancroft's conscientious scruples respecting allegiance, and with him had refused to take the oaths to the new government, read the book, and found in it a passage in decisive opposition to the non-juring views. The doctrine here taught, and embodied, moreover, in a canon, is to the effect that "a government, which had originated in rebellion, ought, when thoroughly settled, to be considered as ordained by God, and as such to be obeyed alike by clergy and laity." Sherlock, "in influence and reputation, though not in rank, the foremost man among the non-jurors, read, and was convinced. His venerable mother the Church had spoken; and he, with the docility of a child, accepted her decree."\* It is generally believed, however, that the Convocation Book only furnished Sherlock with "a pretext for doing what he had already made up his mind to do. His passions and prejudices had led him into an error which he determined to recant; and it cost him less to say that his opinion had been changed by newly-discovered evidence than that he had formed a wrong judgment with all the materials for the forming of a right judgment before him." †

\* *Macaulay, Hist.*, iv. 41, sq.

† *Ibid. Lathbury, Hist. Convoc.* 336.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

JOHN ROBINSON, "THE FATHER OF CONGREGATIONALISM": BAILLIE'S ACCOUNT OF HIM—CATECHISM CONCERNING CHURCH GOVERNMENT—DEFINITION—NOTES—OFFICERS—CALDERWOOD'S ALTAR OF DAMASCUS—BISHOP DAVENANT'S ASSERTION OF THE PROTESTANT DEFINITION OF THE CHURCH AGAINST BELLARMINE; OF THE INVISIBLE CHURCH; OF DEGREES IN THE MINISTRY; OF PRESBYTERIAL ORDINATION—LORD CHANCELLOR BACON: "CONSIDERATIONS ON CHURCH GOVERNMENT."

JOHN ROBINSON, "the Father of *Independentism*," is described by the graphic pen of BAILLIE, the champion of Presbytery, (1645,) as a "supporter of languishing Brownism, in its dying days; the most learned, polished, and modest spirit that ever that sect enjoyed: it had been truly a marvel," he adds, "if such a man had gone on to the end a rigid separatist. Having gone over from England to Leyden, with a separate congregation, he wrote for a time very handsome apologies and justifications of that evil way; but Dr. AMES and Master Parker, compassionating the man, and pitying that so excellent parts should be so ill employed, labored him so by conferences and letters, that there was great appearance, if his days had continued, he might have proved a happy instrument for the total abolition of that schism. But God was pleased to take him away in the beginning of his good work.

"He came back indeed the one half of the way; he ruined the rigid separation, and was the author of a semi-separatism, printing in his later times against his former books, the lawfulness of communicating with the Church of England in the word and prayer, albeit not in the sacraments and discipline: this was a fair bridge, at least a fair arch of a bridge for union; but the man being removed by death before he could perfect

Baillie's  
character of  
Robinson.

1610.

what he had begun, his new doctrine, though it was destructive to his old sect, became an occasion of a new one not very good. It was the womb and seed of that lamentable *Independency* which in Old and New England hath been the fountain of many evils. As for the old Brownists, their number is but very small, and their way is become contemptible not only to all the rest of the world, but to their own children also; even they begin to heap coals of contumelies upon their parents' heads, as may be seen in the elogies which both Master Cotton and the five apologists are pleased to give them in print. Yea, so much are the children ashamed of their fathers, that they usually take it for a contumely to be called after their name. No *Independent* will take it well at any man's hand, to be called a *Brownist* either in whole or in the smallest part." (*Dissuasive*, p. 17.)

The writings of ROBINSON [No. 153,] furnish the most authentic exposition of the Independent scheme of polity; and among these the tract entitled *A Brief Catechism concerning Church Government* may be taken as giving it in the most satisfactory form:

On Church  
Government.

"What is the Church? A company of faithful and holy people, with their seed, called by the word of God into public covenant with Christ and amongst themselves for mutual fellowship in the use of all the means of God's glory and their salvation.

"A church consists of such a number as may ordinarily meet together in one place for the worship of God and sanctification of the Lord's day.

"But are not hypocrites mingled with the faithful in the Church?

"None ought to be by the word of God, and where such are, they are not truly added by the Lord to the Church, but do creep in through their own hypocrisy, and not without the Church's sin also, if they may be discerned to be such.

"How prove you the seed of the faithful to be of the Church with them?

"By the covenant which God made with Abraham and his

seed, which was the covenant of the gospel, and confirmed in Christ; the seal thereof, circumcision, being the seal of the righteousness of faith.

“What are the essential marks of the Church?”

“Faith and order, as the Church in them may be seen, and beheld to walk in Christ Jesus, whom she hath received.

Notes. Faith professed in word and deed, showing the matter to be true; and order in the holy things of God, showing the forms to be true; which are the two essential parts of the Church.

“Are not the preaching of the word and administering of the sacraments certain marks of the true Church?”

“No, for the word may, and that rightly, be preached to assemblies of unbelievers for their conversion, as may the sacraments also (though unjustly) be administered unto them, and so be made lying signs. Besides, the true Church may for a time want the use of divers ordinances of God, but hath always right unto them; as may also the false church usurp and abuse them, but without right.

“How many are the officers of ministry in the Church?”

“Five, besides the extraordinary officers of apostles, prophets, and evangelists, for the first planting of the churches, which are ceased, with their extraordinary gifts. Those officers be, 1. The pastor, (exhorter,) to whom is given the gift of wisdom for exhortation. 2. The teacher, to whom is given the gift of knowledge for doctrine. 3. The governing elder, who is to rule with diligence. 4. The deacon, who is to administer the holy treasure with simplicity. 5. The widow or deaconess, who is to attend the sick and impotent with compassion and cheerfulness.

Church  
Officers.

“By whom are these officers to have their outward calling? By the Church whereof they are members for the present, and to which they are to administer.

“Is this outward calling of simple necessity for a true church-officer? Yea, as for the magistrate in the city and commonwealth, or steward in the family, without which they usurp

their places, how excellent soever, whether in their gifts or works." (*Works*, vol. iii., pp. 427-31.)

In Scotland, the prolonged debate concerning episcopacy was opened by the publication of CALDERWOOD'S *De Regimine Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ brevis Relatio*. [No. 168.] This was followed, after two years, by a reply from the pen of Archbishop SPOTSWOODE, entitled *Refutatio Libelli de Regimine Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ*. [No. 169.] Calderwood rejoined in a noted work bearing the title of *The Altar of Damascus, or the Pattern of the English Hierarchy and Church Policy obtruded upon the Church of Scotland*. The allusion in the title is to the incident

1618.

Altar of  
Damascus.

1621.

recorded in the Second Book of Kings, chap. xvi. 10-16: "And King Ahaz went to Damascus, . . . and saw an altar that was at Damascus: and King Ahaz sent to Urijah the priest the fashion of the altar, and the pattern of it, according to all the workmanship thereof. And Urijah the priest built an altar according to all that King Ahaz had sent from Damascus," etc.

This work, which appeared two years later, in a greatly enlarged form, in Latin, (*Altare Damascenum*), [No. 170,] is regarded by the friends of parity in the ministry as one of the very ablest defences of their system; containing, as it does, a learned and elaborate discussion, from the Presbyterian point of view, of the leading points relating to Church order and ritual, in dispute, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, between Canterbury and Geneva.

The writings of Bishop DAVENANT [No. 186] on the subject of the Church, if estimated according to their weight and worth, are to be assigned the highest place among those of contemporary theologians. As belonging to the ante-Laudian period they here claim some attention. And, *first*, of "the holy Catholic Church which we believe," Davenant, controverting Bellarmine's well-known definition: *The Catholic Church is a body of men united in the profession of the same Christian faith and participation in the same sacraments, under the*

1634.

Protestant  
definition.

*government of lawful pastors*, determines thus: "From this definition it is evident that three things only are required for constituting the Church Catholic — namely, outward profession of the faith, outward participation in the sacraments, and outward subjection to the Bishop of Rome. In whomsoever these externals are found, although they should not be possessed of any virtue, or any gift of internal grace; although they should be reprobate, wicked or hypocrites, yet are they, upon the authority of Bellarmine,\* true members of the holy Catholic Church. We, on the contrary, insist that Christians do certainly become members of particular churches, such, for example, as the Roman, the Anglican, or the Gallican; they also become *presumptive* members, if we may so speak, of the Catholic Church, by outward profession, communion, and subjection under legitimate pastors; yet do not become *true* members of the holy Catholic Church, which we believe, unless they are sanctified by the inward gift of grace, and are united to Christ, the Head, by the inward bond of the Spirit. To this holy Catholic Church, then, which forms the mystical body of Christ, we deny that the ungodly, hypocrites, or any belong, who are not partakers of spiritual life." (*Det.* xlvi.)

Again: "The *invisible Church* is not a Platonic idea. A twofold meaning may be given to this proposition: One, that an invisible Church is not a mere figment of our divines, but that that holy Catholic Church, in which in the  
 The invisible Church. Creed we profess to believe, is really invisible. The other that the orthodox Church, which rightly worships God, may be reduced within such narrow limits, and by a prevailing faction of the superstitious or heretical, be for a time so oppressed, as to come before the eyes of the vulgar with no external splendor.

"What we speak of the invisible Church, (in the first sense,) is perfectly true: *First*, because the main part of it, that which is triumphant in heaven, is not apparent to human vision, but to faith. . . . The denominations of things are very properly taken either from the predominant or the more noble part of

\* *De Eccl. Mil.* iii. 2.

them. Since then that numerous and noble Church, which is now triumphant in heaven, is plainly invisible to us; since Christ himself, the Head of the Catholic Church, is also invisible; when we say that the Church is invisible, we are not putting forward a Platonic idea; on the contrary, we intend to point out the best, the chief, the most holy, and most sure part of the Church. *Secondly*, we maintain that the Church is invisible, on the ground that this part itself which sojourns upon earth cannot be perceived or judged of by any outward sense. We see the individuals, indeed, of whom particular churches are formed, but which of them belongs to the holy Catholic Church, which is Christ's mystical body, there is no evidence for the eyes to discern.

"*Thirdly*, that this proposition is not a mere fiction of the Protestants, but a real truth, may be proved from the fact, that nothing which is capable of being perceived by the sight, or by any other natural sense, affords certain proof concerning any one that he is a member of the Catholic Church." (*Det.* xxxv.)

*Of diversity of degrees in the ministers of the gospel*: "It will not be necessary to inquire minutely whether Episcopacy be a distinct order from Presbytery, or only another and higher degree in the same order. William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris, distinctly affirms that Episcopacy is not an *order*, but an *honor*; which is also maintained by GERSON, whose words are these: *Bishops do not possess a different power of order from that of priests, but they possess the same power in a more perfect measure.* Finally, Durandus is of the same opinion: *Episcopacy*, says he, *is not an order strictly distinct from the simple priesthood, but the distinction between them is of perfect and imperfect.* Hither tends the argument of the schoolmen, that the episcopate, as distinguished from the simple priesthood, is not another order, but a more eminent power and dignity of certain persons who are in the same sacerdotal order. \* It is sufficient for us (laying aside this verbal dispute) to show that those who are peculiarly called bishops, have a higher dignity, greater power,

"Divers orders."

and more excellent offices annexed to them than other presbyters have, and that this is not repugnant to the word of God. But it were trivial to say, *not repugnant*; for it is easy to demonstrate that, in the divine word, this eminence of bishops above presbyters is shadowed out, delineated, and by the apostles themselves established.

“For, *first*, the institution of the high-priest in the Jewish Church afforded to the Christian Church a clear precedent for the establishment of a similar order. *Second*, Christ himself constituted ministers for the edification of his Church, not endued with equal authority, but distinct in degree of dignity and power. For the twelve apostles were superior to the seventy disciples, . . . and it is the constant doctrine of nearly all the Fathers, that the bishops succeeded the apostles in the ordinary government of the Church, as the presbyters also succeeded the seventy disciples. *Third*, before the apostles left the earth, they placed in the great cities a bishop, in authority superior to, and in power greater than the other presbyters. Chief pastor of the city, he possessed superiority not only over the laity, but over the clergy of the city. And of these chief pastors it is certain that there was a perpetual succession.

“There are three peculiar marks, of apostolical appointment, by which bishops are distinguished from other presbyters.

“The *first*, that in the largest cities, each having many presbyters, the apostles *ordained one bishop only*, at whose decease another succeeded singly in the same see. The *second* mark is *the right and power of ordination*, which was transmitted by the apostles themselves to bishops, but denied to inferior presbyters. In this apostolic institution the Catholic Church has always acquiesced, and has not acknowledged any other ordination lawful than that which was solemnized by a lawful bishop.

“*Question*: But can one inferior to a bishop confer sacred orders in case of necessity? *Answer*: Since the act of ordination is, by apostolic institution, proper to the episcopal office, if presbyters, in a well-constituted church, do that, their act is not only unlawful, but is null and void. But in a

disturbed Church, where all the bishops have fallen into heresy or idolatry, where they have refused to ordain orthodox ministers, etc., if orthodox presbyters be compelled to ordain other presbyters, that the Church may not perish, I could not venture to pronounce ordinations of this kind vain and invalid. For if the danger that threatens a single infant be sufficient to transfer the office of baptizing to any layman, which, by the original institution, belongs to ministers alone, why is not the danger impending over a particular church sufficient to transfer to simple priests that office of ordaining, which, by its primary institution, belongs to bishops alone?

Presbyterial  
ordination.

“If, then, certain Protestant churches, which could not look for ordination from popish bishops, have, under this necessity, ordained presbyters, by the unanimous act of their own presbyters, they are not to be considered as having passed any judgment derogatory to the episcopal dignity, but as having yielded to the necessity of the Church.

“The *last* mark of episcopal dignity is *the power of jurisdiction*, not only over the laity, but also over the clergy; not indeed a *regal*, or *lordly*, power, but one that is *pastoral* or *paternal*.” (*Determ.* xlii.)

Early in the reign of James I., Lord BACON gave evidence of his deep interest in the questions then agitating the Church of England by the publication of a Tract: *Certain Considerations touching the better Pacification and Edification of the Church*, etc. As an important contribution to the development of opinion on the subject of which it treats, both in the author's own day and in the generation following, this record of Bacon's views may well claim our attention. The leading points are embraced in the following brief abstract: “I think it good to remove, if it may be, two opinions, which directly confront and oppone to reformation: the one bringing it to a nullity, and the other to an impossibility. The first is, that it is opposed to good policy to innovate any thing in Church matters; the other that all reformation must be after one platform.

Bacon  
on Church  
government.

“For the first of these, it is excellently said by the prophet : ‘State super vias antiquas, et videte quænam sit via recta et vera, et ambulate in ea.’ So as he doth not say, ‘State super vias antiquas, et ambulate in eis :’” for it is true, that with all wise and moderate persons, custom and usage obtaineth that reverence as it is sufficient matter to move them to make a stand, and to discover, and take a view ; but it is no warrant to guide and conduct them : a just ground, I say, it is of deliberation, but not of direction. But on the other side, who knoweth not that time is truly compared to a stream, that carrieth down fresh and pure waters into that salt sea of corruption which environeth all human actions? And therefore if man shall not by his industry, virtue, and policy, as it were with the oar, row against the stream and inclination of time, all institutions and ordinances, be they never so pure, will corrupt and degenerate.”

“For the second point, that there should be but one form of discipline in all churches, and that imposed by necessity of a commandment, and prescript out of the word of God, it is a matter volumes have been compiled of, and therefore cannot receive a brief redargution. I for my part do confess that in revolving the Scriptures I could never find any such thing, but that God had left the like liberty to the church government as He had done to the civil government, to be varied according to time, and place, and accidents, which nevertheless his high and divine providence doth order and dispose. For all civil governments are restrained from God unto the general grounds of justice and manners, but the policies and forms of them are left free ; so that monarchies and kingdoms, senates and seignories, the popular states and communalities are lawful, and where they are planted ought to be maintained inviolate.

“So likewise in Church matters the substance of doctrine is immutable ; and so are the general rules of government ; but for rites and ceremonies, and for the particular hierarchies, policies, and discipline of churches, they be left at large. And therefore it is good we return unto the ancient bounds of unity in the Church of God ; which was one faith, one baptism ; and

not one hierarchy, one discipline; and that we observe the league of Christians, as it is penned by our Saviour; which is in substance this: 'He that is not with us is against us;' but in things indifferent, and but of circumstance, thus: 'He that is not against us is with us.' In these things, so as the general rules be observed; that Christ's flock be fed; that there be a succession in bishops and ministers, which are the prophets of the New Testament; that there be a due and reverent use of the power of the keys; that those that preach the gospel live of the gospel; that all things tend to edification; that all things be done in order and with decency, and the like; the rest is left to the holy wisdom and spiritual discretion of the master builders and inferior builders in Christ's Church, as it is excellently alluded to by that father that noted that Christ's garment was without seam; and yet the Church's garment was of divers colors; and thereupon setteth down for a rule: 'in veste varietas sit, scissura non sit.'

"For the government of bishops, I for my part, not prejudging the precedents of other reformed Churches, do hold it warranted by the word of God, and by the practice of the ancient Church in the better times, and much more convenient for kingdoms than parity of ministers, and government by synods. But then farther, it is to be considered that the Church is not now to plant or build; but only to be pruned from corruption, and to be repaired and restored in some decays." (*Works*, ii. 420, *ed. Mont.*)

## CHAPTER XXV.

BISHOP HALL'S EPISCOPACY BY DIVINE RIGHT, REVISED BY ARCHBISHOP LAUD  
— LAUD'S EXPOSITION OF MATT. XXVIII. 20 — HIS DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLICAL  
SUCCESSION — DIVINE RIGHT — BISHOP HALL'S INTERPRETATION — SMEC-  
TYMNUUS.

A NEW period in the history of the anti-Puritan contro-  
versy opens with the publication of Bishop HALL'S *Epis-  
copacy by Divine Right Asserted*, [No. 190,] a work written at  
the solicitation of Archbishop Laud, and submitted  
to his revision. The author's avowed aim in the  
composition of this treatise was to stem the revo-  
lutionary tide which was now rapidly setting in,  
and threatening to engulf the established polity alike in  
Church and State.

Bp. Hall's  
Episcopacy by  
divine  
right, 1640.

The two leading propositions of the work are stated in the  
terms following: "First, That Episcopacy, that which implies  
a fixed superiority over the rest of the clergy, and jurisdiction,  
is not only a holy and lawful, but a divine institution; and,  
therefore, cannot be abdicated, without a manifest violation of  
God's ordinance.

"Secondly, That the Presbyterian government, however  
vindicated under the glorious names of Christ's kingdom and  
ordinance, by those specious and glozing terms to bewitch the  
ignorant multitude, and to ensnare their consciences, hath no  
true footing, either in Scripture or the practice of the Church,  
in all ages, from Christ's time to the present."

To make good these two propositions, "wherein," says the  
bishop, "consists the life and soul of the whole cause," he  
lays down "certain *postulata*," as he terms them — incontestable  
principles — as the groundworks of his argument. These  
postulates are fifteen in number: "1. That government, whose

foundation is laid by Christ, and whose fabric is raised by the apostles, is of divine institution.

"2. Not only the government which was directly commanded and enacted, but that which was practised and recommended by the apostles to the Church, is justly to be held for an apostolical institution.

"3. The form which the apostles set and ordained for the governing of the Church was not intended by them for that present time or place only; but for continuance and succession for ever.

"4. The universal practice of the Church immediately succeeding the apostolic times, is a sure commentary upon the practice of the apostles, and our best direction.

"5. The primitive saints and fathers neither would nor durst set up another form of government different from that they received of the apostles.

"6. If the next successors would have innovated the form of government, yet they could not, in so short a space, have diffused it through the whole Christian world.

"7. The ancientest histories of the Church and writings of the first fathers are rather to be believed in the report of the primitive state of Church government than those of this present age.

"8. Those whom the ancient Church of God and all the holy fathers of the Church since have condemned for heretics are no fit guides for us to follow, in that their judgment of the government for which they were so condemned.

"9. The accession of honorable titles and not incompatible privileges makes no difference in the substance of a lawful and holy calling.

"10. Those Scriptures, whereon a new and different form of government is raised, had need to be more evident and unquestionable than those which are alleged for the former that is rejected.

"11. If Christ had left this pretended order of government, (the Presbyterian,) it would have, ere this time, been agreed upon, what that form is, and how to be managed.

“ 12. If this, which is challenged, be the kingdom of Christ, then those churches which want any essential part of it are mainly defective, and there is scarce any at all entire.

“ 13. True Christian policy requires not any thing which is either impossible or absurd to be done.

“ 14. New pretences of truths never before heard of, especially in main points, carry just cause of suspicion.

“ 15. To depart from the judgment and practice of the universal Church of Christ ever since the apostles' times, and to betake ourselves to a new invention, cannot but be, besides the danger, vehemently scandalous.”

Such are the propositions and postulates in their final form. As first submitted to LAUD's revision, the second proposition was couched in terms which implied that the Presbyterian form of polity might be useful in places where the episcopate could not be had. To this the primate takes exception, as “an unnecessary and dangerous concession. I am of opinion,” he writes, “there is no place where episcopacy is impracticable. Since they (the Presbyterians) are so bold in their claim, and carry their pretensions so high; since they obtrude their Presbyterian fiction for Christ's kingdom and ordinance, and throw off episcopacy as an opposite and unwarrantable government, we must not use any mincing terms, but unmask them plainly, and expose the delusion; we must not embarrass ourselves, and compliment away truth, for fear of displeasing Amsterdam or Geneva with this plain dealing.”

As originally expressed, the first *postulate* stood thus: “That government which was of apostolical institution cannot be denied to stand upon divine right.” To this the archbishop objects that, though true, it is “too narrowly expressed; for episcopacy is not to be so confined to apostolical institution as to bar it from a further ascent, and from deriving it originally from our Saviour himself; though perhaps the apostles might superstruct something with respect to form and circumstances. . . . The adversaries of episcopacy are not only the furious Aerial heretics, amongst which we may reckon the Scottish

novelists: besides these, there are others of a more specious alloy, both in the Genevian and Roman faction. The latter division will be contented episcopacy should be *juris divini mediati*, by, from, and under the Pope, leaving him the privilege of a spiritual monarch over the whole Church. But these controversy writers of the court of Rome will not allow episcopacy to be *juris divini immediati*, which makes the Church aristocratical in the bishops. This distinction of *juris divini mediati* is the Italian rock; of which the Genevians, to give them their due, stand clear. Some of these men will not deny episcopacy to be *juris divini*, without the above-mentioned distinction: but then they throw in qualifying terms of another kind; it is *ut suadentis vel approbantis, sed non imperantis*: they will needs have this kind of government stand upon courtesy, and leave it to the discretion of the people. And thus, by the help of this reserve, they may either admit or renounce it, as interest or fancy happens to suggest: nay, unless my memory very much fails me, Beza himself is said to have owned episcopacy to be *juris divini imperantis*; but then he comes in with this salvo of *non univ ersaliter imperantis*; and that it was instituted *citra considerationem durationis*. And thus by fencing with these distinctions, and going a little at large, Geneva and Scotland may escape censure, give themselves a dispensation from Catholic practice, live under bishops in one age, and without them in another. This is the great rock in the lake of Geneva, which hitherto you seem not to have sufficiently marked." In reference to the ninth *postulatum*, which affirms that the annexing honorable titles or privileges makes no difference in the substance of the calling, the reviser suggests the propriety of "guarding the meaning from misconstruction: for otherwise it is probable the faction may make an advantage of the assertion; they may pretend it is possible that a bishop implies no more than an honorable distinction, and that their order and powers are the same with that of a priest. As to the eleventh *postulatum*, it must be managed with great caution, for fear

of a saucy answer, which is a great deal more ready with them than a learned one."\*

When the finished work was laid before Laud for his final review, he animadverted upon a remarkable omission: the author had waived the discussion of the question, *Whether Episcopacy be an order or a degree?* as a question of comparatively little moment; "whereas those learned men the archbishop consulted thought the main controversy turned upon this point."

Some time before the publication of this work, there appeared the second edition, much enlarged, of LAUD'S *Conference with Fisher, the Jesuit*, (first edition, 1624,) in which occur the following noteworthy passages: "I am with you always unto the end of the world.' Yes; most certain it is — present by His SPIRIT; for else in bodily presence He continued not with His apostles, but during his abode on earth. And this promise of His spiritual presence was to their successors; else why 'to the end of the world'? The apostles did not, could not live so long. But then to the successors, the promise goes no further than I am with you always, but not to divine and infallible."

Laud's exposition of Matt. xxviii. 20.

To this is appended a marginal note: "Rabanus Maurus goes no further than that to the end some will always be in the world fit for Christ by His spirit and grace to inhabit: *Divina mansione et inhabitatione digni. Pergatis, habentes Dominum Protectorem et Ducem*, saith St. Cyprian. But he doth not say how far forth. And *Loquitur Fidelibus sicut uni corpori*, St. Chrysostom. And if St. Chrysostom enlarge it so far, I hope A. C. (Fisher) will not extend the assistance given or promised here to the whole body of the faithful, to an infallible and divine assistance in every of them, as well as in the pastors and doctors."

The text continues: "'The Comforter, the Holy Ghost, shall abide with you forever.' Most true again; for the Holy Ghost did abide with the apostles, according to Christ's pro-

\* Rushworth, Coll., P. II. Collier, ii., p. 789, viii. 167.

mise there made, and shall abide with their successors forever, to comfort and preserve them. But here is no promise of divine infallibility made unto them. And for that promise which is made, and expressly of infallibility, St. John xvi. 13, that is confined to the apostles only, for the settling of them in all truth. . . . All that was necessary for the founding, propagating, establishing, and confirming the Christian Church. But if any man take the boldness to enlarge this promise in the fulness of it, beyond the persons of the apostles themselves, that will fall out which Augustine hath in a manner prophesied: every heretic will shelter himself, and his vanities, under this color of infallible verity." (*Sect. xvi.*)

The question, What is a true Church? Laud answers in these terms: "A man that is most dishonest, and unworthy the name, a very thief, (if you will,) is a true man, in the verity of his essence, as he is a creature endued with reason, for this none can steal from him, nor he from himself, but death: but is not therefore a right or an upright man. And a Church that is exceedingly corrupt, both in manners and doctrine, and so a dishonor to the name, is yet a true Church, in the verity of essence, as a Church is a company of men which profess the faith of Christ, and are baptized into his name: but yet it is not therefore a *right Church*, either in doctrine or manners. It may be you meant cunningly to slip in this word 'right,' that I might, at unawares, grant it orthodox. But I was not so to be caught: for I know well that orthodox Christians are keepers of integrity, and followers of right things, (so St. Augustine;) of which the Church of Rome at this day is neither. In this sense then no right, that is, no orthodox Church at Rome." (*Id.*, § xx.)

Of *apostolical succession*: "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 true Church in any one place. And where Vincentius Lirinensis calls for antiquity, universality, and consent, as great notes of truth, he hath not one word of succession. . . . Most evident it is that the succession which

Apostolical  
succession.

the fathers meant is not tied to *place* or *person*, but it is tied to the *verity of doctrine*. For so Tertullian expressly. Beside the order of bishops running down (in succession) from the beginning, there is required *consanguinitas doctrinæ*, that the doctrine be allied in blood to that of Christ and his apostles. So that, if the doctrine be no kin to Christ, all the succession become strangers, what nearness soever they pretend. And Irenæus speaks plainer than he: 'We are to obey those presbyters which, together with the succession of their bishoprics, have received *charisma veritatis*, the gift of truth.' "

About a year prior to the publication of his treatise on Episcopacy, Bishop Hall, little thinking that he should be called upon for the performance of any larger task, put forth "Certain irrefragable propositions," as he termed them, "not in the way of a challenger, but rather of a faithful remembrancer to his dear brethren, of those points which they could not," as he believed, "but know and yield." Among these were the two following, "concerning Church government":

I. "No man living, no history, can show any well-allowed and settled national church in the whole Christian world, that hath been governed otherwise than by bishops, in a meet and moderate imparity, ever since the times of Christ and his apostles, until this present age."

II. "No man living, no record of history, can show any lay-presbyter that ever was in the whole Christian Church, until this present age."

These propositions, expressing in his own language the good bishop's earnest convictions, explain the sense in which he claims to demonstrate the *divine right* of Episcopacy, that is to say, in the sense of *apostolical institution*, as ascertained by apostolical precedent and primitive practice; not in the sense of such a divine prescription as renders it indispensable to the being of a Church, or the constitution of a valid ministry. Such indeed is the interpretation which he elsewhere

Divine right. puts upon his own words: "When we speak of *divine right*, we mean not an express law of God, requiring it upon the absolute necessity of the being of a

Church, what hindrances soever may interpose; but a divine institution, warranting it where it is, and requiring it where it may be had. Every church, therefore, which is capable of this form of government, both may and ought to affect it, as that which is, with so much authority, derived from the apostles, to the whole body of the Church upon earth: but those particular churches to whom this power and faculty is denied lose nothing of the true essence of a church, though they miss something of their glory and perfection, whereof they are barred by the necessity of their condition; neither are liable to any more imputation, in their credit and esteem, than an honest tenant who is tied to the limitations and terms of a hard landlord." (*Humble Remonstrance*.)

"There is no difference in any essential matter betwixt the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation. We accord in every point of Christian doctrine without the least variation; their public confessions and ours are sufficient convictions to the world of our full and absolute agreement. The only difference is in the form of outward administration; wherein also we are so far agreed as that we all profess this form not to be essential to the being of a church, though much importing the well or better being of it, according to our several apprehensions thereof, and that we do all retain a reverence and loving opinion of each other in our own several ways, not seeing any reason why so poor a diversity should work any alienation of affection in us one towards another." (*The Peacemaker*, § vi.)

Petitions in great numbers were now pouring into Parliament for the abolition of diocesan episcopacy, and the establishment, in its stead, of the Presbyterian polity. In view of this imminent peril, Bishop Hall put forth, this same year, a tract entitled *An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament, for Liturgy and Episcopacy*. This called forth, *An Answer to a Book entitled 'An Humble Remonstrance;'* in which the original of *Liturgy and Episcopacy is discussed, and queries propounded concerning both. The Parity of Bishops and Presbyters in*

Smectymnuus,  
1641.

*Scripture demonstrated. The occasion of their Imparity in antiquity discovered. The Disparity of the ancient and our modern Bishops manifested. The antiquity of Ruling Elders in the Church vindicated. The Prelatical Church bounded. By SMECTYMNUS. (1641.) [No. 195.]* This was promptly followed, in reply, by *A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance against the frivolous and false exceptions of Smectymnus, wherein the right of Liturgy and Episcopacy is clearly vindicated from the vain cavils and challenges of the Answerers. By the author of the said Humble Remonstrance. (1641.)* In rejoinder, speedily appeared *A Vindication of the Answer to the Humble Remonstrance, etc., by the authors of the Answer. (1641.)* The debate was closed by the publication of *A short Answer to the tedious Vindication of Smectymnus. By the author of the Humble Remonstrance. (1641.)*

## CHAPTER XXVI.

CONTROVERSIAL ACTIVITY IN 1641 — MASON'S VALIDITY OF PRESBYTERIAL ORDINATION — ITS GENUINENESS VINDICATED — GROUND OF ITS REJECTION — MILTON'S PART IN THE PURITAN CONTROVERSY — HIS EXALTED HOPES OF THE "SECOND REFORMATION" — TREATISE OF REFORMATION QUOTED — ORIGIN OF THESE POLEMICAL TRACTS — CHILLINGWORTH — APOSTOLICAL INSTITUTION OF EPISCOPACY — MILTON'S APOLOGY FOR SMECTYMNUS — JEREMY TAYLOR: SACRED ORDER AND OFFICES OF EPISCOPACY — CHARACTERIZED BY BISHOP HEBER — ADOPTS THE PURITAN POSITION — RECEDES FROM THAT OF HOOKER — ON THE PLEA OF NECESSITY.

THE year 1641 is signalized in the annals of the Anglican Episcopacy by an unprecedented controversial activity. A list of no less than twenty-five distinct publications bearing on this subject, issued in a single twelvemonth, attests the liveliness of a newly awakened interest. 1641.

Among the works of merit in this long array [No. 195-219] special attention may be called to the following: *A Collection of Tracts, entitled Certain brief Treatises, written by divers learned men, concerning the ancient and modern Government of the Church: wherein both the primitive institution of Episcopacy is maintained, and the lawfulness of the Ordination of the Protestant Ministers beyond the seas likewise defended.* [No. 197-202.] This volume contains six dissertations, ascribed respectively to Bishop Andrewes, Bucer, Raynolds, and Archbishop Usher, Brerewood, Duree, and Mason.

Of Bishop ANDREWES' share in this collection, MILTON writes in no respectful terms: "A little treatise, lately printed among others of like sort at Oxford, and in the title said to be out of the rude draughts of Bishop Andrewes: and surely they be rude draughts indeed, inso-much that it is marvel to think what his friends meant, to let come abroad such shallow reasonings with

Milton  
vs.  
Andrewes.

the name of a man so much bruited for learning." (*Reason of Ch. Gov.*, b. i., c. v.)

Of the *sixth* treatise in this volume, entitled "The Validity of the Orders of the Ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, maintained against the Romanists," the genuineness has been called in question. The translator of Mason's work on Anglican Orders [No. 159] pronounces it spurious on grounds which may be summed up under the four heads following: 1. The work did not appear until twenty years after Mason's death. 2. It was edited by John Duree, a Scotchman, respecting whom it is not known whether he ever received English orders, but who was a zealous partisan of the Presbyterians in 1641, and afterwards joined the Independents when they obtained the upper hand; and who, moreover, does not state how the work came into his possession. 3. It is published as an addition or appendix to Mason's work in defence of the ministry of the Church of England; though Mason himself has given no intimation of the existence of such appendix; nor does the publisher of the Latin edition, which appeared four years after the author's death, (1625,) who had the originals of Mason's own writing in his hands, make any allusion to it. 4. And this is held to be conclusive: some of the statements in the addition are inconsistent with the principles advocated in Mason's undisputed work. "From whence," concludes the translator, "I make no scruple to pass this censure upon it, that it is none of his, but published in his name by a timeserver, to serve the turn of a faction (after his death) by Mason's well-established reputation."

A sufficient answer to these exceptions is found in the facts following: 1. The tract is ascribed to Mason by his contemporary, Dr. Bernard, Archbishop Usher's chaplain, (*Judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh*, etc., 1657, p. 133.) 2. It first appeared in the collection of tracts above named, of which Usher, then living, was in part the author. 3. In "A letter from Mr. Samuel Ward to Mr. James Usher, afterward Archbishop of

Mason on  
Orders.

Its genuineness  
vindicated.

Armagh, then in London," written shortly after the publication of the *first* edition of Mason's work in 1613, occur the following passages: "I pray you inform me what the specialties are which are omitted in Mr. Mason's book. I would only know the heads." And at the close of the letter: "I had no leisure when I was with you to inquire how Mr. Mason doth warrant the vocation and ordination of the ministers of the Reformed Churches in foreign parts." (*Parr's Life and Letters of Usher*, p. 34).

"After a consideration of these two passages," writes Dr. Wordsworth, "I apprehend that there will remain little doubt that the tract in question did indeed constitute, originally, a portion of Mason's grand work; that it formed one of the main "specialties omitted," and inquired after by Ward; being left out at the press, possibly from some prudential considerations; and that it continued in MS. till 1641, when it appeared in a collection, of which there is good reason to believe that Usher, then archbishop, was cognizant." (*Brit. Mag.*, vol. xxii., p. 385, 1842; and *Goode, Doctrine of Ch. of Eng. on Non-Episc. Orders*, p. 38, 1851.) And yet, in a volume entitled "Apostolical Succession in the Church of England," etc., 1869, Mason's *Vindication of Foreign Orders* is summarily set aside as a book undoubtedly spurious!

The ground of this summary condemnation is obvious enough; the author teaches the parity of episcopal and presbyteral order: The bishop "in his consecration receiveth a sacred office, an eminency, a jurisdiction, a dignity, a degree of ecclesiastical pre-eminence. . . . He hath no higher degree in respect of intention or extension of the character; but he hath a higher degree, that is, a more excellent place in respect of authority and jurisdiction, in spiritual regiment. Wherefore, seeing a presbyter is equal to a bishop in the power of order, he hath equal intrinsical power to give orders." (Pp. 160-1.)

Ground of  
rejection.

*Philodox*, the Romish advocate, insisting that "the pre-eminence of bishops is *jure divino*," *Orthodox* replies:

"First, if you mean by *jure divino* that which is according

to the Scripture, then the pre-eminence of bishops is *jure divino*; for it hath been already proved to be according to the Scripture. Secondly, if by *jure divino* you mean <sup>Jure divino.</sup> the ordinance of God, in this sense also it may be said to be *jure divino*. For it is an ordinance of the apostles, whereunto they were directed by God's Spirit, even by the spirit of prophecy, and consequently the ordinance of God. But if by *jure divino* you understand a law and commandment of God, binding all Christian Churches, universally, perpetually, unchangeably, and with such absolute necessity that no other form of regiment may in any case be admitted; in this sense neither may we grant it, nor yet can you prove it to be *jure divino*. . . . The apostles, in their lifetime, ordained many bishops, and left a fair pattern to posterity. The Church, following the commodiousness thereof, embraced it in all ages through the Christian world." (*Ib.*, p. 163.)

Mason, following Hooker and Field, rests the defence of the validity of the ordinations in the foreign Reformed Churches on the ground of *necessity*. *Philodox* replies: "Suppose that ordination might be devolved to presbyters in case of necessity; yet the necessity ceasing, such extraordinary courses should likewise cease. Why then do they continue their former practice? Why do they not now seek to receive their orders from Protestant bishops?" The reply of *Orthodox* is noteworthy: "The Churches of Germany need not seek to foreign bishops, because they have superintendents or bishops among themselves. And as for other places which embrace the discipline of Geneva, they also have bishops in effect;" a statement which the writer proceeds to establish by showing that the Presbyterian Churches have "the substance of the office." "Thus much," he concludes, "concerning the ministers of other Reformed Churches, wherein, if you will not believe us disputing for the lawfulness of their calling, yet you must give us leave to *believe God himself from heaven approving their ministry by pouring down a blessing upon their labors.*" (*Ib.*, p. 173-6.)

The publication of these treatises furnished the occasion

for the second appearance of JOHN MILTON as an eager disputant in this controversy — a controversy rendered specially memorable by the active part taken in it by the great poet. Five distinct publications signalize his zeal in the advocacy of the Puritan cause. [No. 204-8.] Of these the earliest written — *Of Reformation touching Church Discipline in England* — composed in the freshness of the writer's early manhood, is perhaps, of all his prose compositions, the most thoroughly *Miltonic*.

Milton's part  
in the Puritan  
debate.

Such is my impression of the unsurpassed energy, alike of thought and style, specially characteristic of this work, that I cannot resist the temptation of here quoting a few of its more striking sentences, illustrating, as they do, the exalted character of Milton's hopes in regard to the issue of the newly inaugurated "second reformation."

"When I recall to mind at last, after so many dark ages, wherein the huge overshadowing train of error had almost swept all the stars out of the firmament of the Church; how the bright and blissful Reformation (by divine power) struck through the black and settled night of ignorance and Anti-christian tyranny, methinks a sovereign and reviving joy must needs rush into the bosom of him that reads or hears; and the sweet odor of the returning gospel imbathe his soul with the fragrancy of heaven: Then was the sacred Bible sought out of the dusty corners where profane falsehood and neglect had thrown it, the schools opened, divine and human learning raked out of the embers of forgotten tongues, the princes and cities trooping apace to the new-erected banner of salvation; the martyrs, with the irresistible might of weakness, shaking the powers of darkness, and scorning the fiery rage of the old red dragon.

"Thou, therefore, that sittest in light and glory unapproachable, Parent of angels and men! next, Thee I implore, omnipotent King, Redeemer of that lost remnant whose nature Thou didst assume, ineffable and everlasting LOVE! and Thou, the third subsistence of divine infinitude, illumining Spirit, the joy and solace of created things! One Tripersonal God-

head! look upon this, thy poor and almost spent and expiring Church; leave her not thus a prey to those importunate wolves that wait and think long till they devour thy tender flock; these wild boars that have broke into thy vineyard, and left the print of their polluting hoofs on the souls of thy servants.

“O thou, that after the impetuous rage of five bloody inundations, and the succeeding sword of intestine war, soaking the land in her own gore, didst pity the sad and ceaseless revolution of our swift and thick-coming sorrows; when we were quite breathless, of thy free grace didst motion peace, and terms of covenant with us; and having first wellnigh freed us from Antichristian thralldom, didst build up this Britanic empire to the glorious and enviable height, with all her daughter islands about her; stay us in this felicity, let not the obstinacy of our half-obedience and will-worship bring forth that viper of sedition, that for these fourscore years hath been breeding to eat through the entrails of our peace; but let her cast her abortive spawn without the danger of this travailing and throbbing kingdom; that we may still remember in our solemn thanksgivings, how for us the northern ocean even to the frozen Thule was scattered with the proud shipwrecks of the Spanish armada, and the very maw of hell ransacked, and made to give up her concealed destruction, ere she could vent it in that horrible and damned blast.

“Then amidst the hymns and hallelujahs of saints, some one may perhaps be heard offering at high strains in new and lofty measure, to sing and celebrate thy divine mercies and marvellous judgments in this land throughout all ages.”

Of the origin of this portion of Milton's controversial writings we have an account from his own pen: “When two bishops of superior distinction (Hall and Usher) vindicated their principles against some principal ministers, I thought that on these topics, to the consideration of which I was led solely by my love of truth and my reverence for Christianity, I should not probably write worse than those who were contending only for their own emolument and usurpations.” (How did Milton come by the

Origin of  
these writings.

knowledge of this fact, that the two venerable bishops "were contending *only* for their own emoluments," etc.?) "I therefore answered the one (Usher) in two books, of which the first is inscribed *Concerning Prelatical Episcopacy*, and the other *Concerning the Mode of Ecclesiastical Government*; and I replied to the other (Hall) in some *Animadversions*, and soon afterwards in an *Apology*. On this occasion it was supposed that I brought a timely succor to the ministers, who were hardly a match for the eloquence of their opponents; and from that time I was actively employed in refuting any answers that appeared." (*Second Defence of the People of England*.)

The point at issue between Milton and the two bishops was the divine or the human origin of episcopacy, as a peculiar order in the Church, distinct in kind, and pre-eminent in degree. It has been often suggested, as it is obvious to remark, that Milton's hostility to episcopacy and advocacy of the Presbyterian parity seem to have been called forth by temporary causes: the united support given by the bishops of his day to the cause of arbitrary power, on the one hand, and the earnest struggle of the Puritans for popular rights, on the other. An episcopacy constituted after the primitive pattern, there is, I think, little reason to believe that he would not at least have acquiesced in, if not cordially approved, as having scriptural warrant.

To the same fruitful year is to be assigned the original publication of CHILLINGWORTH'S celebrated *Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy Demonstrated*, [No. 236,] which comes down to us with the *imprimatur* of Archbishop USHER.

Chillingworth,  
1641.

The argument for the apostolical institution of episcopacy which impressed the mind of Chillingworth with the weight of a demonstration, drawn up in syllogistic form, is this: "That government which was received universally in the Church, either in the apostles' time, or presently after, cannot with reason be denied to be apostolic." But "episcopal government," that is, "an appointment of one man of eminent sanctity and sufficiency to have the care of all the churches

within a precinct or diocese, and furnishing him with authority, (not absolute or arbitrary, but regulated and bounded by laws, and moderated by joining to him a convenient number of assistants,) to the intent that all the churches under him may be provided of good and able pastors; and that of both pastors and people, conformity to laws and performance of their duties may be required, under penalties not left to discretion, but by law appointed — “this government was received universally in the Church, either in the apostles’ time, or presently after.” This proposition “is so evident and unquestionable, that the most learned adversaries of this government do themselves confess it.” To this effect is cited the free acknowledgment of *Peter Du Moulin* and *Theodore Beza*, the great defenders of presbytery. “Therefore episcopal government cannot with reason be denied to be apostolic.”

The demonstration concludes in these words: “When I shall see therefore all the fables in the *Metamorphoses* acted, and prove true stories; when I shall see all the democracies and aristocracies in the world lie down and sleep and awake into monarchies; then will I begin to believe that presbyterial government, having continued in the Church during the apostles’ times, should presently after (against the apostles’ doctrine, and the will of Christ) be whirled about like a scene in a mask, and transformed into episcopacy. In the mean time, while these things remain thus incredible, and in human reason impossible, I hope I shall have leave to conclude thus:

“Episcopal government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the Church, presently after the apostles’ times.

“Between the apostles’ times and this presently after, there was not time enough for, nor possibility of, so great an alteration.

“And therefore, there was no such alteration as is pretended. And therefore, episcopacy, being confessed to be so ancient and catholic, must be granted also to be apostolic: *Quod erat demonstrandum.*”

The vehemence of Milton's declamation in denunciation of prelacy was fairly matched by the winning eloquence of JEREMY TAYLOR's argumentation in its defence. The *Apology for Smectymnuus* of the one, and the treatise *Of the Sacred Order and Offices of Episcopacy* [No. 223] 1642. of the other, were the products of the same year.

The *Apology* is specially remarkable for the copiousness of its reminiscences of the author's personal history; and "we may well wonder," as one of Milton's latest editors remarks, "that out of a gladiatorial controversy of this sanguinary kind, anything should have arisen so richly teeming with beautiful thoughts, so full of youthful and cheering reminiscences, so varied, so polished, so vehemently eloquent, as the *Apology for Smectymnuus*, which, as a noble and justifiable burst of egotism, has never, perhaps, in any language been excelled."

The work of Taylor is well characterized by his biographer as "a specimen of manly and moderate disputation; of a variety of learning, such as, even in that learned age, few other writers have brought to bear upon the same

subject; and of a style vigorous and elastic, which, Taylor on  
Episcopacy. both in taste and energy, leaves far behind it the

greater number of contemporary theologians, and only falls short of that which few indeed have equalled, the sustained and majestic harmony of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*." In

Taylor's argument, however, there is little that is absolutely new; and in the few points on which he occupies

a position different from that of Hooker, he betrays a marked inferiority to that great master. Abandons  
Hooker's  
position.

Thus, for example, he falls back upon the ground

held by the early Puritans, of "the absolute necessity that some form of Church government should be found laid down in Scripture;" a position which Hooker had shown to be wholly untenable. The reasons, too, on which Taylor rests his position, as Heber takes pains to point out, "are as unsound as the position itself is, *prima facie*, questionable."\*

"To sit down in the calm spirit of philosophers, and examine

\* *Life of Taylor*, p. 181, Lond., 1828.

whether or not there is such a government prescribed, was too humble a proceeding for the theologians of the seventeenth century. It was assumed to be abundantly manifest, previous to all examination, that God must have given a scheme of Church government; and every sect saw in the New Testament its own scheme."

On the plea of necessity. How far he receded from Hooker's position on another point — the plea of *necessity* as justifying presbyterial ordination — will appear from what follows:

"Are all ordinations invalid which are done by mere presbyters? What think we of the Reformed Churches?"

"For my part, *I know not what to think*; the question hath been so often asked, with so much violence and prejudice, and we are so bound by public interest to approve all that they do, that we have disabled ourselves to justify our own. For we were glad at first of abettors against the errors of the Roman Church; we found these men zealous in it; we thanked God for it, as we had cause; and we were willing to make them recompense by endeavoring to justify their ordinations, not thinking what would follow upon ourselves: but now it has come to that issue that our own episcopacy is thought not necessary, because we did not condemn the ordinations of their presbytery.

"Why is not the question rather what we think of the primitive Church, than what we think of the Reformed Churches? Did the primitive councils and fathers do well in condemning the ordinations made by mere presbyters? If they did well, what was a virtue in them is no sin in us: if they did ill, from what principle shall we judge of the right of ordinations? Since there is no example in Scripture of any ordination made but by apostles and bishops; and the presbytery that imposed hands on Timothy is by all antiquity expounded either of the office or of a college of presbyters; and St. Paul expounds it to be an ordination made by his own hands, as appears by comparing the two epistles of St. Timothy together; and may be so meant by the principles of both

sides; for if the names be confounded, the presbyter may signify a bishop; and that they of this presbytery were not bishops they can never prove from Scripture, when all men grant that the names are confounded. So that whence will men take their estimate for the rights of ordinations? From Scripture? That gives it always to apostles and bishops, as I have proved; and that a priest did ever impose hands for ordination, can never be shown from thence. From whence then? From antiquity? That was so far from licensing ordinations made by presbyters alone, that presbyters, in the primitive Church, did never join with bishops in collating holy orders of presbyter and deacon, till the fourth Council of Carthage; much less do it alone, rightly, and with effect.

“But will not necessity excuse them who could not have orders from orthodox bishops? Shall we either sin against our consciences, by subscribing to heretical and false resolutions *in materiâ fidei*, or else lose the being of a Church, for want of episcopal ordinations? Indeed, if the case were just thus, it was very hard with good people of the transmarine Churches; but I have here two things to consider.

“First, I am very willing to believe that they would not have done anything, either of error or suspicion, but in cases of necessity. But then I consider that M. Du Plessis, a man of honor and great learning, does attest, that at the first reformation, there were many archbishops and cardinals in Germany, England, France, and Italy, that joined in the reformation, whom they might, but did not employ in their ordinations; and what necessity then can be pretended in this case, I would fain learn, that I might make their defence. But, which is of more and deeper consideration, for this might have been done by inconsideration and irresolution, as often happens in the beginning of great changes; but it is their constant and resolved practice, at least in France, that if any returns to them, they will re-ordain him by their presbytery, though he had before episcopal ordination, as both their friends and their enemies bear witness.

“Secondly, I consider that necessity may excuse a personal

delinquency; but I never heard that necessity did build a Church. Indeed, no man is forced, for his own particular, to commit a sin; for if it be absolutely a case of necessity, the action ceaseth to be a sin; but indeed if God means to build a Church in any place, he will do it by means proportionable to that end; that is, by putting them into a possibility of doing and acquiring those things which himself hath required of necessity to the constitution of the Church. So that, supposing that ordination by a bishop is necessary for the vocation of priests and deacons, as I have proved it is, and, therefore, for the founding or perpetuating of a Church, either God hath given to all Churches opportunity and possibility of such ordinations, and then, necessity of the contrary is but pretence and mockery; or if he hath not given such possibility, then there is no Church there to be either built or continued, but the candlestick is presently removed.

“There are divers stories in Ruffinus to this purpose. When *Ædesius* and *Fruventius* were surprised by the barbarous Indians, they preached Christianity and baptized many; but, themselves being but laymen, could make no ordinations, and so not fix a Church. What then was to be done in the case? . . . *Fruventius* comes to Alexandria to get a bishop. *Athanasius*, being then patriarch, ordained *Fruventius* their bishop. . . . The same happened in the case of the Iberians, converted by a captive woman.

“Thus the case is evident, that the want of a bishop will not excuse us from our endeavors of acquiring one; and where God means to found a Church, there he will supply them with those means and ministries which himself hath made of ordinary and absolute necessity. . . . If an ordinary necessity will not excuse this, will not an extraordinary calling justify it? yea, most certainly, could we but see an ordinary proof for an extraordinary calling, viz., an evident prophecy, demonstration of miracles, certainty of reason, clarity of sense, or anything that might make faith of an extraordinary mission.

“But shall we then condemn those few of the reformed Churches whose ordinations always have been without bishops?

No, indeed, that must not be; they stand or fall to their own Master. And though I cannot justify their ordinations, yet what degree their necessity is of, what their desire of episcopal ordinations may do for their personal excuse, and how far a good life and a Catholic belief may lead a man in the way to heaven, although the forms of external communion be not observed, I cannot determine. For aught I know, their condition is the same with that of the Church of Pergamus: 'I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is; and thou holdest fast my faith, and hast not denied my name: *nevertheless some few things I have against thee.*' "

## CHAPTER XXVII.

ERASTIANISM, IN WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY — JOHN SELDEN ITS LEADING ADVOCATE — HIS EXPOSITION OF MATT. XVIII. 15-17 — THE RULING ELDERSHIP — PROLONGED DISCUSSION — CALVIN'S THEORY REJECTED — JUDGMENT OF BLONDEL AND VITRINGA — WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH — RISE OF QUAKERISM — BARCLAY'S APOLOGY — DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH — DR. HAMMOND — FOUR DISSERTATIONS — ANNOTATIONS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT — LEADING THE WAY TO THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ORDINAL — 1661-2.

THE prolonged debates on questions of Church discipline in the *Westminster Assembly* (1643-1649) first gave prominence in England to the theory of Church authority thenceforward popularly known as *Erastianism*. The views of ERASTUS, as developed in a posthumous work *On Excommunication*, [No. 111,] first published in 1589, may be briefly stated thus: The pastoral office is similar to that

1643-1648.

of a lecturer in divinity — an office not of *authority*

of any kind, but exclusively one of persuasion.

Erastianism.

Christian ordinances, baptism, the eucharist, etc., are free and open to all without distinction, the Church, or the minister representing it, having authority to define the qualifications for communion, but having no power to inhibit from it; the administration of penal laws belonging exclusively to the civil magistrate; and the proper ground of excommunication, or exclusion from the privileges of Church communion, being not vice, or any species of immorality, but dissent from the Church's doctrinal teaching — not misconduct, but heterodoxy.

As this theory obviously involves, in its ultimate development, the abolition of all ecclesiastical or spiritual jurisdiction — the complete subjection of the Church to the civil power — it is not surprising that the term Erastianism came now to be popularly applied, as a term of reproach, to that theory of

Church authority which maintains the supremacy of the civil power over the ecclesiastical, alike in matters of doctrine and discipline — the absolute subjection of the Church to the control of the State.

The advantage claimed for this theory by its English advocates was that it precluded the existence of an *imperium in imperio*, or one government within another of a distinct and independent nature. It is evident, however, that it is neither more nor less than a reproduction, under another form, of the papal despotism, combining, as it does, in one irresponsible power, civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and by the combination destroying both civil and religious liberty.

In the Westminster Assembly, the leading advocate of Erastianism was the celebrated SELDEN, whose exposition of the classical passage, Matt. xviii. 15-17, in the interest of the Erastian scheme, is reported by the faithful pen of Lightfoot. While the Independent disputant labored to prove that the Church, in this text, is not a civil court, not a Jewish sanhedrim, not a presbytery or synod, nor a national church, but a particular congregation only; and the Presbyterian advocate, that the term stood for the Church in no one single application, exclusively; neither for a single congregation nor for a national church, nor for the Church universal only; but for either, or for all in turn, as the occasion might require; Selden entered into a learned argument to show that the passage furnished no support for ecclesiastical jurisdiction. He contended, with an imposing display of rabbinical lore, that the passage related solely to the ordinary practice of the Jews in their common courts: "It results to this: if an Israelite offend thee, *dic ecclesiæ*, tell the sanhedrim." To the objection, But what means, "Let him be unto thee an heathen"? Selden answered, "This indeed may be excommunication by the court; or, by himself: 'If thy brother offend,' etc., after such and such admonition, sue him at the court, or else inform of him there; if he will not obey the court, do thou excommunicate him."

John Selden.

Exposition of  
Matt. xviii.  
15-17.

One of the questions that engaged the most earnest and prolonged consideration of the Assembly was that of the ruling eldership. The discussion on the subject, as we learn from the journal of Lightfoot, was continued in the Grand Committee, with some interruption, through a period of thirty days. The proposition introduced for discussion gave distinct expression to the theory of Calvin: "That besides those presbyters that rule well, and labor in the word and doctrine, there be *other presbyters* who especially apply themselves to ruling, though they labor not in the word and doctrine."

1643.

Ruling eldership.

The unanimous conclusions of the committee, as recorded by Lightfoot, contain no reference to 1 Tim. v. 17, and make no mention of *elders*, in connection with the ruling office: "1. That Christ hath instituted a government and governors ecclesiastical in the Church.

Dec. 11.

"2. That Christ hath furnished some in His Church with gifts for government, and with commission to execute the same when called thereunto.

"3. That it is agreeable to and warranted by the word of God that *some others besides the ministers of the word* be Church governors, to join with the ministers in the government of the Church." (*Rom.* xii. 7, 8; *1 Cor.* xii. 28.)

A year later, when these conclusions were submitted to the consideration of the Assembly, preparatory to their transmission to Parliament, a fresh debate arose on the question whether the lay rulers should be called "ruling elders" or no — "a very sad and long discussion," writes the chronicler; "at last it was determined by vote, thus — *such as in the Reformed Churches are commonly called 'elders.'*" Thus Calvin's theory of the ruling eldership finds no support in the action of this great Presbyterian council; nay, is deliberately rejected by it.

1644.

Nov. 14.

Calvin's theory rejected.

But already, before this decision of the Westminster Assembly, the same position had been maintained by the famous champions of Presbytery known under the name of *Smec-*

*tymnus*, [No. 195,] who refrain from quoting "the three known texts of Scripture produced by some for the establishing of governing elders in the Church," and conclude the argument thus: "First, in the ancient Church <sup>1641.</sup> there were some called *seniors*; secondly, these seniors were not clergymen; thirdly, they had a stroke in governing the Church, and managing the affairs thereof; fourthly, seniors were distinguished from *the rest of the people*."

To the same effect are the recorded judgments on this question of some of the ablest advocates of Presbytery in other lands. Thus the renowned BLONDEL, in his treatise *De Jure Plebis*, etc., [No. 258,] written to vindicate the right of the laity to a share in the government of the Church, protests against the novelty of applying the text — 1 Tim. v. 17 — to the lay rulers of the Reformed Churches, as having no support in ancient precedent, and being without any plea of necessity. "The institution and function of these officers," he declares, "must be established on other foundations — the practice of the apostles and of the first ages of the Church." So also, and with equal explicitness, VITRINGA: *De Syn. Vet.* ii. 3, 482, sq. Judgment of  
Blondel.

After four years of careful deliberation, the Westminster Assembly gave to the world the mature fruit of its protracted labors in the form of a systematic *Confession of Faith*, ratified (with the exception of the thirtieth, <sup>1647.</sup> the thirty-first, and the twentieth chapter, section four,) a year later, (1648,) after thorough examination, by the Long Parliament.

This important document, the doctrinal standard of all the Presbyterian churches, properly so named, embodies the following statements in relation to the Church: "I. The Catholic or Universal Church, which is in- Westminster  
Confession. visible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.

"II. The visible Church, which is also Catholic or Univer-

sal under the gospel, (not confined to one nation as before under the law,) consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.

“ III. Unto this Catholic visible Church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints, in this life, to the end of the world; and doth by his own presence and spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto.

“ IV. This Catholic Church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less visible. And particular churches, which are members thereof, are more or less pure, according as the doctrine of the gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and public worship performed more or less purely in them.

“ V. The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan. Nevertheless there shall be always a Church on earth, to worship God according to his will.

“ VI. There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself, in the Church, against Christ, and all that is called God.” (Chap. xxv.)

The statements of the Confession in relation to the *Power of the Keys* and *Church Synods*, which—the former as unacceptable to the Erastians, the latter as offensive to the Independents—were “recommitted” by the Parliament, are to the following effect: “The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his Church, hath herein appointed a government in the hand of church-officers, distinct from the civil magistrate.

“To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed; by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the im-

penitent, both by the word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require." (Chap. xxx.)

"For the better government and further edification of the Church, there ought to be such assemblies as are commonly called *synods* or *councils*: and it belongeth to the overseers and other rulers of the particular churches, by virtue of their office, and the power which Christ hath given them for edification, and not for destruction, to appoint such assemblies; and to convene together in them, as often as they shall judge it expedient for the good of the Church.

"It belongeth to synods and councils, ministerially, to determine controversies of faith, and cases of conscience; to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of his Church, etc.

"All synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred." . . . They "are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs, . . . unless by way of humble petition, in cases extraordinary." (Chap. xxxi.)

On the subject of the *ministry*, or "the officers of the Church," the discussions of the Assembly issued in the following conclusions, ratified by the Parliament, and approved (1645) by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland: "The officers which Christ hath appointed for the edification of his Church, and the perfecting of the saints, are, some extraordinary, as apostles, evangelists, and prophets, which are ceased. Others ordinary and perpetual, as pastors, teachers, and other church-governors, and deacons."

To the office of *pastor* it belongs — "1. To pray for and with his flock, as the mouth of the people of God. 2. To read the Scripture publicly. 3. To feed the flock by preaching of the word. 4. To catechize. 5. To administer the sacraments. 6. To bless the people from God. 7. To take care of the poor.

“The *teacher* or *doctor* is also a minister of the word as well as the pastor, and hath power of administration of the sacraments. . . . Where be several ministers in the same congregation, they may be designed to several employments, according to the different gifts in which each of them doth most excel. And he that doth more excel in exposition of Scriptures, in teaching sound doctrine, and in convincing gain-sayers, than he doth in application, and is accordingly employed therein, may be called a teacher or doctor. Where there is but one minister in a particular congregation, he is to perform, so far as he is able, the whole work of the ministry.

“*Other Church governors.* — Christ . . . hath furnished some in his Church, besides the ministers of the word, with gifts for government, and with commission to execute the same when called thereunto, who are to join with the minister in the government of the Church, which officers Reformed Churches *commonly call elders.*” This guarded language in designating the governing officers of the Church joined with the minister, as those *commonly called elders*, sufficiently indicates the mind of the Assembly, that they were *not properly* so called.

“The Scripture doth hold out *deacons* as distinct officers in the Church; whose office is perpetual, and to which it belongs to take special care in distributing to the necessities of the poor.”

The year 1647 marks an epoch in our history as the date of the first beginnings of that purest form of Christian mysticism, known as Quakerism. GEORGE FOX set out upon his self-denying career of Church reform by proclaiming, as the fundamental doctrine of the newly revealed faith, that “it is not the Scriptures, but the Holy Spirit, by which opinions and religions are to be tried.” And as a manifestation of the Spirit is vouchsafed to all without distinction, every individual believer is divinely qualified and called, according to the measure of his gifts, to minister in the Church, independently of any human vocation or appointment.

ROBERT BARCLAY, the accredited expounder of the orthodox Quaker system, whose Apology holds, by common consent,

the place of a symbolical book, defines the Church as "the society, gathering, or company of such as God hath called out of the world and worldly spirit, to walk in his light and life. The Church so defined is to be considered" under two aspects. First, "as it comprehends all that are thus called and gathered truly by God, both such as are yet in this inferior world, and such as, having already laid down the earthly tabernacle, are passed into their heavenly mansions, which together do make up the one Catholic Church. . . . Out of which Church we freely acknowledge there can be no salvation; because under this Church and its denomination are comprehended all, and as many, of whatsoever nation, kindred, tongue, or people they be, though outwardly strangers, and remote from those who profess Christ and Christianity in words, and have the benefit of the Scriptures, as become obedient to the holy light and testimony of God in their hearts, so as to become sanctified by it, and cleansed from the evils of their ways. For this is the universal or Catholic Spirit by which many are called from all the four corners of the earth, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. . . . There may be members therefore of this Catholic Church both among heathen, Turks, Jews, and all the several sorts of Christians." "The Church in this respect hath been in being in all generations, . . . though many times not much observed; and therefore though still in being, hath been oftentimes as it were invisible, in that it hath not come under the observation of the men of the world.

"Secondly, the Church is to be considered as it signifies a certain number of persons gathered by God's Spirit, and by the testimony of some of his servants raised up for that end, unto the belief of the true doctrines of the Christian faith, who, through their hearts being united by the same love, and their understandings informed in the same truths, gather, meet, and assemble together to wait upon God, to worship Him, and to bear a joint testimony for the truth against error, suffering for the same, and so becoming through this fellowship as one family and household in certain respects, do each of them

teach, instruct, and care for one another, according to their several measures and attainments. . . . To be a member of a particular church, as the inward calling of God by his light in the heart is indispensably necessary, so is also the outward profession of, and belief in Jesus Christ, and those holy truths delivered by his Spirit in the Scriptures; seeing the testimony of the Spirit recorded in the Scriptures doth answer the testimony of the same Spirit in the heart, even as face answereth face in a glass." (*Prop.* x. ii.-iv.)

Among the ardent supporters of Anglican Episcopacy in this its season of humiliation, whose writings prepared the way for the reaction of 1662, the next place after Taylor must un-

questionably be assigned to HENRY HAMMOND, pronounced by Bishop Heber "not inferior to Taylor either in judgment or learning." Of his numerous controversial treatises on questions connected with Church discipline, the most noted is a volume written in answer to BLONDEL'S *Hieronymi Sententiæ*, and *Walonis Messalini de Episcopis et Presbyteris* of SALMASIUS; entitled *Quatuor Dissertationes*, etc., [No. 267,] *Four Dissertations in which the Rights of the Episcopate are set forth from Holy Scriptures and Primitive Antiquity*, etc.

Of the four dissertations composing this volume, the *first* is introductory, "Of Antichrist; of the Mystery of Iniquity; of Diotrephes, as Developed in the Apostolic Age;" the *second* treats "Of Ignatius, and his Testimony compared with Jerome's Opinion;" the *third*, "Of all the Passages in the Gospels that refer to the Form of Church Government;" the *fourth*, "Of the Passages in the Acts and Epistles which refer to the same subject."

The author was led, we are informed by his biographer, to undertake the composition of this work in Latin by circumstances of which he gives the following account: "Archbishop Usher having received from Blondel a letter of exception against his edition of Ignatius, he communicated it to Dr. Hammond, desiring his opinion of several passages in it. In reply, the doctor wrote a pretty full exposition of his views,

promising a yet fuller one, if it should be deemed desirable. Usher at once exacted the performance of the promise; and the work thus produced furnished the "materials for a great part of the *Dissertations*." The primate's letter (dated July 21, 1649,) is deserving of record: "I have read with great delight and content your accurate answer to the objections made against the credit of Ignatius his Epistles, for which I do most heartily thank you, and am moved thereby farther to entreat you to publish to the world in Latin what you have already written in English against this objector, and that other (Salmasius) who for your pains hath rudely requited you with the base appellation of *Nebulo* for the assertion of episcopacy; to the end that it may no longer be credited abroad that those two have beaten down this calling, that the defence thereof is now deserted by all men, as by Lud. Capellus is intimated in his thesis of *Church Government*, at Sedan, lately published, which I leave unto your serious consideration, and all your godly labors to the blessing of our good God, in whom I evermore rest. Your very loving friend and brother, Ja. Armachanus."

The Dissertations were answered by the Provincial Assembly of London, in a book entitled *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*. In reply, Hammond wrote a "Vindication" of the Dissertations. Hammond's statement of the question, as Hunt has well pointed out, "is undoubtedly the clearest that had ever hitherto been made. It left the course of the argument to be an inquiry into the facts as they could be determined from Scripture and the writings of the age succeeding that of the apostles." (*Relig. Thought in Eng.*, i. 319.)

Yet more important in its influence in the development of opinion on the episcopal question was Hammond's *Annotations on the New Testament*; a work which seems to have contributed largely to that reversal of the judgment of our earlier divines in regard to the interpretation of the terms *bishop*, and *elder* or *presbyter*, as interchangeable titles in the New Testament,

Annotations  
on the New  
Testament.

which obtained in the next generation, issuing in the reconstruction of the ordinal in its present form.

Thus, in a note on Phil. i. 1 : "The word *ἐπισκοπος*, *bishop*, in the Old and New Testament notes *prefecture*, or *ruling power* in the Church. But whether this belonged to singular persons, one in each city and region adjoining, or to a number of such, ruling together as colleagues, hath been of late controverted by some, and this place which mentions in Philippi bishops in the plural, hath been a principal testimony to conclude that in one church there were many bishops. This, if it were granted, and consequently, that bishops here denote no other than those whom we now call presbyters, would be of no force to infer this conclusion — that churches in the apostles' times were ruled not by single bishops, but many presbyters ; because, first, it were possible that the apostle himself might at this time retain that supreme episcopal power in his own hands, and though *absent in body*, yet *by letters* being *present in spirit* exercise that power over them. Or, second, if the apostles had constituted a bishop over them, yet 't is possible that at the writing this epistle, the chair might be vacant, or that the bishop might be absent. And indeed Epaphroditus, who is by Theodoret and others affirmed to be Bishop of Philippi, . . . appears (iv. 18) to have been with Paul at this time, when he wrote the epistle, . . . and to have carried the epistle to them. . . . But there is no need of such answers as these to avoid the force of this argument. Philippi being a metropolis, under which were many other churches, which had each of them a bishop, *all these bishops* are here meant by *ἐπισκοποις* in the plural, as this epistle was written to all those cities or churches, and not only to that of Philippi. . . . As the word *πρεσβυτερις*, elders, is a note of prefecture, and so may fitly belong to the bishop in each city, (*Note on Acts xi. 30,*) in all the places of the New Testament, so there is little reason to doubt of the word *ἐπισκοποις*, *bishops*. The first mention of it is Acts xx. 28, where those who had been called elders of the Church, (v. 17,) are *bishops of the flock*, set over it by the Holy Ghost : where, if

the flock were the Christians of any one city, there might be some pretence that the *elders* or *bishops* in the plural might be those which are now called *presbyters*. But it is apparent that *the flock* is the Christians of all *Asia*, of which it is said (xix. 10) that *all that dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord*. . . . And consequently the elders or bishops there are the bishops of all *Asia*, at least those that belonged to *Ephesus* as their metropolis."

And on Acts xi. 30: "This word *πρεσβυτεροι*, *elders*, being made use of by the apostles, and writers of the New Testament, is affixed to the governors of the Christian Church, the several bishops of several cities, answerable to the rulers of thousands, or patriarchs, which being <sup>Acts xi. 30.</sup> first used among the Jews, are in the Christian Church the ordinary title of *bishops*. And although this title of *elders* has been also extended to a second order in the Church, and is now only in use for them, under the name of *presbyters*, yet in the Scripture times it belonged principally, if not alone, to bishops; there being no evidence that any of that second order were then instituted, though soon after, before the writing of *Ignatius's Epistles*, there were such instituted in all churches."

That the changes introduced into the ordinal, in the period of reaction, (1661-2, *sq.*) have been <sup>Reconstruction of the Ordinal.</sup> justly termed a reconstruction of the office, may appear from the following statement of facts:

I. In the *Preface* to the ordinal, instead of these words — "No man (*not being at this present bishop, priest, nor deacon*) shall execute any of them (these orders) except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following" — as found in the *Preface* of 1549-52, — there were now substituted the following: "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.*"

II. In the Form of Ordering Priests, instead of the portion of Scripture appointed for the Epistle in the office of 1549, viz., Acts xx. 17-35: "Take heed therefore," etc.; or, 1 Tim. ii. 1-16: "This is a true saying. If a man desire the office of a BISHOP," etc., is substituted Eph. iv. 7-13: "And he gave some apostles," etc., 1 Tim. iii. 1-7, being left out. Instead of Matt. xxviii. 18-20; or, John x. 1-16; or, John xx. 19-23 — the Gospel in the office of 1549 — is substituted in the revised Form Matt. ix. 36-38; or, John x. 1-16; John xx. 19-23 being omitted, and transferred to the "Form of Consecrating a Bishop."

The original formula accompanying the imposition of hands: "Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins thou dost forgive, etc., is changed into "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 hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive," etc.

III. In the Form of Consecrating a Bishop, while the office of 1549 has 1 Tim. iii. 1-7, *in common with the office of ordering priests*, for the Epistle; and John xxi. 15-17; or, John x. 1-16; also *in common with the office just named*; the revised form of 1661-2 has 1 Tim. iii. 1-7; or, Acts xx. 17-35, for the Epistle; and for the Gospel, John xxi. 15-17; or, John xx. 19-23; or, Matt. xxviii. 18-20.

For the original formula, "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee," etc., is substituted, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, *now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands*. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee *by this imposition of our hands*; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear," etc.

IV. The changes made in the phraseology of the titles prefixed to the ordinal, and to the offices severally composing it, are specially noteworthy: "The form and manner of making, *ordaining*, and consecrating archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons; the form and manner of *making* deacons; the form

and manner of ordering priests; the form of *ordaining* or consecrating a bishop."

The most significant changes or additions are marked in the foregoing quotations by the *italics*.

V. In the formula to be used in presenting a candidate for ordination to the presbyterate, the expression, "the *order* of priesthood" is found alike in both offices — 1549 and 1661-2; while in that prescribed for presenting a priest for consecration to the episcopate, there is the addition or interpolation in the revised form of the word *ordained*: for the earlier form, "we present this . . . man to be consecrated bishop," we have now, "we present," etc. . . . "to be *ordained* and consecrated," etc.

It is here not unworthy of remark that in the petition, in the Litany, for the candidates to be admitted to the diaconate or the priesthood, the expression is "the *order* of deacons or priests;" but in that prescribed to be offered for the bishop elect, the term *order* is omitted; the words being simply: "That it may please thee to bless this *our brother elected*," etc. . . . "that he may duly execute the *office* whereunto he is called," etc. This would seem to have haply escaped the attention of the revisers of 1661.

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

STILLINGFLEET'S IRENICUM—OBJECT OF THE WORK—THE MAIN QUESTION DISCUSSED—DIVINE RIGHT—FOUR PLEAS—SERMON ON MISCHIEF OF SEPARATION—REPLIES OF OWEN AND BAXTER—REVIEW BY JOHN HOWE—“UNREASONABLENESS OF SEPARATION.”

THE close of the Cromwellian period is marked in this history by the appearance of STILLINGFLEET'S *Irenicum*,  
1659. [No. 288,] a work the main object of which, as the author assures us, is “to show that there can be no argument drawn from any pretence of *divine right*, that may hinder men from consenting and yielding to such a form of government in the Church as may bear the greatest correspondence to the primitive Church, and be most advantageously conducive to the peace, unity, and settlement of our divided Church.” It is an able presentation of the argument for episcopacy drawn from considerations of expediency; and a plea for conformity to the order of the Church of England, on the ground that no form of Church polity is expressly laid down in Scripture. “With the view of facilitating the admission of non-conformists into the Church of England, the author aims to break down the claims of any and all religious communities to an imprescriptible right, derived from divine authority, and to prove that no other conditions of communion should be imposed than such as Scripture expressly requires.”

To the work as reprinted in 1662, the author, with a view to conciliate those who had taken offence at some passages in the *Irenicum*, added an appendix in the form of a “Discourse concerning the Power of Excommunication in a Christian Church.” Its object is to prove that the Church is a distinct society from the State, possessed of rights and immunities of

its own, particularly the right of censuring offenders, resulting from its constitution as a Christian society; and that these rights of the Church cannot be alienated to the State, after the union of Church and State in a Christian country. According to Bishop Burnet, the argument of Stillingfleet is conducted with such learning and skill, that none of either side ever undertook to answer it. He moreover informs us that, notwithstanding, the author "not only retracted the book, but went into the humors of that high sort of people," as he expresses it, "beyond what became him, perhaps beyond his own sense of things." The ground of this imputation we shall examine a little farther on.

The main question discussed in the *Irenicum*, as stated by the author, is "*the divine right of particular forms of Church government*: whether the particular form whereby the Church must be governed, be determined by any positive law of God, which unalterably binds all Christians to see the observation of it. . . . The forms of government in controversy are only these two, the particular officers of several churches, acting in an equality of power, which are commonly called *a college of presbyters*; or a superior order above the standing ministry, having the power of jurisdiction and ordination belonging to it by virtue of a divine institution — called episcopacy. The question now, is not, which of these two doth come the *nearest to apostolical practice*, and the first institution, which hath hitherto been the controversy so hotly debated among us; but whether either of these two forms be so settled by a *jus divinum*, that is, be so determined by a positive law of God, that all the Churches of Christ are bound to observe that one form so determined without variation from it; or whether Christ hath not in settling of his Church (provided there be some form of government, and a settled ministry for the exercise of it,) left it to the prudence of every particular church, consisting of many congregations, to agree upon its own form which it judgeth most conducing to the end of government in that particular church. . . . The most probable

The main  
question.

Divine  
right.

way to come to an issue in this question, is, to go through all the ways whereon men do fix an unalterable divine right, and to see whether any of these do evince a divine right, settled upon a positive law or not, for one of these forms. The pleas

then for such a divine right are these: either  
 Four pleas. (a) some formal law standing in force under the gospel, or (b) some plain institution of a new law by Christ informing his Church, or (c) the obligatory nature of apostolical practice, or (d) the general sense of the primitive Church, to which we shall add, by way of appendix, the judgment of the chief divines and churches since the Reformation."

On the *first* point the author's conclusion is, "that the Jewish pattern is no standing law for Church government now, . . . but because there was some superiority of order then, and subordination of some persons to others under that government, such a superiority and subordination is no ways unlawful under the gospel; for that would destroy the equity of the law." On the *second*, the conclusion is, "that our Saviour hath determined no

more of church government than what is applicable to a diversity of particular forms, and so hath not by any law or practice of his own determined the necessity of any one form."

Special attention is due to the discussion of the  
 Third plea. *third* plea of a *divine right*. On the question of chief interest, *Who have authority to ordain*, according to apostolic precedent? the leading points of the argument are the following: "In reference to the fixed officers of the Church, in their first state and period, as Hierom tells us, 'the churches were ruled by the common council of the presbyters;' before the jurisdiction of the presbyters was restrained by mutual consent, in this instance doubtless, the presbyters enjoyed the same liberty that the presbyters among the Jews did, of ordaining other presbyters by the power with which they were invested at their own ordination.

"In the first primitive Church, the presbyters all acted in common for the welfare of the Church, and either did or might ordain others to the same authority with themselves;

because the intrinsical power of order is equally in them and in those who were after appointed governors over presbyteries. And the collation of orders doth come from the power of order, and not merely from the power of jurisdiction. It being likewise fully acknowledged by the schoolmen, that bishops are not superior above presbyters, as to the power of order."

"In the *second* period of the Church, the former liberty was restrained, by some act of the Church itself, for preventing the inconveniences which might follow the too common use of the former liberty of ordinations;" and "the main controversy is, when this restraint began, and by whose act; whether by any of the apostles, or only by the prudence of the Church itself, as it was with the *sanhedrim*. But in order to our peace, I see no such necessity of deciding it, both parties granting that in the Church such a restraint was laid on the liberty of ordaining presbyters; and the exercise of that power may be restrained still, granting it to be radically and intrinsically in them. So that this controversy is not such as should divide the Church. For those that are for ordinations only by a superior order in the Church, acknowledging a radical power for ordination in presbyters, which may be exercised in the case of necessity, do thereby make it evident that none who grant that do think that any positive law of God hath forbidden presbyters the full power of ordination; for then it must be wholly unlawful, *and so in case of necessity it cannot be valid*. Which doctrine I dare with some confidence assert to be a stranger to our Church of England. . . . On the other side, those who hold ordinations by presbyters lawful, do not therefore hold them necessary, but it being a matter of liberty and not of necessity, . . . this power then may be restrained by those who have the care of the Church's peace."

The conclusion under this head is summed up "in these three propositions, viz.: *First*, that we cannot arrive to such an absolute certainty of apostolical practice, or what course the apostles took in governing churches, as to infer from thence the only divine right of that one form which the several parties imagine comes the nearest to it; nor, *secondly*, is it

probable that the apostles did tie themselves up to any one fixed course in modelling churches; nor, *thirdly*, if they did, doth it necessarily follow that we must observe the same: *a mere apostolical practice being supposed, is not sufficient of itself for the founding an unalterable and perpetual right, for that form of government in the Church, which is supposed to be founded on that practice.* Before an acknowledged apostolical practice be looked on as obligatory, it must be made to appear that what the apostles did, they did from some unalterable law of Christ, or from such indispensable reasons as will equally hold in all times, places, and persons."

On the *fourth* point, "Whether the primitive Church did conceive itself obliged to observe unalterably one individual form of government, as delivered down to them either by a law of Christ, or an universal constitution of the apostles?" the conclusion of our author's argument is, that the primitive Church "did only settle and order things for Church government, according as it judged them tend most to the peace and settlement of the Church, without any antecedent obligation, as necessarily binding to observe only one course." In other words, "the only rule and law which the primitive Church observed, as to Church government, was the tendency of its constitutions to the peace and unity of the Church; and not any binding law or practice of Christ or his apostles." The points of proof are, (*a*) the enlargement of Church power in correspondence with that of churches: these, at first, composed of all the Christians in cities; then, of those in neighboring territory; then dioceses, provinces; (*b*) no certain form used in all churches, some being without bishops, some with but one in a whole country, etc.; (*c*) Church government conformed to the civil in the extent of dioceses; (*d*) validity of ordination by presbyters acknowledged in places where bishops were settled.

Under the last head, the judgment of Reformed divines, the author's statement, "that the most eminent divines since the Reformation have been all of this mind, that no one form is determined as necessary for the

Fourth plea.

Church of God in all ages," is supported by an array of authorities quite overwhelming.

Twenty years later, STILLINGFLEET, now dean of St. Paul's, again came forth in this debate, professedly as the advocate of peace and union, by the publication of a *Sermon on the Mischief of Separation*; an earnest appeal to the Non-conformists to strengthen the hands of the established Church against the common enemy, Popery, "by manfully laying aside trivial differences, and rejoining her communion."

Mischief of  
Separation.

1680.

Of the circumstances leading to the delivery of this sermon we have an account from the author himself, to this effect: While the nation was in a ferment about the Popish plot, and the apprehended ascendancy of Romanism, through the influence of the court, and the growing divisions among Protestants, a book came out under the name of a *Plea for Peace*, (from the pen of Baxter,) which better deserved the title of a *Plea for Disorder and Separation*, containing, as it did, numerous keen and bitter reflections on the constitution of the Church of England, and "no fewer than thirty tremendous aggravations of the sin of conformity." And, as if this were not enough, not long after, from the same pen, appeared another book, conceived in the same spirit, entitled *The True and Only Way of Concord of all the Christian Churches*; a volume fraught with such impracticable notions and dividing principles, that its whole design would seem to be to prove that *there is no true way of concord among Christians*.

That a person of Baxter's reputation for piety, of his age and experience, and such a lover of peace, withal, as he had always professed himself, should think of leaving two such firebrands behind him, followed, as they have since been, by four or five more, to the same purpose, thus seeming resolved to leave his life and sting together in the wounds of this Church, was matter of infinite surprise and concern. That even those who pretend to plead for peace, and to labor for the restoration of concord in the Church, should but fan the flame of contention — this, says Stillingfleet, "gave the first

occasion to those thoughts which I afterwards delivered in my sermon. And it falling to my lot to preach in the most public auditory of the city, at a more than usual appearance, being the first Sunday of the term, I thought fit to take opportunity to lay open the due sense I had of the unreasonableness and mischief of the present separation. Though I knew this to be so sore a place, that the parties most concerned could hardly endure to have it touched, even with a soft and gentle hand, yet I considered the duty which I owe to God and this Church above the esteem of good words of peevish and partial men; as I had before done in my dealing with the Papists; and I resolved to give them no just provocation by reproachful language or personal reflections; but if truth and reason would anger them, I did not hold myself obliged to study to please them."

But, however kindly meant, the sermon had the very contrary effect to that intended and looked for by its author. Dr. JOHN OWEN, the great Puritan leader, in reply to the sermon, put forth a *Brief Vindication of the Non-conformists from the Charge of Schism*, written, as Stillingfleet acknowledges, in a tone of civility, if with little force of argument. Stillingfleet had charged upon dissent, or separation from the established Church, the guilt of schism; an unlooked-for attack from such a quarter, which roused to the highest pitch the resentment of the dissenting leaders, and soon called forth a number of indignant replies. Owen's, as written in a spirit of moderation, is deserving of special remark. It would appear that complaint had been made of the unseasonableness of Stillingfleet's exposure of the mischief of dissent, in view of the imminent danger to the Protestant interest then apprehended from popery. Owen expresses a different opinion: "For it is meet that honest men should understand the state of those things in which they are deeply concerned. Non-conformists might possibly suppose that the common danger of all Protestants had reconciled the minds of the conforming ministers to them, and I was really of the same judgment myself. If it be not so, it is well they are fairly warned what

they have to expect, that they may prepare themselves to undergo it with patience." He proceeds to point out the unfairness of charging the Non-conformists with the sin of schism, and their ministers with insincerity, urging that the tendency of such an assault was to stir up persecution against a body of religionists who had already suffered for their honest convictions more than enough.

Owen was quickly followed by BAXTER, in a number of publications [333-335] — all betraying too much of the petulance of the polemic. His part in this controversy is not unjustly characterized by his distinguished adversary, as marked by unbecoming passion.

Baxter.

No such censure attaches to the review of the sermon put forth by JOHN HOWE: *A Letter written out of the Country to a Person of Quality in the City, who took offence at the late Sermon of Dr. Stillingfleet*, etc. In this temperately written critique, which presents the Non-conformist's plea in its most convincing form, special exception is taken to Stillingfleet's conduct of the argument on two grounds, viz., the writer's too great acrimony, and his too little seriousness. Other lesser opponents appeared in ALSOP, *Mischief of Imposition*, a book which the dean compares to the bird of Athens, as seeming to be made up of *face and feathers*; and BARRETT, *The Rector of Sutton* — Stillingfleet's parish when he published the *Irenicum* — *committed with the Dean of St. Paul's*; or a Defence of Dr. S.'s *Irenicum* against the late sermon; a production which seems to have caused the dean no little uneasiness.

Howe.

In reply to his numerous assailants, great and small, the author of the *Irenicum* gave to the world, as the mature fruit of his studies in this department, a volume entitled *The Unreasonableness of Separation*, [No. 340;] or an impartial account of the history, nature, and pleas of the present separation from the communion of the Church of England; a work displaying a minute acquaintance with the writings of the early Puritans, and with the different views of the several parties among

1681.

Unreasonable-  
ness of Separation.  
tion.

the Presbyterians. It brings out the fact that the Puritans, many of them, employed the same arguments against the Brownists which Churchmen now urged against themselves. "It cannot be denied," says the Puritan advocate Orme, "that on the principles of many of his adversaries, the dean had the better of the argument. The discussion turned chiefly on this point—Are the parochial churches true churches? If they be, why desert them? If you deny that they are, you are guilty of the uncharitableness which your forefathers charged on the separatists. If you hold occasional communion with them, which many of you do, and for the lawfulness of which most of you contend, why separate from them at all? Such were the dilemmas on the horns of which the reverend dean endeavored to toss his opponents." (*Life of Owen.*)

## CHAPTER XXIX.

RIGHTS OF CONVOCATION — REVISION OF THE LITURGY — ALTERATIONS PROPOSED — OPPOSED BY SHERLOCK — ADVOCATED BY TENISON — ANTI-REVISIONIST TRIUMPH — SYNODAL CONDEMNATION OF BURNET'S EXPOSITION — DISPUTE BETWEEN THE UPPER AND THE LOWER HOUSE — DECLARATION OF THE LATTER — ADDRESS AND COUNTER-ADDRESS — THE BISHOPS' REPLY — HIGH CHURCH AND LOW CHURCH.

SHORTLY after the Revolution of 1688, the rights of Convocation began to be strenuously advocated. It was justly urged that the Church, considered only as an integral member of the commonwealth, and the greatest corporation within it, might fairly claim the right of managing its own affairs, a right confessedly inherent in every other association; that the judgment of the Convocation — the Church representative — ought to have independent weight in the determination of all ecclesiastical questions; its province being the care of the interests of the Church, even as that of the Parliament was the care of the interests of the State; that the argument from abuse, which had been much employed by the Church's enemies, was wholly futile, as telling equally against all representative government, and against civil liberty itself; that without the intervention of such a synodical body, as experience had abundantly shown, no amendment was to be looked for in the affairs of the Church, the legislature being lamentably indifferent, and the clergy, for the most part, justly jealous of its interference.

Rights of  
Convocation.

These cogent arguments were met by a number of allegations, more remarkable for ingenuity than weight, viz., that ecclesiastical assemblies, when powerful, as Convocation, composed of a wealthy and numerous clergy, must always be, have in all ages and countries been mischievous; that the

caustic remark of Clarendon, that of all mankind none form so wretched an estimate of human affairs as churchmen, is abundantly confirmed by experience; that the representation of the Church in the House of Lords is sufficient for the protection of its interests; that the clergy have an influence which no other corporation enjoys over the bulk of the nation, and are apt to abuse it for the purposes of undue ascendancy, unjust restraint, or factious ambition; that the hope of any real good in reformation of the Church by its own assemblies, to whatever sort of reform we may look, is utterly chimerical; finally, that as the laws now stand, which few would incline to alter, the ratification of Parliament must be indispensable for any material change.\*

While this debate was keenly pursued on either side, the question of the revision of the Liturgy excited a no less lively interest, and called forth much earnest discussion. Early in 1689, an *act for exempting dissenters from the penalties of certain laws*, called the *Act of Toleration*, received the royal assent. A large number of dissenters, however, were desirous to bring about a scheme of comprehension with the established Church; and a bill on the subject had passed the House of Lords. But as the Commons considered the question as more suitable for Convocation, the Lords concurred in an address to the throne praying that, according to the ancient usage in time of Parliament, his majesty would be pleased to issue writs for calling a Convocation of the clergy to be advised with in ecclesiastical matters. Before the synod was convened, to prepare the way, a royal commission was issued, authorizing twenty persons named as commissioners, to meet and propose alterations in the Liturgy and Canons, and to consider other matters connected with the Church.

The commissioners, among whom were Burnet, Stillingfleet, Patrick, Tillotson, Tenison, and Beveridge, proceeded earnestly in the work, the majority doubtless in the hope of accomplishing some plan

Revision of  
the Liturgy.

Alterations  
proposed.

\* Hallam, *Const. Hist.* xvi.

of comprehension. As the result of their deliberations they proposed, among a number of alterations of minor importance, the following :

A rubric on the usefulness of the sign of the cross in baptism. The use of it to be omitted altogether when desired.

The sacramental elements to be administered in pews to those who might object to kneeling.

The absolution to be read by deacons; the word *minister* being substituted for *priest*; and the words "remission of sins" omitted.

Sponsors to be disused; and children to be presented in the name of their parents, if desired.

A rubric to declare that the curses in the Athanasian Creed are confined to those who deny the substance of the Christian religion.

It soon became evident that the changes proposed by the commission were altogether unacceptable to the majority of the clergy; and that an attempt to introduce them would be met with the most determined opposition. The character of that opposition is fairly illustrated in the following passage from a publication of the period, ascribed to Dr. Sherlock, the champion of the anti-revision party: "Whether there be any necessity of such alterations in the Liturgy; if there be any, for the satisfaction of the members of our Church, who generally believe there is none, why is not this necessity made appear? If there be none, whether it be for the reputation of the Church to be so frequently meditating unnecessary alterations? If not necessary, whether they are intended for the sake of the Church, or for the satisfaction of dissenters? If for the sake of the Church, should it not first be inquired whether the Church desires it; and what alterations she requires? Should not the Convocation, then, have first met and considered, before the commissioners had troubled themselves to make such alterations? If for the sake of the Church, why should any thing be altered which hath the general approbation of the true members of the Church? If for the satisfaction of dissenters, do they know what will satisfy dissenters? Can any alterations

Opposed by  
Sherlock.

in the prayers satisfy them who declare against all forms? Whether they ought not to have as tender a regard to the members of our own Church as to dissenters? If such alterations should make a schism, would it not prove of more consequence than this present schism?"

The cause of revision was espoused, in reply to Sherlock, by TENISON, in a publication without his name, entitled "A Discourse on the Ecclesiastical Commission, proving it to be agreeable to the Law, etc., useful to the Convocation, tending to the well-being of the Church, and seasonable at this juncture." Tenison agrees with Sherlock in avowing the conviction "that the prayers cannot be altered for the better;" not meaning this commendation, however, to apply to every collect.

When the Convocation assembled, the struggle between the friends and the opponents of revision at once began in the election of a prolocutor. The anti-revisionists carried it by a majority of two to one; but before it could enter upon the consideration of the question of revision, the Convocation was dissolved.

Ten years elapsed without any synodical action beyond that of meeting and adjourning; and in the year 1700 the Convocation was at length permitted to meet for business. It soon became apparent that the attitude of the two parties had in the mean time continued unchanged. Among its earliest acts, the lower house, under the leadership of Atterbury, proceeded to pronounce condemnation upon Bishop BURNET'S Exposition of the Articles of Religion. The *animus* of this proceeding, which was regarded as the crowning act of a factious opposition to the upper house, may appear from the general character of the charges alleged: "1. That the book tends to introduce such a latitude and diversity of opinions as the Articles were framed to avoid. 2. That there are many passages in the Exposition of several articles, which appear to us to be contrary to the true meaning of them, and to other received doctrines of our Church. 3. That there are some things in the said book which seem to us to be of dangerous consequence to the

Advocated  
by Tenison.

Anti-revisionist  
triumph.

Burnet's  
Exposition  
condemned.

Church of England as by law established, and to derogate from the honor of its reformation." It is well understood that Burnet's liberal, or, as they were stigmatized, latitudinarian views on questions of Church order, as developed in his exposition of the twenty-third article, were the real object of attack in the *Representation* of the lower house. In reply, the bishops pronounce the action of the lower house of Convocation, in "censuring the book of the Bishop of Sarum in general terms, without mentioning the particular passages on which the censure is grounded, defamatory and scandalous."

In the disputes now so unhappily carried on between the two houses of Convocation, the course of the bishops, it is universally conceded, is marked by singular moderation and forbearance; in striking contrast with that of the majority of the lower house. The leading subject of contention was the claim of the latter to sustain the same relation to the upper house that the Commons in Parliament bore to the House of Lords; that they should adjourn by their own authority, apart from the upper house, where, and to such time, as they should see fit. This the bishops in a body resisted, very properly, as it would seem, insisting upon conformity to the ancient usage, which had never yet been departed from, that the president adjourn the two houses together, and to the same time.

The two  
Houses  
dispute.

While these discussions were in progress, the lower house, taking advantage of a report now industriously circulated against them, that they were favorable to presbytery, their opposition to the bishops being artfully construed into hostility to episcopacy, put forth a *Declaration* to the following effect: That "whereas they had been scandalously and maliciously represented as favorers of presbytery, in opposition to episcopacy, they now declare that they acknowledge the order of bishops as superior to presbyters, to be of divine apostolical institution, and that they claim no rights but what they conceive necessary to the very being of the lower house of Convocation."

Declaration  
of Lower  
House.

In another address, on the same day, they pray the bishops,

to concur with them in settling the doctrine of episcopacy, that it might be the standing rule of the Church. It is plain that in preferring this request, the lower house were guilty of a discreditable attempt to entrap the bishops into a decision of a question which it was not competent for them to decide. They further hoped, it would appear, to involve the bishops in this dilemma: if their proposal should meet with the bishops' concurrence, they would gain their point; if not, the bishops themselves might appear to be covert favorers of presbytery.

A counter address was presented by the minority of the lower house, disclaiming the *Declaration*, on the ground that such a proceeding was of dangerous precedent, though they fully concurred in the doctrine which it asserted. They moreover expressed their doubt whether, as the Church had not declared that bishops are superior to presbyters by divine institution, they could legally assert the doctrine in Convocation without the royal license.

In reply to the declaration and address of the lower house, the bishops, through their president, put forth a statement to the effect that the preface to the ordinal contains a declaration of three orders in the ministry; but that it was not within their province to enact any canon or rule respecting doctrine or discipline without the royal license. Commending the zeal of the lower house for episcopacy, they express a hope that that body would continue to act accordingly in the future. The wisdom and moderation of this reply did not, however, avail to prevent an expression of surprise on the part of the clergy, that the bishops should decline to avow their position on the point in question; to say plainly whether they did or did not concur in the *Declaration*.

It was during the progress of these disputes in Convocation that the since hackneyed appellations *High Church* and *Low Church* first came into use; and it is a noteworthy fact that, at the time when these party designations were first applied, the bishops, as a body, were ranked among the *Low Churchmen*.

## CHAPTER XXX.

LORD KING'S INQUIRY—ITS HIGH PROFESSION OF CANDOR—NOT FULLY BORNE OUT—SUPPORTS INDEPENDENCY—ANSWERED BY SCLATER—ORIGINAL DRAUGHT—KING'S CONVERSION—PROBABILITY OF THE TRADITION—CHARACTER OF SCLATER'S ARGUMENT.

A WORK too important in its influence on the development of opinion in the succeeding age, to be overlooked in this record, is Lord KING's *Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church*, [No. 383,] a treatise marked by a singular show of candor, by no means realized in the writer's conduct of his argument.

Lord King's  
Inquiry.

1691.

The author's definition of a church is that of the Independents: "a society of Christians, meeting together in one place under their proper pastors, for the performance of religious worship, and the exercising of Christian discipline." "The constituent parts of a particular church are the clergy and laity, an early distinction, mentioned by Clemens Romanus." Of the clergy, the particular orders and degrees "we may say to be three, viz., bishops, priests, and deacons. In the apostolic and primitive days, there was but one supreme bishop in the place, that was ὁ ἐπισκοπος, the bishop by way of eminency; the proper pastor and minister of his parish, to whose care and trust the souls of that church, or parish, over which he presided, were principally and more immediately committed. This is he which in the Revelation is called 'the angel' of the Church." As "there was but one bishop to a church," so "there was but one church to a bishop. The bishop's diocese exceeded not the bounds of a modern parish, and was the same, as in name, so also in thing. All the people of a diocese did every Sunday

Independent  
Definition.

meet all together in one place to celebrate divine service. The bishop had but one altar or communion-table in his whole diocese, at which his whole flock received the sacrament from him. The greatest bishoprics in the world, even in the third century, were no more than single congregations."

The functions of the bishop's office were preaching the word, praying with his people, administering the two sacraments, taking care of the poor, ordaining of ministers, governing his flock, excommunicating of offenders, absolving of penitents. The primitive apostolic bishop was elected by all the members of a parish, both clergy and laity. When approved by the neighboring bishops whose approbation and consent were necessary to his legal constitution, he was ordained "in his own church by the neighboring bishops."

"The ancients generally mention presbyters distinct from bishops. . . . The great question which hath most deplorably sharpened and soured the minds of too many, is what the office and order of a presbyter was: about this the world hath been, and still is, most uncharitably divided. Some equalize a presbyter in every thing with a bishop; others as much debase him, each according to their (his) particular opinions, either advance or degrade him. In many controversies a middle way hath been the safest; perhaps in this, the medium between the two extremes may be the truest.

"Now the definition of a presbyter may be this: a person in holy orders, having thereby an inherent right to perform the whole office of a bishop; but being possessed of no place or parish, not actually discharging it, without the permission and consent of the bishop of a place or parish. As a curate hath the same mission and power with a minister, whose place he supplies; yet not being the minister of that place, he cannot perform there any acts of his ministerial function, without leave from the minister thereof; so *a presbyter had the same order and power with a bishop*, whom he assisted in his cure, yet being not the bishop or minister of that cure, he could not there perform any parts of his pastoral office without the permission of the bishop thereof: so that what we

generally render bishops, priests, and deacons, would be more intelligible in our tongue, if we did express it by rectors, vicars, and deacons; . . . different in *degree*, but yet equal in *order*.

“With the bishop’s permission, the presbyter preached and administered the sacraments; he ruled in the church to which he belonged; together with the bishop he presided in church consistories; he had the power of absolution, and of excommunication, and also of confirmation.

“As for *ordination*, I find but little said of this in antiquity; yet as little as there is, there are clearer proofs of the presbyters’ ordaining, than there are of their administering the Lord’s Supper. . . . Whatever a bishop did, the same did a presbyter; the particular acts of their office were the same; the only difference that was between them was in degree.

“The *unity of the Church Universal* consisted, not in an uniformity of rites and customs, nor in an unanimity of consent to the non-essential points of Christianity, but in a harmonious assent to the essential articles of religion, or in an unanimous agreement in the fundamentals of faith and doctrine.

“The *unity of a particular church* consisted in the members’ love and amity toward each other, and in their due subjection to their pastor or bishop: accordingly the breach of that unity consisted either *first*, in hatred and malice of each other, or, *second*, in a rebellion against their lawful pastor, or, which is all one, in a causeless separation from their bishop and those that adhered to him. The *first* (without a formal separation) was called *schism*, as in 1 Cor. xi. 18; the *second* was what the ancients commonly termed schism. The causes justifying separation from the bishop were three: (*a*) apostasy from the faith, or, when a bishop renounced the faith; (*b*) heresy; (*c*) a scandalous and wicked life.”

In the controversies that have arisen in our own country on the constitution and ministry of the Church, Lord King’s *Inquiry* has not unfrequently been quoted and referred to by writers against episcopacy, in such a way as to imply that it had never received an answer; that,

indeed, it is unanswerable. A full quarter of a century was allowed to elapse before an answer appeared, yet when at length the answer came forth, under the title of *An Original Draught of the Primitive Church*, [No. 461,] it was hailed, by general acknowledgment, as a conclusive refutation of Lord King's book. The tradition is that the author of the *Inquiry* was himself convinced by it. The first record of this tradition is to be found in the *Works of the Learned*, for January, 1739, only six years after Lord King's death. It is to this effect: "An answer was made by a very learned and judicious divine to this book, (the *Inquiry*,) in 1717, which Sir Peter King saw, and read in manuscript before it was printed; and he had it in his power to prevent the printing of it effectually, if he pleased. But so far was he from that, that he gave up his own book, (which had just then received a second edition,) and he returned the manuscript with thanks, and desired it might be printed, for it had convinced him of his mistakes."

The truth of this report, which has been contemptuously questioned, is rendered fairly, if not highly probable by the considerations following: The *Inquiry* was a *youthful performance*; as such, it is repeatedly referred to by the author himself, who manifests throughout the volume a becomingly modest appreciation of his work, not hesitating to declare, as he does in the preface, "unfeignedly and sincerely to prevent mistakes in my younger years, I humbly desire, (if the request be not too bold,) and shall heartily thank any learned person, that will be so kind as to inform me, if he knows me to have erred in any one or more particulars; . . . and I promise, if my mistakes are fairly shown, I will not pertinaciously and obstinately defend, but most willingly and thankfully renounce them, since my design is not to defend a party, but to search out the truth."

There seems little reason to question the sincerity of the youthful writer's profession of unreserved openness to conviction; and when, in his mature age, the exposure of his errors and mistakes was brought before him in such a convincing

form as we see it to be in the *Original Draught*, it is altogether reasonable, as it is but due to the author of the *Inquiry*, to believe that he actually made the acknowledgment ascribed to him. This presumption is strengthened by the fact that he attempted no reply to his reviewer; and by the further fact, that, not long after the appearance of the *Original Draught*, he made its author an offer of a living in the Church of England—an offer which Selater as a non-juror could not accept.

As a sample of the trenchant yet temperate style of our author's critique, take the following from the opening of the fourth chapter: "To heal divisions in a church, and displease none that make them, are two such works of charity as can scarce consist together. Yet, to carry this as far as it would go, the good Inquirer seems to aim at both; the former he solemnly professes in his preface, the latter as visibly appears in the performance itself. But with what success, and by what means he has done it, in a great measure appears by what has gone before, and in this fourth chapter will be much clearer still.

"There are three or four parties, as he tells us himself, which he aimed to reconcile: He began with the *Independents'* cause, and in order to make them and the rest agree, he has strained antiquity, you see, to make it speak *their* sense, in the points of congregational dioceses, and the popular right of choosing their own bishops, the main matters they contend for, which, no doubt of it, will offend none of them; but as to clearing up the truth in their case, and bringing them to a peaceful disposition for compromising matters with such as differ from them, we may justly fear, by the palpable writhings for their sake, he has done little or nothing that can tend to that happy end."

The charge of *straining antiquity* in favor of Independency, thus explicitly alleged against the *Candid Inquirer*, is supported at large in the first three chapters. A single instance of misrepresentation, out of the large number adduced by our author, may be taken as fairly representing the whole: In his exposition of passages in the writings of the fathers, which

Lord King alleges to prove that in the largest cities there were no more than a single congregational church during the first three hundred years, "He begins with Justin Martyr, and renders a passage in his first Apology, thus: *On Sunday all assemble together in one place.* Now Justin's words are these: *On Sunday all throughout cities or countries meet together;* and why do we think he left out these words, *throughout cities or countries,* which were the very middle of the sentence. Why? because those words of the holy martyr would undeniably show it to be a general account of Christian practice in all places of the Christian world; whereas, *our Inquirer's business was to make it a particular instance of a single bishop's diocese,* and that all the members of it, both in city and country, met in one and the same place together at once; and if it were so, thus *cities and countries* in the plural number would be too much for him; for if they proved any thing in that sense, they would prove that *cities and countries,* indefinitely taken, wherever there were any Christians in them, met *all* together every Sunday, and made but one congregation; and therefore the expression *assembling together,* used with reference to a complex body, as it evidently is here, severally refers to each distinct member and part whereof that complex body consists, and plainly denotes that every part . . . did hold an assembly on that day. (*Chap. ii.*)

"He now proceeds to bring the Presbyterian party to a temper, by much the same way; that is, by allowing them fairly, as fast as he can, without regard to such as differ from them, the chief and fundamental point they insist upon, *the equality of order in the bishops and the presbyters;* and to clear his way for that, he defines his presbyters thus: *A person in holy orders, having thereby an inherent right to perform the whole office of a bishop,* etc.

"In this proposition it is implied that in the judgment of antiquity, the solemn office of promoting a presbyter to the station of a bishop added nothing more to his former character and order than a right and title only to exercise those powers, to the full, which were inherent in him before."

Now here "I observe, after the example of the Inquirer himself: 1st. That the same word which all antiquity uses for expressing the promotion of a layman to a deacon, or a deacon to a presbyter, they used also for the promotion of presbyters into the station of a bishop. It is *ordination* of bishops as well as of priests and deacons in the familiar language of the fathers. This our Inquirer owns. Hence I argue in his own words, 'if the same appellation of a thing be a good proof for the identity of its nature,' then the rite of consecrating a bishop must confer a new order upon him.

"2d. A single bishop, by the ancient canons of the Church, and by sufficient evidence besides, might ordain a presbyter or deacon. But to make a bishop, a whole province of bishops did most commonly assemble, and collate that power and character upon him which ever after, and never before, he was invested in."

## CHAPTER XXXI.

WARBURTON'S THEORY OF THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO THE STATE — THE ALLIANCE — ANALYSIS OF — COLERIDGE'S THEORY COMPARED — ARNOLD'S THEORY — GLADSTONE'S — BUNSEN'S — PREVAILING VIEWS OF CHURCH ORDER IN ENGLAND AS REPRESENTED BY LESLIE AND LAW — EMANUEL SWEDENBORG: CHURCH OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.

HOOKER'S theory of the relation of the Church to the State was now for the first time controverted with competent ability by WILLIAM WARBURTON, who came forth in ex-  
Warburton's position and defence of a system which, since its theory. promulgation, has divided, with those of Hooker 1736. and the Puritans, the suffrages of thinking men.

The Puritans, as we have seen, maintained that the Church and the State are two distinct and independent societies; and that therefore the Church is in no way subject to the control of the magistrate. In opposing these views, Hooker asserted that the Church and the State were but portions of the same society, and that the State had a rightful supremacy over

the Church. Warburton, in his *Alliance between Church and State*, [No. 494,] advocates a theory opposed alike to both; maintaining that the Church and the State, though originally distinct, had voluntarily formed an alliance, on just and reasonable terms, for the sake of mutual advantage; an hypothesis supposed to have been suggested by the French notion of a social contract between governors and those governed.

The leading points of Warburton's argument, as developed in the *Alliance*, are contained in the following brief abstract: "The dependence of one society upon another must arise either from the law of nature or the law of nations. Depend-

ence by the law of nature is from essence, or generation ; but the Church could not in this way be dependent on the State ; for the Church existed before the State had a being. Whatever connection, therefore, exists between the two, must exist under the law of nations, or by civil compact.

“ But as man, when he submitted to become a member of civil society, necessarily relinquished some of his individual rights, so the Church, when she entered into alliance with the State, acted in a similar manner, by giving up her right of independence, which she transferred to the civil power. But as man received an equivalent for the natural rights which he relinquished in entering into society, so should the Church receive an equivalent for that which she relinquished in entering into alliance with the State. The equivalent, then, which the Church received, for acknowledging the civil power to be her superior, was, protection in her acts, and support to her authority.

“ The State, at the same time, expected assistance and support from the Church, in the exertion of her influence for the promotion of virtue and good order in the community. One of the modes in which the State, as the protector and guardian of the Church, would enable her to exercise her authority in its behalf, would be by conferring on her a portion of coercive power to enjoin the observation of such duties of imperfect obligation — the duties, for instance, of charity, gratitude, hospitality, and others of similar nature — as laws cannot enforce ; and such others, also, of perfect obligation, as are violated by the intemperance of the several appetites. Such coercive power the Church does not possess of herself, for though she has power of excommunication, the only power that a religious society, considered independently, needs — yet this power is not of general influence in regard to the community, but of efficiency only to preserve the purity of her own particular worship.

“ A great means of bestowing this coercive power on the Church is the public endowment of its ministers, assigning for their maintenance a fixed share of the national property ;

thus rendering the religious society, of whose aid the State has so much need, more firm and stable, and destroying that dependence of the clergy on the people which arises from their maintenance by voluntary contribution. Such public maintenance may be provided by means of tithes, a mode of support not, indeed, obligatory, but just as eligible for modern as it was for ancient times.

“The dignity of the clergy and the interest of the Church will be promoted by the State’s conceding to the superior members of the Church a place in the legislature, such as, in England, the bishops’ seat in Parliament; a just concession, inasmuch as the Church, having, when she formed an alliance with the State, relinquished to the latter her independence, ought to have a voice in the legislature to prevent the power, which the State now possesses over her, from being perverted to her injury. Had she no such voice, her position would be that, not of a subject, but of a slave, to the State; and no laws could justly be made in the legislature concerning her, because no free man, or free body of men, can be bound by laws to which they have not given their consent.

“If, when the union between Church and State in any country is formed, there should be more churches in it than one, the State will form its alliance with the strongest, or most numerous, acting thus from motives of policy; for the larger a religious society is, the better able will it be, as having the greater number under its influence, to render service to the State. To other less powerful religious bodies the State will grant toleration, or the free enjoyment of their opinions and forms of worship, yet under such restrictions as will keep them from injuring the religion allied with the State; for without such restrictions, the State could not fully discharge its contract with the Church to which it is allied. One reasonable restriction of this sort is that by which the dissenting bodies are excluded from those offices of honor and power in which they might exert influence to the injury of the allied Church. Such a *test-law* was introduced in England in the reign of Charles II., as a security to the established Church

against the Puritans; a law of which William III. acknowledged the necessity.

“The exclusion of dissenters from places of honor and profit, for matters of opinion, is no violation of their civil rights, for those places are not lodged in the hands of the civil power as a trust, which may be claimed by all subjects, and equally shared among them, but are of the nature of prerogative, of which the civil power may dispose at pleasure, being only bound to see that the offices be filled by persons duly qualified; and among due qualifications not the least will be a favorable disposition to the established religion. When opinions affect the peace of society, they come within the jurisdiction of the civil power, and the peace of society is directly and necessarily affected by those opinions which a test-law makes matter of disqualification.

“The alliance between Church and State is not indissoluble. It will naturally continue only so long as the Church in alliance with the State maintains its superiority in numbers over other religious societies. When this superiority is lost, the alliance becomes void; since the allied Church being no longer able to perform its part in the compact, by influencing the majority of the nation to the observance of morality and good order, the State is at once disengaged from the alliance; and a new alliance may be formed with such other religious society as may have become the most numerous. Thus the alliance between the pagan church and the empire of Rome was dissolved, and the Christian established in its place; and thus the alliance between the Romish Church and the kingdom of England was broken, and another made with the Reformed in its stead.”

And so, on the other hand, the Church having subordinated itself to the State upon faith of certain stipulations for support by the latter, if the State violates, or withdraws from the fulfilment of those stipulations, the Church is thereby remitted to her original independence.

Such is the theory of Warburton as developed in the *Alliance*: let us compare with it that of COLERIDGE, put forth a

century later, in his work *On the Idea of Church and State*, [No. 575,] a work to which Maurice ascribes a superiority over almost every book so recently published, as having "exercised a more decided influence over the thoughts and feelings of men who ultimately rule the mass of their countrymen."

Coleridge's  
theory.

So far as the inter-dependency of the Church and the State is in question, Coleridge agrees with Warburton. The peculiarity of his system is grounded on a distinction taken between the visible Church of Christ, as localized in any Christian country, and the national or established Church of that country. *Distinction*, not separation, for the two ideas, not only may coexist in the same *suppositum*, but may require an identity of subject in order to the complete development of the perfections of either. The Christian Church, according to Coleridge, is not a kingdom or realm of this world, nor a member of any such kingdom; it is not opposed to any particular State, in the large or narrow sense of the word; it is in no land national, and the national Reserve is not intrusted to its charge. (The primitive races, in taking possession of a new country, and in the division of the land into heritable estates among the individual warriors or heads of families, set apart a *Reserve* for the nation itself. The sum total of these heritable portions is called the Propriety; the *Reserve* is named the Nationalty. These were constituent factors of the commonwealth; the existence of the one being the condition of the rightfulness of the other.)

It is, on the contrary, opposite to the world only; the counterforce to the evils and defects of States, as such, in the abstract—asking of any particular State neither wages nor dignities, but demanding protection, that is, to be let alone. The Christian Church is a public and visible community, having ministers of its own, whom the State can neither constitute nor degrade, and whose maintenance among Christians is as secure as the command of Christ can make it. (1 *Cor.* ix. 14.) The National Church is a public and visible community, having ministers whom the nation, through the

agency of a constitution, has created trustees of a reserved national fund, upon fixed terms, and with defined duties, and whom, in case of breach of those terms, or dereliction of those duties, the nation, through the same agency, may discharge. "If the former be *ECCLESIA*, the communion of such as are called out of the world, that is, in reference to the especial ends and purposes of that communion; the latter might more expressively have been called *Enclesia*, or an order of men chosen in and of the realm, and constituting an estate of the realm."

It is thus evident that Coleridge's system is at direct variance with that of Warburton, and that of Hooker, as also with the theory of the Presbyterian Puritans, in so far as they, one and all, consider any branch of the Church of Christ, *as such*, in the character of a National Establishment, and arrogate to it, *as such*, upon any ground, worldly riches, rank, or power.

"It is not denied that it is contrary to justice to compel those who dissent from a religious system, to contribute to the maintenance of its ministers; but it is at the same time maintained, that a national dedication of funds for the support of a determinate class of men charged with the duty of national civilization, can no more be vacated by reason of the voluntary secession of dissenters, because the seceders understand the nature of that duty in a way of their own, than the right of the legislature to levy taxes for the protection of the State from foreign aggression can be affected by the opinion of the Quakers, that war is unlawful.

"But the funds set apart by the nation, it is urged, for the support of the National Church, are now, in fact, received by the ministers of the Church of Christ in England. True, answers Coleridge; but, according to the idea, it is not because they are *such* ministers that they receive those funds, but because, being now the only representatives, as formerly the principal constituents, of the National Clerisy or Church, they alone have a commission to carry on the work of national cultivation on national grounds. Such a Church is a principal instrument of the divine providence in the institution and gov-

ernment of human society. But it is not *that* Church against which we know that hell shall not prevail. Though the Church of England may fall, the Church of Christ *in* England will stand erect; and the distinction lost now in a common splendor, will then be better seen and felt by that world to which the Christian Church must become, more and more, a conspicuous opposite."

With Coleridge's theory of the Church we may compare that of ARNOLD, (*Fragment on the Church*), [No. 686,] that of GLADSTONE, (*The State in its Relations with the Church*), [No. 601,] and that of BUNSEN, (*The Church of the Future*.) [No. 734.]

Arnold's  
theory.

Arnold's theory may be summarily expressed in the phrase: *the Church is the State*; and, as given in outline by its author, may be stated thus: 1. The State has for its legitimate object the highest happiness of its people, not physical well-being only, but also intellectual and moral. 2. Church officers, as sovereign or independent, can be regarded in two lights only, that of *priests* or that of *rulers*. *Priests* are independent, as deriving either from supposed holiness of race or person, or from their exclusive knowledge of the divine will, a title to execute certain functions, which none but themselves can perform; and therefore these functions being of prime necessity, enable them to treat with the State, not as members or subjects of it, but as foreigners conferring on it a benefit, and selling this on their own terms. *Rulers* of course are independent and sovereign, *ipsâ vi termini*. 3. But ecclesiastical officers of Christianity are, by God's appointment, neither priests nor rulers. Not *priests*, for there is one only Priest, and all the rest are brethren; none has any holiness of person or race more than another; none has any exclusive possession of divine knowledge. Not *rulers*, for Christianity not being a *θρησκευεῖα*, or ritual service, but extending to every part of human life, the rulers of Christians, quâ Christians, must rule them in all matters of principle and practice; and if this power be given to bishops, priests, and deacons, by divine appointment, Innocent III. was right, and every Christian

country should be like Paraguay. Hence the relation of the Church to the State is not that of an alliance or union, but of absolute identity. In other words, the object of the State and that of the Church being alike the highest welfare of man, and the State not being able to accomplish this, unless acting with the wisdom and goodness of the Church, nor the Church, unless invested with the sovereign power of the State, the State and the Church in their ideal form are not two societies, but one, and it is only as this identity is realized in a particular country, that man's perfection and God's glory can be established on earth.

This theory, though sanctioned, as Arnold's biographer remarks, by Hooker, by Burke, and, in part, by Coleridge, had never before been so completely the expression of a man's whole mind, or the basis of a whole system, political as well as religious, positive as well as negative.

Mr. GLADSTONE'S theory rests on the fundamental position, that "the propagation of religious truth is one of the principal ends of government, as government; that whatever be the body which, in any community, is employed to protect the persons and property of men, that body ought also, in its corporate capacity, to profess a religion, to employ its power for the propagation of that religion, and to require conformity to that religion as an indispensable qualification for all civil office."

Gladstone's  
theory.

Mr. Gladstone's argument embodies, in substance, the following propositions: "*First*, Governors, as *individuals*, lie under an 'obligation to profess and maintain religion in their government, as in other parts of their conduct.' *Second*, The State itself, taken *collectively*, has a personal existence, a duty and a conscience, and is therefore bound, *collectively*, to the same profession and maintenance. *Third*, If externally able, and internally qualified, and if the same thing cannot be done so well otherwise, the State ought to extend and propagate the same religion through the nation. But the same thing cannot be so well done otherwise, as the failure of the voluntary system, left alone, proves; and the State is externally

competent, both as having the means of endowment, and as coming to men's minds with authority, and appealing both to their sympathies and interests. And *lastly*, The Government is intrinsically competent; i. e., in proportion as it is good government, it attracts to itself those among the people who are best qualified to choose in matters of religion."

The fundamental position of BUNSEN'S theory of the Church, [No. 734,] as that of Arnold's, is the doctrine of the universal priesthood of Christians; that there is and can be no priesthood intermediate between the expiatory mediation of the Head, and the Eucharistic oblation of the whole body of his members—the former necessarily single and exclusive, the latter common and universal. "This great moral idea, though requiring for its existence in the germ only the Christian *family*, demands for its full development a Christian *nation*, and a Christian *State*; just as the life of man demands for its full development to be life in the State." There is here no organized society, or body corporate distinct from the family, the nation, the State; no new social relation similar to these introduced into the world by Christianity, such as is generally understood by the term *Church*. "The Church," in Bunsen's scientific phraseology, "as a spiritual personality, is the human race, redeemed by Christ: as an institution, she is the divinely appointed means for restoring disunited and shattered humanity to peace with God and unity with itself." By "becoming a member of the Church, a nation becomes a portion of divinely liberated humanity, and the body politic becomes actually the highest visible manifestation of moral life."

"An Evangelical Church polity is, accordingly, nothing but one side of the constitution of an Evangelical State." Of the two ministries, or *orders*, in the Church, that of the Word, or preaching, and that of internal government, the former, as instituted by Christ himself, is grounded on divine right; the latter is also *jure divino*, but *mediately*, through the divine right which is inherent in human society, or the State. "The supremacy of the Church is vested in the whole congrega-

tion." Disclaiming the "invisible Church," and denouncing what he calls "the invisibility of the visible Church," as "an invention of the theologians—an opportune invention to help the canonists out of their difficulty in finding the sovereign person of the Church whom they had lost sight of on the downfall of the Church of the clergy"—Bunsen teaches that "the congregation—the visible community or Church of the Lord, which is mankind in its process of restoration, which is confessedly incapable of being represented as a whole—can express itself only through Christian literature and public opinion. As a visible universal Church would presuppose a universal State, particular Christian States are the highest manifestations of that universal life of mankind which cannot be represented as a whole, and exhibit the nearest actual approach to that community in which the supreme earthly authority resides. A Christian nation, then, so far as it presents itself as an Evangelical National Church, forms the supreme body. Thus Church and State, or nation, are identical."

The views of Church order that have obtained most general acceptance in the churches of the Anglican communion, since the reaction of 1661-2, even down to our own day, may be fairly represented by CHARLES LESLIE and WILLIAM LAW, both non-juring divines. If not the ablest theologians, they were yet the most influential theological writers of their day. Leslie, eulogized by Dr. Johnson as the only one of the non-jurors who could reason, and he "a reasoner who is not to be reasoned against"—defines the Church as "not only a sect, that is, a company of people believing such and such tenets, like the several sects of the heathen philosophers; but as a society under government, with governors appointed by Christ, invested with such powers and authority, to admit into and exclude out of the society, and govern the affairs of the body.

"This power was delegated by Christ to His apostles and their successors to the end of the world; accordingly the apostles did ordain bishops in all the churches which they planted throughout the whole world, as the supreme governors

and centre of unity, each in his own church. These were obliged to keep unity and communion with one another, which is therefore called Catholic communion; and all these churches considered together is the Catholic Church, as the several nations of the earth are called the world."

*Of Episcopacy* Leslie writes in this decisive strain: "A society cannot be without a government, for it is that which makes a society; and a government cannot be without governors. The apostles were instituted by Christ the first governors of His Church; and with them and their successors He has promised to be to the end of the world. The apostles did ordain bishops as governors in all the churches which they planted throughout the whole world; and these bishops were esteemed the successors of the apostles, each in his own church, from the beginning to this day. . . . Thus it continued from the days of the apostles to those of John Calvin: in all which time there was not any one church in the whole Christian world that was not episcopal.

"So evident is that saying, that the Church is the pillar and ground of the truth, that we can hardly find any error which has come into the Church, but upon an infraction made upon the episcopal authority.

"For which this is to be said, that *it has all the four marks* before mentioned, to ascertain any fact in the concurrent testimony of all churches, at all times; and therefore must infallibly be the government which the apostles left upon the earth. To which we must adhere till a greater authority than theirs shall alter it."

The "four marks" are those Leslie lays down in his "Short Method," the concurrence of which in any matter of fact demonstrates its reality. "1. That the matter of fact be such as that men's outward senses may be judges of it. 2. That it be done publicly in the face of the world. 3. That not only public monuments be kept up in memory of it, but some outward actions be performed. 4. That such monuments, and such actions, or observances, be instituted, and do commence from the time that the matter of fact was done." These all

meeting in the matter of fact of episcopacy, constitute, Leslie contends, "*an infallible demonstration*" of it. (*Letter to a Friend*, and, to the same effect, in *Discourse on the Qualifications requisite to Administer the Sacraments.*) [No. 474.]

LAW, who is justly characterized as "one of the most powerful and original of English writers in the interest of religion," handles the subject of the Church and ministry, with characteristic vigor, in his *Third Letter to the Bishop of Bangor*. [No. 462.] "There is, no doubt of it," he writes, "an invisible Church, i. e., a number of beings that are in covenant with God, who are not to be seen by human eyes; and we may be said to be members of this *invisible Church*, as we are entitled to the same hopes and expectations. But to call the number of men and women who believe in Christ and observe His institutions, whether dispersed or united in this visible world, to call *these* the invisible Church, is as false and groundless as to call them the order of angels, or the Church of seraphims. The profession of Christians is as visible as any other profession, and as much declared by visible external acts. And it is as proper to call a number of men practising law or physic, an invisible society of lawyers and physicians, as to call the Church on earth the *invisible Church*. For all those acts and offices which prove people to be Christians, or the Church of Christ, are as visible and notorious, as those which prove them to be of any particular secular employment. . . . The holy Catholic Church, the kingdom of Christ, differs from worldly societies and kingdoms, but not in point of *visibility*, but in regard to the *ends* and *purposes* for which it is erected; viz., the eternal salvation of mankind."

"The doctrine of *the uninterrupted succession of the clergy*" is thus strenuously asserted: "If the commission to exercise the priestly office be to descend through ages, and distinguish the clergy from the laity; it is certain that the persons, who alone can give this commission, must descend through the same ages, and consequently an uninterrupted succession is as necessary as that the clergy have a divine commission. Take away this succession, and the clergy may as well be ordained

by one person as another ; a number of women may as well give them a divine commission as a congregation of any men. They may indeed appoint persons to officiate in holy orders, for the sake of *decency* and *order* ; but then there is no more in it than an external *decency* and *order* ; they are no more the priests of God than those that pretended to make them so.

“ It is not true that the *divine unalterable* right of episcopacy is founded *merely* upon apostolical practice.

“ We do not say that episcopacy cannot be changed *merely* because we have apostolical practice for it, but because such is the nature of the Christian priesthood that it can only be continued in that method which God has appointed for its continuance. Thus episcopacy is the *only* instituted method of continuing the priesthood ; therefore episcopacy is *unchangeable*, not because it is an apostolical practice, but because the nature of the thing requires it : a positive institution being only to be continued in that method which God has appointed ; so that it is the nature of the priesthood, and not the apostolical practice alone, that makes it necessary to be continued. . . . The argument proceeds thus : The Christian priesthood is a divine positive institution, which, as it could only begin by the *divine appointment*, so it can only descend to after ages in such a method as God has been pleased to appoint.

“ The apostles instituted episcopacy *alone* ; therefore this method of episcopacy is *unalterable*, not because an apostolical practice cannot be laid aside, but because the priesthood can only descend to after ages in such a method as is of divine appointment.”

The objection from the alleged *uncertainty* of the succession is answered thus : “ I know no reason why it is so uncertain, but because it is founded upon *historical evidence*.” But “ Christianity itself is a matter of fact only conveyed to us by historical evidence ; the canon of Scripture is only made known to us by historical evidence. . . . Cannot historical evidence satisfy us in one point as well as in the other ? Till it is shown *when*, or *how*, or *where*, this succession broke, or *seemed* to break, or was *likely* to break, I shall content myself

with offering this reason why *it is morally impossible* it ever should have broken in all the term of years, from the apostles to the present times.

“The reason is this: it has been a received doctrine in every age of the Church, that no ordination was valid but that of bishops. This doctrine has been a constant guard upon the *episcopal succession*: for seeing it was universally believed that bishops *alone* could ordain, it was *morally impossible* that any persons could be received as bishops, who had not been so ordained.” (II. *Letter, P. S.*)

The year 1757 is the date fixed by EMANUEL SWEDENBORG as that of the foundation of the *Church of the New Jerusalem*. In his treatise, *De Nova Hierosolyma*, published in 1758, [No. 504,] Swedenborg gives a formal exposition of his theory of the New Church: “The first heaven,”

1757.

consisting of imaginary heavens in the world of spirits, passed away at “the last judgment;” but in the Apocalypse we read also of a “first earth;” which likewise “passed away.” This earth, says Swedenborg, signifies the Christian Church dead and done for. Subsequent to the passing away of heaven and earth was the descent of the Holy City, New Jerusalem, seen by John, from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.

The New Jerusalem, then, “is the Church with respect to doctrine.” The Christian Church having come to an end, a New Church is established, and for its establishment a new code of doctrine is requisite. This code Swedenborg delivers. “It is,” he writes, “for the New Church, and is called heavenly doctrine, because revealed to me out of heaven. When I speak of the churches in the Christian world, I mean Protestant churches, and not the Popish or Roman Catholic Church, since that is not a Christian Church; for, wherever the Christian Church exists, the Lord is worshipped, and the Word is read; whereas, among Roman Catholics, they worship themselves instead of the Lord, forbid the Word to be read by the people, and affirm the Pope’s decree to be equal, yea, even superior to it.

“It is the disappearance of Charity that has caused the dissolution of the Church; for where there is no Charity there can be no Faith; notwithstanding the Protestant churches throughout Christendom justify their divisions on the score of Faith. But nothing is more certain than that goodness alone has confidence and manifestation in the Truth, and that therefore none but the righteous can believe in the Lord, or possess real Faith; and their Faith is simple or profound in the strict measure of their righteousness. Hence we may see how Faith ceases when Charity ceases.

“Love and Faith, in other words, the presence of the Lord in man, constitute the Church. In whomsoever the Divine life is manifest, that is, in whomsoever the Lord’s will is done — in him is Heaven, in him is the Church, whatever be his circumstances, and whatever his nominal creed.

“The community among whom the Lord is acknowledged and the Word exists, is called the Church. . . . Doctrine formed from the Word is one of the conditions of the existence of a Church, for without Doctrine the Word cannot be understood: but Doctrine alone does not form the Church, but Life according to Doctrine.” (*De Nov. Hier.*)

Gentiles who acknowledge God and live in obedience to the Truth they know “are in communion with the Church; for no one who believes in God and lives well is damned. Hence it is evident that the Lord’s Church exists everywhere on earth, but specifically where He is confessed and the Word is read.” (*Ibid.* 244).

Swedenborg prescribed no form of Church government, discipline, or ritual; not designing, it would appear, that any body of Christians receiving his peculiar views, should be formed into a distinct organization or separate sect. Having himself lived and died in the Lutheran communion, he left his followers free to adhere to the communion of the churches in which they were severally reared, or to abandon them for others, as they might see fit.

## CHAPTER XXXII.

THE AMERICAN EPISCOPATE — WILLIAM WHITE — SCHEME FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH — THE DIVINE RIGHT OF EPISCOPACY — MODERATE VIEWS — THE QUESTION OF LAY ELDERSHIP IN THE AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH — DR. J. P. WILSON — DR. MILLER — DR. BRECKINRIDGE — THE QUESTION IN THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND — DR. COLIN CAMPBELL — LAY ELDERSHIP UNTENABLE — DR. GEO. CAMPBELL OF ABERDEEN — LECTURES ON ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY — BISHOP SKINNER — DEFENCE OF EPISCOPACY.

IN the prolonged dispute on the question of an American Episcopate, as agitated in the Colonies, before the separation from the mother country, "There were two periods," writes Bishop White, "especially productive of pamphlets and newspaper essays. The first was about the time of the civil controversy which arose on the occasion of the Stamp Act." Prominent among the names of those engaged in this dispute, we find that of Dr. MAYHEW, of Boston, on the one side, and that of Archbishop SECKER, on the other. The second period was a few years before the Revolutionary War, when the Rev. Dr. Chandler, of New Jersey, put forth an appeal to the public in favor of an American Episcopate; a publication which called forth numerous replies and defences. So strong, however, at this time, was the prevailing feeling against the measure, that but few laymen in the Episcopal communion could be found to favor it. The ground of this opposition seems to have been the apprehension that American Episcopacy would have been made subservient to the oppressive rule of the mother country. And while "in the Eastern States the distinctive features of Church discipline and order were passionately valued; in the South the great majority were not unwilling to give them up entirely. Separation between the two 'sections' seemed in-

American  
Episcopate.

evitable, and in the latter the very existence of Episcopacy was in peril."

At this perilous juncture a man appeared who was remarkably endowed with "those gifts of judgment and temper which were needful for the crisis; and hence the name of WILLIAM

William  
White.

WHITE will ever be recorded by the grateful remembrance of the Western Church. Mild in manners, meek in spirit, and large in toleration of the

views of others, he was yet firm and decided in his own." Having espoused from conviction the cause of colonial independence, he was in a position, when that cause triumphed, to abate the jealousy with which the communion to which he belonged was popularly regarded. "Men would hear from him what they would not from another; and this advantage he was not slow to employ for the general good. His views

Scheme of  
organization.

were early turned to gathering the various flocks which were scattered through the States, into one visible communion. Early in August, 1782, despairing of the speedy recognition of American independence, and 'perceiving our ministry gradually approaching to annihilation,' while England was as unwilling to give as America to receive the episcopate from her, he proposed a scheme for uniting the different parishes in convention, and on behalf of their whole body, committing to its president and others the powers of ordination and discipline." \*

This scheme is fully developed in a publication entitled, "The Case of the Episcopal Churches Considered," [No. 517,]

and contains the following provisions: "That individual churches should be associated in small districts, in each of which there should be a convention composed of representatives elected from the vestry or congregation of the several churches within it, the minister being one; that they should choose a permanent president, who, with other clergymen, appointed by the body, might exercise powers purely spiritual; in particular, those of ordination and discipline, over the clergy, according to reasonable laws; that

1782.

\* Wilberforce, Hist. American Church, c. vi.

the United States should be divided into three larger districts, in each of which there should be an annual assembly, consisting of members sent from the smaller districts within it, equally composed of clergy and laity, and voted for by those orders promiscuously, the presiding clergyman being always one; and that there should be a body representing the whole Church, consisting of members from each of the larger districts, of clergy and laity equally, and among the clergy equally of presiding ministers and others, to meet stately once in three years; these representative bodies making such regulations, and receiving appeals in such matters only as should be judged necessary for their continuing one communion.

“The churches were to retain the episcopate; but as the succession could not at present be obtained, there was to ‘be included in the proposed frame of government a general approbation of Episcopacy, and a declaration of an intention to procure the succession as soon as conveniently may be; but in the mean time, to carry the plan into effect without waiting for the succession;’ and when ‘the episcopal succession should be afterwards obtained, any supposed imperfections of the intermediate ordinations might, if it were judged proper, be supplied, without acknowledging their nullity, by a conditional form of ordination, resembling that of conditional baptism in the Liturgy; an expedient proposed by Archbishop Tillotson, Bishops Patrick, Stillingfleet, and others, at the Revolution, and actually practised in Ireland by Archbishop Bramhall.’”

The views of Dr. White,\* as expressed in this pamphlet — views to which he consistently adhered to the last, in opposition to some of his most respected brethren in the episcopate, particularly Bishop Hobart — have not unfrequently been misunderstood and misrepresented, as if the author had surrendered the claim of Episcopacy to apostolical institution, and the general obligation of retaining it. A temporary departure from the primitive usage, on the ground of an

\* Wilson's Life of Bishop White.

evident necessity, was the extent of the relaxation recommended in this publication.

In a volume of Lectures, [No. 549,] published in 1813, the matured opinions of Bishop WHITE, on questions of Church order, are expressed at large, and with no deviation from his earlier statements. Thus, in Lecture VII. — *Of the Ministry* —

On the divine right. after expressing his full conviction of the apostolic institution of Episcopacy, as a fact, the lecturer proceeds to answer the question, whether the fact of apostolic institution involves the principle of “divine institution,” meaning, by that expression, as he himself explains, such a divine appointment as renders an observance “obligatory, like the sacraments, at all times, and under all circumstances of the Church.”

The answer is noteworthy, alike in view of its subject-matter, and of the characteristic manner in which it is expressed: “If the moving of this question had originated in the mere rage for innovation, it would be hardly worth the resolving, at the expense of the danger of disparaging an institution made venerable by apostolic origin, and by the uninterrupted usage of fifteen centuries. But it happened at the Reformation, that in some countries, Christians were so circumstanced, as that they had no alternative between dispensing with this particular regimen and the continuing in the bosom of a Church extremely corrupt in doctrine; and under this embarrassment many ecclesiastical systems of discipline were established without the requisition of episcopal ordination. It should be remembered that I am engaged in opening and defending the sense of the Episcopal Church, as received from the Church of England. At the same time, that, on the point of fact, she decidedly set her feet on the ground of the apostolic origin of Episcopacy, she carefully avoided passing a judgment on the validity of the ministry of other churches; or the determining, in any shape, on the question the last proposed. This line of conduct on the part of the Church has left room for considerable variety of sentiment among her clergy. For my own part, I profess to admire the moderation

of the Church of England, transmitted to the Church in these States, in this particular. And I am content to adopt the words of one of the wisest men who ever wrote in the Church of England, where, speaking of non-episcopal churches, he delivers himself as follows: 'This, their defect and imperfection, I had rather lament in such a case, than exagitate; considering that men, oftentimes, without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regimen which is best; and to content themselves with that which either the irremediable error of former times, or the necessity of the present hath cast upon them.'

And in Dissertation X., the most elaborate in the volume, entitled *Of Episcopacy*, the question is stated in another form: "Whether episcopacy be obligatory on Christians, in all times and places; so that on this is dependent the being of a Christian Church?" The answer here given is, that it is a duty to adhere to apostolic appointments, when perceived to be such, "as closely as possible; at least with no other exception than cases of imperious necessity; the effects of this to continue no longer than the crisis which gave occasion to them." Speaking of "the very moderate ground taken at the time of the Reformation, by the Church of England, in the present matter," the bishop continues: "Certain it is, that she did not, in any of her institutions, say any thing decisive on the question now contemplated. Not only so, many of her public proceedings show her care to avoid it; of which only the following instance shall be given. When the episcopacy was conveyed by that Church to the Church of Scotland, in the reign of James I., it was pressed by some, that the ministers sent for consecration should previously be ordained deacons and priests: their ministerial character being in virtue of ordination not episcopal. But Archbishop Bancroft—the very prelate accused by the Puritans of that day of carrying the episcopal claims higher than had been done by his predecessors—overruled the objection; 'lest the calling and character of the ministry in most of the Reformed Churches might be questioned.'

Moderate  
views.

Perhaps there is no work which, from the circumstances connected with it, has so good pretensions to be considered as evidence of the opinions of the leading churchmen of the period as Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Of the five books then published, the third is devoted to the proof of what includes the negative of the present question. The same sentiment seems to have prevailed universally from the Reformation until after the time of Hooker. At least, if there be opposing authorities, they have not come to the knowledge of the present writer." (Pp. 424, *sq.*)

That the requirement of re-ordination in the case of ministers not episcopally ordained, seeking admission to the ministry in the Episcopal Church, is inconsistent with this moderate position, as many affirm, Bishop White emphatically denies: "There is no inconsistency." This Church does "not judge of the sufficiency of peculiar circumstances in regard to others. But she perceives no such circumstances in the relations in which she stands. For her therefore to dispense with the difference of grade in the ministerial character, when she believes that she discovers clear evidence of it in the appointments of the apostles, would be conduct which she could not defend, on any principle of consistency."

The only question of discipline productive of any warmth of discussion in the American churches of "the great Presbyterian family," is the yet unsettled question respecting the true character, position, and duties of the ruling eldership. Early in the present century, Dr. James P. Wilson, a Presbyterian minister of high standing, published a series of essays, [No. 589,] assailing with much vigor of reasoning and a rough energy of expression suited to the strength of the writer's convictions, the accepted view of the Lay Eldership in the Presbyterian Church. A singularly crabbed style and uninviting method have prevented these papers from receiving the attention or exerting the influence to which their sterling merit justly entitles them. The aim of the author is to demonstrate "the illiteracy," as he terms

Question  
of Lay  
Eldership.

Dr. J. P.  
Wilson.

it, "of making mute presbyters a characteristic of the primitive Church." "Of presbyters without authority to preach, neither a word nor an example is found from the demise of the last apostle, unto the reformation in Switzerland; they neither existed in the original form of government, nor in the secondary, which was parochial episcopacy; nor in that which absorbed the rest, the diocesan, which became, so far as we yet know, literally Catholic. That Calvin did afterwards attempt to justify the reception of lay presbyters from the authority of the Scriptures, his writings evince. It is perfectly clear, nevertheless, that it (*sic*) was adopted at first by him as an expedient for reducing the Church at Geneva to a state of discipline which should secure the reformation at that place. The introduction of laymen originated, not from a previous design to introduce an inferior kind of presbyters, but from the exigencies of their condition. Having dropped the office of deacon into practical oblivion, the next effort appears to have been to justify what they had done; and as this task naturally devolved upon the inventor, so no man was better qualified to essay its accomplishment than Calvin." (Pp. 236-244.)

This work was probably called forth by the publication, in 1831, of a volume on the Ruling Eldership, by Dr. SAMUEL MILLER, of Princeton, N. J. This work, the expansion of a sermon published twenty years previously, is a labored defence of the theory of Calvin, adopting all his arguments and indorsing all his conclusions. On one point his remarks are deserving of special attention: "That ruling elders, besides being regularly *chosen* to office, should be *ordained*; that is, publicly and solemnly designated and introduced to office by appropriate formalities, our ecclesiastical constitution requires, and prescribes a form for the purpose, concerning which I shall only say, that as far as it goes, it is well devised, etc. I say, *as far as it goes*; for it has been for many years my settled conviction, that the Ordination Service in question, in not making the *im-*

Dr. Miller  
on the  
Eldership.

1831.

Ordination  
of Ruling  
Elders.

*position of hands* a stated constituent part of it, is chargeable with an omission, which, though not *essential*, and therefore not a matter for which it is proper to interrupt the peace of the Church; yet appears to me incapable of a satisfactory defence; and which it is my earnest hope may not much longer continue to be, as I know it is with many, matter of serious lamentation." (P. 278.)

Just ten years after the republication in a posthumous volume, [No. 589,] of Dr. Wilson's damaging assault, ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, whose fame as the champion of Presbyterian

Dr. R. J. Breckinridge. orthodoxy is in all the churches, came forth as the advocate of the restoration, as he claimed, of the Ruling Eldership to its primitive position. In

a publication embracing the substance of two arguments delivered before the Synod of Philadelphia, in 1843, [No. 716,] the author pleads, with characteristic vigor, for the right of the ruling eldership to unite with the preaching eldership in the laying on of hands in the rite of ordination. The General

Decision of General Assembly. Assembly of 1842 decided by a unanimous vote that it was not within the intent of the Church's constitutional rule upon the subject, that ruling elders should join in the imposition of hands in ordination. This decision having been reconsidered, and the question referred for final settlement to the next assembly, which met in 1843, that body, after a full consideration of the subject, decided, by a vote of 138 to 9, that the constitution of the Presbyterian Church does not authorize ruling elders to impose hands in the ordination of ministers.

"It is truly mortifying," says the Princeton Reviewer, "that the Presbyterian Church, at this period of her history, should be employed in the juvenile task of laying again the foundation of the doctrine of the laying on of hands." But so, unhappily, it is: the question of the true character, position, offices, and duties of the ruling elder is still the subject of debate in the Presbyterian communion.

"Dr. B.'s view, as set forth in this publication, and in his work, *The Knowledge of God Subjectively Considered* (pp. 628,

sq.)— a view espoused by a very small minority in the Presbyterian family—is, that “in the body of the Christian elders, from their first existence, all, without exception, were rulers. But a new function, that of preaching, unknown to the elders of the synagogue, manifested itself among these elders; and thereupon, the apostles divided the whole body of elders into two classes, one of which should perform the preaching function, in addition to all other functions, and the other should unite with them, as before, in the performance of all other functions of the elders’ office, including, of course, the laying on of hands in the rite of ordination.”

This theory of the eldership, it is obvious to remark, involves the proper ministerial, or *clerical* character of the ruling elder. “Lay eldership,” so called, it is thus plain, is not so much a misnomer as a contradiction in terms.

In the Church of Scotland the same question has, of late years, awakened a fresh interest, and is even now undergoing a renewed investigation. A treatise from the vigorous pen of Dr. Colin Campbell, principal of the University of Aberdeen, published at Edinburgh, in 1866, [No. 793 a,] contains a searching examination of the received theory, exposing, with admirable candor, the inconclusiveness of the arguments alleged in its support.

The question  
in Scotland.

The writer calls attention to the significant fact, that Calvin originally based the institution of lay rulers, not on the text afterward alleged for a lay eldership (1 *Tim.* v. 17)—the *sole* basis of the theory—but on others which make no mention of elders, but specify the office of *government*, as, e. g., Rom. xiii. 8. (*Inst.* iv. iii. 8. 1543. The *Commentary on the Epistles to Timothy* appeared in 1556. Yet, in a later chapter of the *Institutes*, (xi. 1,) lay rulers are classified with presbyters.) “While Calvin avowedly derived from the Bohemian Church the institution of lay assessors, that church, in turn, received from him the theory and interpretation of 1 *Tim.* v. 17, by which he had attempted to underprop it.”

Dr. Colin  
Campbell.

The untenableness of the theory which classes lay rulers

with presbyters, our author conclusively evinces on the following grounds: 1. There is no support in Scripture for the difference among presbyters, which this theory implies. 2. The equality, *inter se*, of all presbyters, and the interchangeableness of the term *presbyter* with that of *bishop* — a main point with Presbyterians in argument with prelatists. Hence, “lay rulers, if presbyters, must also be bishops; and if bishops, then, also, *pastors*.” . . . “Strange,” indeed, that a Presbyterian divine should find himself, as Dr. Campbell confesses, “under the necessity of maintaining against Presbyterians the equality of the New Testament bishop and presbyter!” 3. The single text alleged, truly interpreted, affords the theory no support, having no bearing on the office in question. 4. Were the theory honestly followed out, and the precept in 1 Tim. v. 17 obeyed, the ruling elders ought to be stipendiaries of the Church, as uniformly, if not so liberally maintained by it, as the ministers of the word and sacraments. The administration of the Church would then be entirely in the hands of a professional class, and the benefits of the lay element lost. (Pp. 3, 30, 65.)

This view of the question is only a return to the position maintained by the Scottish Church, as early as 1645, in its adoption, through the General Assembly, of the Westminster conclusions of the year preceding. It has, moreover, received the support of some of the most eminent theological writers of Scotland, during the last two centuries. Suffice it to name Jameson, Geo. Campbell of Aberdeen, and Hill of St. Andrews.

The controversy concerning Episcopacy was re-opened in Scotland, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, by the publication of Dr. CAMPBELL'S *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*. [No. 525.] Though a professed Presbyterian, the author, in this work, occupies the position of the *Independents*, surrendering, in their favor, the ground common to Presbyterians and Episcopalians, as to the scriptural application of the word Church. He affirms that “it denotes either *a single congregation of Christians*, actually assembled, or accustomed to assemble together in one place, or *the*

Lay Eldership  
untenable.

1800.

*whole Christian community*, the Church universal. Of the application of the word in any intermediate sense between these two, not one instance can be produced from Scripture." (*Lect.* vi., p. 117.)

In regard to the force of *apostolic precedent* in matters of order, Campbell teaches that, even when clearly proved in favor of one particular form of Church polity, the practice of the apostles is not sufficient to establish a *jus divinum*; and that a proved departure from such practice does not affect the inherent lawfulness of any system of Church polity. "Not but that a presumptuous encroachment on what is evidently so instituted, is justly reprehensible in those who are properly chargeable with it, as is, indeed, any violation of order; . . . but the reprehension can affect those only who *are conscious of the guilt*: for the fault of another will never frustrate to me the divine promise, given by the Messiah to all indiscriminately, without any limitation, that he who receiveth his testimony hath everlasting life." (*Lect.* iv.)

A clever review of Campbell's work appeared in 1803, from the pen of Bishop SKINNER, entitled *Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated from Modern Misrepresentation*, [No. 530,] in which it is shown — *First*, That the *Lectures*, though extravagantly lauded, on their first appearance, as "an accurate historical deduction of the progress of Church power," and as presenting the argument against Episcopacy in its most convincing form, yet contain nothing that had not been often and better said before by the more distinguished defenders of Presbytery. *Second*, That the lecturer, in advocating a scheme of Church order as different from that established in Scotland, as it is opposed to the primitive model, is justly chargeable with infidelity to his trust, as a divinity professor in a Presbyterian institution, "holding some of the most distinguished offices which the religious establishment of Scotland has to boast of." *Third*, That the lecturer's attempt to find support for the congregational theory in the *Letters* of Cyprian, marked, as it is, by a singular absence of quotation or reference, in proof or illustration, discredits his reputation for ingenuously-

ness. *Fourth*, That in his denunciation of "the polity and discipline" of the Church of England, as a "system devised for the express purpose of rendering the clerical character odious, and the discipline contemptible," the lecturer betrays either inexcusable ignorance, or a culpable disregard of truth. *Fifth*, That as a labored attempt on the part of a *Presbyterian* (?) professor to convince his Presbyterian pupils of the superiority of the *congregational* polity, the *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History* have no claim to the attention of Episcopalians.

## CHAPTER XXXIII.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES — DISTINCTIVE PRINCIPLES OF ANGLO-CATHOLICISM — APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION — IN CONNECTION WITH THE SACRAMENTS — BROAD CHURCH VIEW OF THE THEORY — WHATELY'S KINGDOM OF CHRIST — BUEL'S REPLY — ISAAC TAYLOR — "SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM" — TESTIMONY TO EPISCOPACY — BISHOP O'BRIEN'S CHARGE — ARCHER BUTLER'S SERMON — NECESSITY OF LIMITATION — PRINCIPLE OF ACCOMMODATION.

A FRESH interest was imparted to the discussion of questions of Church order, by the publication of TRACTS FOR THE TIMES, by *Members of the University of Oxford*. [Nos. 619-37.] The object of these publications, as avowed by their authors, was, "to aid the rulers of the Church to meet the difficulties with which they had to contend, by stirring up her ministers to remember and assert *the power which had been bestowed upon them at their ordination*, and by giving her lay members better information concerning her constitution and principles; by imparting to them clearer views of the foundation of her claims to authority, and making them better understand the privileges which they enjoy in her communion." The importance of such an object was indisputable; the only question was as to the principles on which, and the mode in which it was to be best attained.

The distinctive principles of modern Anglo-Catholicism, as put forth in the *Tracts*, are the following: "1. The doctrine of *apostolic succession*, as set forth in our ordinal. 2. Baptismal regeneration, as set forth in our catechism and our baptismal service. 3. The Eucharistic sacrifice, and the real communion in the body and blood of our Lord, as set forth in our communion office. 4. The appeal to the Church from the

Tracts for the  
Times.

1833.

Distinctive  
principles of  
Anglo-Cath-  
olicism.

beginning, as the depositary and witness of the truth, as set forth in our canon of 1571." (PERCEVAL: *A Collection of Papers*, etc.) [No. 644.] These four points are held by the tractators as the essential principles of their system, "having their warrant in holy writ, and having been taught authoritatively by all branches of the Catholic Church, in all ages."

The doctrine of *apostolic succession*, as set forth in the Tracts, embraces the following propositions: A commission to discharge the offices of a spiritual priesthood was first given by Christ to his apostles, and was by them conveyed to those who followed them in the same office, in an unbroken line of succession, from the first commissioned to the bishops now living. This commission has been conveyed by the laying on of the hands of the apostles, and their successors; and the successors of the apostles now are the chief pastors in every place, who have received the apostolic commission. All apostolic churches are episcopal, but all episcopal churches are not apostolic; since the chief pastors in some Christian bodies are called bishops, who have not received the apostolic commission. All so-called churches that are without the apostolic succession, are not members of the Church Catholic.\* The apostolic commission "*empowers its possessors* — 1. To admit into or exclude from . . . the kingdom of heaven any one whom they judge deserving of it. 2. To bless and intercede for those who are within this kingdom, in a sense in which no other men can bless or intercede. 3. To make the Eucharistic bread and wine the body and blood of Christ, in the sense in which our Lord made them so. 4. To enable delegates to perform this great miracle, by ordaining them with imposition of hands." †

The Anglo-Catholic doctrine of apostolical succession in its connection with that of the sacraments is stated thus: "A person not commissioned from the bishop may use the words of baptism, and sprinkle or bathe with the water; but there is no

\* Churchman's Manual. Tract No. 1.

† Froude's Remains, p. 41.

promise from Christ that such a man shall admit souls to *the kingdom of heaven*. A person not commissioned may break bread and pour out wine, but it can afford no comfort to any to receive it at his hands; because there is no warrant from Christ to lead communicants to suppose, that while he does so here *on earth*, they will be partakers in the Saviour's *heavenly* body and blood." (*Tract* No. xxxv.)

And again: "And this is a matter pertaining to each man's salvation. For that bread and cup are the appointed means whereby the faithful are to partake of Christ's body and blood offered for their sins. . . . In the judgment of the Church it makes no less difference than this: Whether the bread and cup which he partakes of shall be to him Christ's body and blood, or no. I repeat it: in the judgment of the Church, the Eucharist, administered without apostolical commission, may, to pious minds, be a very edifying ceremony; but it is not that blessed thing which our Saviour graciously meant it to be; it is not 'verily and indeed taking and receiving' the body and blood of Him, our Incarnate Lord." (*Tract* No. lii.)

"The doctrine of the apostolic succession as a rule of practice," is stated by Froude in these terms:

"1. The participation of the body and blood of Christ is essential to the maintenance of Christian life and hope in each individual. 2. It is conveyed to individual Christians *only* by the hands of the successors of the apostles and their delegates. 3. The successors of the apostles are those who are descended in a direct line from them by the imposition of hands; and the delegates of these are the respective presbyters whom each has commissioned." (*Letter to Perceval*.)

In reference to this article of the Anglo-Catholic scheme, the remarks of Bishop Thirlwall, as presenting the view of a well-known school of modern Anglicans, are worthy of attention: "It is hardly disputed that what is called the high doctrine of the apostolic succession, including, that is, not only the historical fact that the ministry of our Church is derived by uninterrupted descent from the apostles, but likewise that it was

Broad Church  
view of the  
theory.

established by them as a permanent and unalterable institution, to be continued according to certain invariable regulations — it is hardly disputed that this doctrine has been held by so large a part of our best divines, and has received so much apparent countenance from the anxiety shown to preserve succession, when it was in danger of interruption, that it would be unreasonable to complain of it as a novelty, or even to represent it as being now exclusively held by a particular school.

“‘Men may hold episcopacy to be divine, and the episcopacy of apostolical succession to be the only true episcopacy, but yet they may utterly reject the notion of its being essential to the efficacy of the sacraments.’ And the opinion of such a connection between the two doctrines has been condemned both as groundless and pernicious. But there is a sense in which the connection between them would be neither so arbitrary, nor pregnant with such dangerous consequences. If any one believes that the ministerial commission may be traced through the apostles to the Head of the Church, and that it was originally designed to comprehend the administration of the sacraments, then he will be naturally led to consider the character of the minister as a part of the ordinance; and it will follow that he cannot look upon it as altogether immaterial whether this part be absent or not: he will not venture to say that the ordinance would be, to all intents and purposes, the same without it; and this he might express by saying that the apostolical succession is requisite for the *due application of it*. But it would not follow that he undertakes to pronounce how far it is an essential part, or to what degree its absence affects the efficacy of the rite, or that there are many circumstances in which it may be safely omitted, and in which its place will be surely and effectually supplied.

“In a word, there appears to be nothing in the doctrine itself that is exclusive or uncharitable beyond what is implied in a strong preference of one communion over another. Its character will depend on the temper in which it is embraced; and since those who maintain it most firmly, still declare their

belief that 'God's favor is not limited to the bounds of his heritage, but that, in the Church or out of the Church, every one that calleth on the name of the Lord, with a pure and perfect heart, shall be saved,' we would hope that its influence may, in most cases, be found consistent both with charity and humility." (*Charge*, 1842.)

This may be taken as a fair expression of the attitude toward the High-Anglican theory of a school of churchmanship in the Anglican communion variously denominated the Liberal, the Broad, or the Latitudinarian; a school claiming to be distinguished by its practical assertion of unfettered intellectual freedom in the discussion of theological questions — a freedom not unguarded, however, it is affirmed, by reverence for the Church's dogmatic definitions.

Among the numerous and able contemporaneous protests against the extreme views of Church order advocated by the writers of the Oxford Tracts, not the least worthy of mention is a volume put forth by Archbishop WHATELY, under the title of *The Kingdom of Christ*, etc., [No. 661,] treating mainly of the constitution, powers, and ministry of the Church as appointed by Christ Himself.

Whately's  
Kingdom of  
Christ.  
1841.

While claiming our admiration for its clearness of statement and cogency of argument in support of some important Scripture truths, as against the assaults of the Romanizing faction in the Church of England, this treatise is yet open to the charge of contemplating the Church too exclusively from the mere human point of view, a radical defect which goes far to neutralize its influence as a corrective of the errors against which it is specifically aimed. "Holding that no form of Church government is of divine appointment, surrendering almost all the Episcopalian positions, and adopting many of the Presbyterian, the author seeks to prove that all the powers and privileges of the Church may be traced up to the powers and privileges inherent in a mere human and voluntary society."

A vigorously written reply to Dr. Whately's work appeared in 1844, from the pen of an American clergyman, under the

title of *The Apostolical System of the Church Defended*. An uncompromising advocate of the High Church theory, the author, Rev. SAMUEL BUEL, expresses his conviction that the influence at once seductive and pernicious which he does not hesitate to ascribe to the work which he reviews, is to be traced, not to the intrinsic force of its arguments, or the truth of its conclusions, "but to its confident air, its plausible sophisms, its misrepresentation of the views which it opposes, and especially to its agreeableness to the taste of *the religious world*, and its recognition and defence of the position of various denominations of professing Christians." [No. 684.]

Buel's  
Reply.

More efficient as a counteractive to the anti-Reformation tendencies of religious thought in the early days of the Tractarian movement, was a work antedating that of Whately by several years, entitled *Spiritual Despotism*, by ISAAC TAYLOR, [No. 593,] a publication hailed on its first appearance by Sir JAMES STEPHEN, the most discriminating critic of his day, "as the most original, comprehensive, and profound contribution which any living writer in our country has made to the science of ecclesiastical polity." (*Essays*, p. 81).

Isaac  
Taylor.

1835.

The main purpose of this volume is to point out the untenableness of certain prevailing opinions in reference, *first*, to the alliance between Church and State; *secondly*, to the maintenance of the clergy through the medium of a legal provision; and *thirdly*, to *episcopacy*, which, the author holds, is sanctioned by apostolic practice, approved by the common sense of mankind in parallel instances, and at once demanded, and insensibly introduced by, the spread of Christianity.

Spiritual  
Despotism.

"The Scripture evidence alone, and unaided by learned research, can never be so presented," says our author, "to the mass of Christians as to command their assent to this or that system, as apostolic and unchangeable." . . . "Those who read Church history purely as HISTORY, will not hesitate to conclude that nine out of ten of the churches of the first century

were episcopal; or that nineteen out of twenty of those of the second century, and almost all of the third, acknowledged this form of government. The ORTHODOXY of the great mass of Christians in those ages, and their EPISCOPACY, are two prominent facts that meet us, directly or implicitly, on almost every page of the extant remains of those times. The same method of quotation, and the same misrepresentation of evidence which enable the ingenious author of the *History of Early Opinions* to throw a shade over the first of these important facts, may enable an opponent of Episcopacy to put us in doubt concerning the second. But no method sanctioned by truth and honesty will do it.

“This system of polity proves itself to be the spontaneous form of external Christianity, whenever the natural course of things (during a prosperous condition of the Church) is not interfered with by special opinions or prejudices.

“Christianity, fully brought to bear upon human nature, and allowed to draw into its service all gifts and talents, natural and divine, will spontaneously tend to the episcopal model. . . The Church needs services to be performed, not of one kind, but of many; and nature actually provides persons adapted to that diversity of service. Among fifty or a hundred clerical persons, some will be found whose bold and ardent zeal calls them into the field of labor and danger in carrying the gospel upon new ground; some, whose tastes for intellectual pursuits, and whose faculty of acquisition mark them for the closet, or for the chair of catechetical instruction; some, whose powers of utterance and flow of soul challenge them for the pulpit; some, whose gentleness of spirit, and whose placid skill fit them for the difficult task of the personal cure of souls; some, whose philanthropy and self-denying love forbid them to be happy anywhere but among the poor and wretched; and some, moreover, although it be a few, whose calmness of judgment and temper, whose comprehensiveness of understanding, whose paternal sentiments and personal dignity, declare them, without mistake, to be destined to the throne of government.

We may decry Episcopacy, but the Lord sends us bishops, whether or not we will avail ourselves of the boon." (*Sect. iv.*)

These deliberate conclusions of a layman who had been trained in Non-conformist notions and modes of worship, and, after mature investigation of the points of difference between the English Dissenters and the Established Church, passed over to the communion of the latter, constitute a testimony in behalf of the episcopal scheme of polity, which no candid mind can disregard.

Testimony to  
Episcopacy.

Among the more valuable contributions to the discussion called forth by the Oxford movement, there are two deserving of special mention, as the productions of representative divines of the Church of Ireland. The first is a Charge delivered to his clergy by Bishop O'BRIEN, of the united dioceses of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, [No. 667 ;] the second, a sermon, entitled "Primitive Church Principles not Inconsistent with Universal Christian Sympathy," by WILLIAM ARCHER BUTLER, late professor in the University of Dublin.

1842.

Dr. O'Brien's Charge contains a clear and comprehensive account of the Oxford movement from its inception, and a concise exposition of the whole Anglo-Catholic scheme. "ALL OUR GREAT DIVINES," says Bishop O'Brien, "who maintain the reality and the advantages of a succession, 'from the apostles' time,' of episcopally consecrated bishops, and episcopally ordained ministers in the Church, and who rejoice in the possession of it by our own Church, as a signal blessing and privilege, *not only did not maintain that this is absolutely essential to the being of the Church, but are at pains to make it clear that they do not hold that it is.*"

Bishop  
O'Brien's  
Charge.

Professor Butler's sermon may be taken as a candid exposition of the views of the moderate, or, as they choose to be styled, 'conservative' school of Anglican divines, who claim to occupy the safe midway position between High Anglicanism, on the one hand, and Low-Church Evangelicalism, on the other.

Prof. Butler's  
Sermon.

“The spirituality of our religion,” writes Prof. Butler, “is marshalled, by one hostile division in the Church, against its authorized polity — the polity asserted, by another, in a form that too often obscures or overlooks the spirituality. It may be well to try if we cannot, with St. Paul, rejoice to see and to welcome both. . . . By *one* party it is openly professed that the polity of the Church and ministry of Christ is entirely a matter of temporary, occasional, variable expediency; that all bodies and all individuals who believe in the name of Jesus are equally contemplated in His original charter and equally realize His original design. By the *other* it is usually maintained with as resolute a conviction, that the one constitution of the Church and her ministry, being in every element essentially divine, forms the sole exclusive machinery of human salvation; that to it alone the sanctifying graces of the gospel are promised; and that there exists no ground in the New Testament for anticipating that they can ever travel out of the channel it affords for their transmission. The eager advocates of each of these views are so possessed with the absolute truth of the main principles for which they struggle, as to overlook the enormous difficulties that challenge them when they descend to the simple *facts* of the case; when the bold theory of the latitudinarian is met, not only by the internal improbability of his supposition, but by the clear evidence of Scripture and apostolic antiquity; when the rigorous scheme of his opponent is encountered by the overwhelming evidence of daily experience, establishing by the most decisive attestations, by proofs which, if we reject, we must reject all human reasoning on religion, that the purifying and saving graces of the gospel are not limited, as he would affirm, but extend through almost every community in which the leading doctrines of the faith of Christ are preached.

“When views thus contradictory and thus extreme are put forth; when it is certain they cannot both be strictly true; when both may be made in their degree plausible — and yet facts exist that seem inconsistent with either — the most valuable service that can be rendered to the public mind is the

work of *limitation*; the attempt to show under what qualifications, principles true in themselves, ought to be accepted, so as to make them consistent with others of equal certainty. . . . Just and strict views, then, of the original polity of the Church of Christ, and of our obligation to preserve and transmit that polity, are *theoretically* consistent with a full recognition of the fact of great and genuine piety existing in irregular and less happily constructed communities; of the consequent possibility and propriety of our *practically* sympathizing with many of their projects of benevolence, and of our cherishing a Christian and charitable affection for their godly members. This principle, that a strong obligation to a particular polity may coexist with a general law of divine benevolence, might be exemplified largely. . . .

“Another view of this question which leads to the same result is that derived from what may be called the principle of *accommodation*. By this I mean the principle observable in God’s merciful dispensations, of suiting Himself to the infirmities and errors of His creatures, by occasional variations of His stated laws without any repeal of those laws themselves. All mercy is an accommodation of this kind. Is it, then, unlikely (a) that God should appoint a special organization of the means of grace in His Church? (b) *that when that organization has been more or less impaired*, He should condescend to continue His gifts in a manner accommodated to the alteration? Nay, it is supposable that the whole body of (irregular) systems, though human and unauthorized, may be found to form *designed members* in a vast scheme of divine moral government of *which the Church itself is as yet but a part, though the noblest part*. . . . In order to save the pious Dissenter we are not forced to make his irregular society an integral portion of the mystical body of Christ. The mercy of God secures his salvation, when he is saved, on deeper grounds than this” — the ground of “the mystical membership with Christ” — a grace which “all other graces presuppose.” (*Serm. xxiv.*)

Necessity of  
limitation.

Principle of  
accommo-  
dation.

## CHAPTER XXXIV.

CHURCH QUESTIONS IN GERMANY—MÖHLER'S "UNITY IN THE CHURCH"—  
ANALYSIS OF THE WORK—ROTHE'S ANFÄNGE, ETC.—A PROTESTANT  
COUNTERPART—HIS THEORY OF THE CHURCH—BASED ON THE HEGELIAN  
PRINCIPLE—THEORY OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EPISCOPATE—STAHL'S THEORY  
OF THE CHURCH—THE NEO-LUTHERAN AND THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC FUNDA-  
MENTALLY ONE—SCHLEIERMACHER'S THEORY—MORE RECENT VIEWS—  
SCHENKEL'S EXPOSITION OF THE PROTESTANT VIEW—CONCLUSION.

IN Germany a fresh interest in the discussion of questions relating to the Church seems to have been awakened by the publication of MÖHLER'S *Einheit in der Kirche*, [No. 813;] a work of which Rothe writes: "I never return to it without joyous admiration of its natively powerful, fresh, and in the main, true as well as deep comprehension of the innermost self-consciousness of the primitive Church." (*Anfänge*, ix.)

Church  
Questions in  
Germany.  
1825.

Of a work so little known and which is not likely to be translated, a brief analysis may not here be out of place. The work is divided into two parts; the first treating of *The Unity of the SPIRIT*, the second, of *The Unity of the BODY*—the CHURCH. The former is subdivided into four chapters: I. Of *Mystical Unity*—the Unity of the Holy Ghost, the communication of which is conditioned by that individual reception of Christianity, on the part of the faithful, which unites all believers in one communion, through which, also, He communicates Himself to the yet non-believing, in which the divine life maintains and transmits itself, (inward tradition,) and thereby produces in us the love through which Christ is communicated, of which we become conscious only in the communion of the faithful.

Möhlér's  
Einheit in der  
Kirche.

II. Of *sensible* (verständige) Unity. Under this head are treated these topics: Doctrine, the intelligent expression of the

Christian spirit; the understanding of the written word conditioned through the Spirit; the diffusion of Christianity by means of the living Word, (external tradition;) the determination of the true doctrine by the inquiries of the whole body of believers; the inviolable oneness of Scripture — the embodied expression of the Holy Spirit in the beginning of Christianity, through the specially gifted apostles, and of tradition, which, extending through all times, at every moment living and active, yet at the same time embodying itself, in the expression of this Spirit, animating the collective body of believers.

III. Of *variety or multiplicity without unity*, as exemplified in the various heresies, of which freedom of inquiry is the fundamental principle.

IV. Of *unity in diversity, or multiplicity*: the preservation of individuality in the unity of the faithful, the unity of the revealed faith, which, under variety of form, all the faithful alike have, as the foundation of the true knowledge of God; in the Church the greatest variety in regard to Christian usages, manners, and customs; the true nature of controversies in the Church; freedom of worship. Such is a bare enumeration of the subjects discussed in the first division of the work.

The *second* part — of the Unity of the CHURCH — is occupied with the discussion of the topics following: I. Of THE BISHOP, in whose person, as the image of the love of the Church, corporate unity is summed up. (*b*) From the bishop ascent is made to *unity in metropolitans*. (*c*) Of synods. (*d*) From synods an ascent to the unity of the collective episcopate, (formal union of all Churches in their bishops;) so that to the inner spiritual unity the external fully corresponds — a result rendered attainable by means of the metropolitan bond.

And yet while the collective Church organization presents itself as the love of the faithful, manifesting itself in definite forms, it still falls short of the point of final development; viz., the manifestation of the unity of the episcopate, and of the faithful collectively, in ONE CHURCH AND ITS BISHOP, which is the living middle point of the living unity of the whole Church — THE ROMAN PRIMACY. The successive steps in the

development of this august hierarchal system, culminating in the papal monarchy, are traced in this work by the hand of a master.

As a Protestant counterpart to Möhler's *Einheit in der Kirche*, ROTHE'S *Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche*, [No. 817,] is deserving of special attention. This volume is well described by Dr. Schaff as "consisting, for the most part, of an exceedingly thorough and acute investigation of the origin and development of the episcopal constitution, and (what is closely connected with this) of the Catholic doctrine concerning the historical, visible Church, its unity, holiness, catholicity, apostolicity, and exclusiveness. It comes to the conclusion that the episcopate, *as a necessary substitute for the apostolate*, in maintaining and promoting unity, reaches back even to the days of St. John, and thus has the apostolic sanction, and that this idea of the Church arose in the first centuries by an inward necessity."

Rothe's  
Anfänge, etc.

Rothe's view of the Church is succinctly stated by *Schenkel*, thus: "The religious spirit is essential to morality, and morality answers to its idea only in so far as it is, at the same time, piety. In the true moral development, civil society, which is properly moral association, is in itself religious communion, that is, the Church. The Church is, emphatically, the communion of piety as such. It is, therefore, morally indispensable, that every man have a part in the Church; for only thus can his part in other associations have moral validity. It follows that when humanity becomes perfect, the Church vanishes; for then the sphere of the moral and that of the religious communion become one and the same. Hence the Church disappears in proportion as the State becomes perfect. This gradual solution of the Church in the State can take place only by the State's becoming essentially and truly a religious body, a kingdom of God, a theocracy in the highest sense. The Church remains indispensable as the communion of entire humanity, so long as particular States are not perfectly organized into one complete

national system, taking cognizance of all the moral interests of mankind.

“To quote Rothe’s own words: ‘As long as the single national State has not completed its development as a State, the extent of the ethical communion of the people is not yet completely embraced in their religious fellowship; that is, the political body (the State) does not include and swallow up the religious communions. In such a state of things, there must of course be a Church alongside of the State. But the Church, as a distinct body, must also recede and be dissolved just in proportion as the State approximates to the perfection of its development.’ ” (*Ethik*, ii., pp. 145, *sq.*)

“But in the present state of Christendom, and especially from the Protestant point of view, we may always see the indications that the *churchly* stage of the historical development of Christianity is past, and that the Christian mind has already entered on its moral, i. e., civil period. Christianity no longer has its essential form in the Church. Its inherent tendency is to transcend the Church; to make all secular affairs its sphere; to put on the living form which is, in itself, moral. Rothe considers the Reformation as the turning-point, where Christianity passed from the churchly stage into the political, or assumed its just position in relation to human society at large; and where it abolished the Church *as to its principle*. Hence Protestantism has produced nothing like a really independent Church, and no Church constitution worthy of the name. Rothe does not believe in the possibility of a better reconstruction of our Church institutions. The old Protestant Church is on the way to dissolution, and the new, which rises out of it, *must not be again a Church*. The Church thus acquiesces in her present declining grandeur, strives after release into a higher form of Christian fellowship, and translates the *churchly* piety into the piety of the *Christian consciousness*.” (*Anfänge*, i., pp. 42, *sqq.* *Ethik*, i. 418; ii. 145; iii. 1009, *sq.*)

Rothe’s theory assumes that the State is *the* moral communion; whereas it is, in point of fact, only *one particular form* of moral communion or association, viz., the communion of law.

It is not therefore its province to resolve into itself all possible forms of moral association, but rather to protect them by its legal authority. Rothe's conception of the Church is based on the Hegelian principle that the moral ideal is realized in the State, or that the State is, or should be, the realization of the whole moral idea; a position wholly untenable, for the moral idea requires various forms for its full manifestation, and the State is only one of them. The Church, as an ideal communion of all believers, is fundamentally different from the State, which, as a legal institution, must have external limits. The Church, in all her forms, universal and national, is designed to realize *piety*; the State, *as such*, is not. A moral, civil society is not a pious communion. Not that morality is, in itself, *essentially* different from piety; for the pious spirit produces the moral act. Piety is the productive factor, morality the result.

Based on  
the Hegelian  
principle.

"Rothe's theory, which is that of a perfect theocracy, cannot, it is evident, be applied in any earthly condition of the Church. His ideal State is the kingdom of God, as it will be only under the immediate, eternal reign of Christ, when the dualism between State and Church will wholly disappear." (*Hertzog*, vii., pp. 597-8.)

Rothe's theory of the origin of the Episcopate may be briefly stated: When Jerusalem was destroyed, with it was destroyed also the visible centre of the Church; and the need arose for a new organization to preserve the unity of the Christian body. This body had hitherto existed as the aggregate of distinct, independent congregations, having their bond of union simply in the profession of a common faith, not bound together in one whole by any permanent external organization. In other words, there was as yet no *Catholic Church*.

Origin of the  
Episcopate.

*This* conception of the Church is first apparent in the Epistles of Ignatius; and it arose in the period intermediate between the downfall of Jerusalem and the end of the first century. Its development is due to the apostles then surviving,

especially St. John, to whom is to be referred the chief agency in the organization of the new constitution.

The evidence of this united action on the part of the apostles consists of the following particulars: Eusebius relates that after the fall of Jerusalem, the surviving apostles and personal disciples of the Lord, with his kinsmen then living, met together, and after due deliberation, unanimously appointed Symeon the son of Clopas to be the successor of James. This second apostolic council, it may well be supposed, did not confine their action to the appointment of a single bishop, but embraced in their deliberations the affairs of the Church at large; and the establishment of the episcopate throughout the Church may well have engaged their attention.

Of this conjecture confirmation is found in a fragment of Irenæus, in which are these words: "They who have paid attention to *the second ordinances* of the apostles know that the Lord appointed a new offering in the new covenant." These "second ordinances" must mean some appointments of later date than those recorded in the New Testament; and these would naturally be framed and promulgated by such a council as Eusebius names.

To the same effect is the well-known statement of Clement of Rome, that the apostles, having appointed elders in every church, and foreseeing the disputes that would arise, "afterwards added a codicil, or supplementary direction, that if they (the apostles) should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their office, i. e., the apostolate." This is a distinct witness to the apostolic institution of the episcopate, as a continuation of the apostolate; while in the word "afterwards" is contained an allusion to the second apostolic council, to which the "second ordinances" of Irenæus also refer.

The conclusion which these notices seems to justify is this: "That after the fall of Jerusalem a council of the apostles and first teachers of the gospel was held to deliberate on the crisis, and to frame measures for the well-being of the Church. The centre of the system then organized was episcopacy, which at once secured the harmonious working of each individual con-

gregation, and, as a link of communication between separate brotherhoods, formed the whole into one undivided Catholic Church. Recommended by this high authority, the new constitution was immediately and generally adopted."

As a new defence of the episcopal scheme of polity put forth by a non-episcopalian, this theory is entitled to more consideration than it seems to have received at the hands of Episcopalians. "Its intrinsic value," as Dr. Lightfoot remarks, "seems to have been unduly depreciated; for, if it fails to give a satisfactory solution, it has at least the merit of stating the conditions of the problem with great distinctness, and of pointing out the direction to be followed." (*Philippians*, p. 202.)

In direct antagonism to Rothe's theory of the Church is that of another school in Germany, represented by Dr. STAHL, its ablest living advocate. (*Philos. des Rechts*, ii. 2, 408.) According to this theory, which is essentially a reaction toward mediævalism, the Church is not the collective whole of Christian societies, but *the objective institution*, in distinction from its members, which maintains the word of God, the sacraments, divine supremacy, divinely appointed offices, previous witnesses of the faith, the historical order of government, etc. The Church, as an institution, stands *above* the collective congregations or aggregate of Christian communions. This definition of the Church has more recently been adopted, in substance, by KLIEFOTH, who names the Church an institution of salvation; a living organism, of which the several constituent members are institutes, offices, and orders, regulated by church-laws, and composing church-government and a governed church.

Stahl's  
theory.

"It is a noteworthy peculiarity of the neo-Lutheran confessionalism, that, with few exceptions, it insists upon *the restoration of the Church*, meaning, by that expression, the restoration of *external ordinances, offices, and ceremonies*. LÖHE and DELITSCH stand with SCHEIBEL in opposing the Plan of Union on the ground of its involving the subversion of the Lutheran Church. LUTHER, they insist, appeared as the founder of a CHURCH. Löhe aims to prove that the Lutheran Church is the

true Church; that is, the queen among the Churches, THE Church κατ' ἐξοχὴν, the Bride of the Lord, the depositary of saving grace. (*Drei Bücher von der Kirche.*) KAHNIS calls the Lutheran Church "the Mother of the Faith," or "the Church of the Truth;" and, in his conception of the Church, seems to stand not far from that of Rome, avowing, as he does, his belief, that whenever in our day a Romish institution falls, a constituent part of Christianity falls with it; a view which he certainly did not derive from Luther. Pastor WOLFF, in his *Lutheran Answer to the Memorial of the Theological Faculty of Göttingen*, expresses himself in favor of a 'subordination' among the Lutheran 'Mother-churches,' and of 'a blind faith' in authority. So also HENGSTENBERG speaks of the '*divine* institution of government in the Church;' and VILMAR has declared his return to the Romish idea of the Church, in expressly repudiating, as he has done, the conception of the Church as a communion 'which is ever something subjective, and the result of the gift of assurance imparted by Christ,' and advancing to the idea of an *institution*, as the *objective* originating the communion. Vilmar is of the opinion that in addition 'to the two necessary means of grace — pure doctrine and the sacrament — a third, including both of these, is not less necessary: the *maintenance* of pure doctrine and the right sacrament; that is to say, *ordinances* and an institution must be added, by means of which such a maintenance may be secured with the fullest certainty. Of this 'third necessary means of salvation' — the Church as an institution — MÜNCHMEYER has recently treated in the most thorough manner. While Vilmar, in advocating his idea of the Church, professes to plant himself upon the Augsburg Confession, Münchmeyer, with remarkable candor, acknowledges that the old Lutheran conception of the Church does not harmonize with the neo-Lutheran, or, as he expresses it, 'that it contains the remains, not yet fully eliminated, of the false spiritualism which developed itself among the Reformed.' (See No. 844.) According to Münchmeyer, the Church, in its essence, consists of *all the baptized; all the baptized form the body of*

*Christ*, and are real members thereof; hence, the ungodly also belong to it, yea, even the baptized 'children of the devil.' The Church is accordingly defined as 'the spiritual mother who, *through holy baptism*, bears spiritual children to the Lord.' It is, therefore, altogether wrong and misleading to speak of an *invisible* Church: there is only a visible Church of the baptized.

"The tendency is now apparently strong in certain quarters to subvert or break through the conception of the Church maintained by the Reformers, and transform the Church from a communion of faith into an institution for preaching and administering the sacraments. But this view has by no means met with general acceptance, nor is it indeed in agreement with the spirit of Protestantism. It rests fundamentally upon the same grounds as Anglican Puseyism, with this exception, that the latter has in its favor Church-tradition, and, to some extent, the Anglican Confessional books; while the neo-Lutheran conception of the Church stands in avowed contradiction alike to the symbols of the Lutheran Church and the views of the Lutheran Reformers: a point clearly demonstrated by Höfling in his work on the *Principles of the Evangelical Lutheran Church-constitution*. [No. 837.] The neo-Lutheran theory is essentially one with the Romish, and, practically carried out, would lead to the restoration of a new visible head of the collective Church-body — a new Pope in some form or other, whether resident in Rome or Mecklenburg were a matter of the utmost indifference.

The Neo-Lutheran theory.

German form of Puseyism.

"On the whole, evangelical Protestantism," Schenkel thinks, "has nothing to fear from this Romeward tendency. The utmost it can effect will be to awaken the friends of Protestant Christianity to greater vigilance in opposition to innovations which would destroy the essence of Protestantism."

A third view of the nature of the Church, obtaining in Germany, is that of SCHLEIERMÄCHER. "It is essentially that of the Reformation; that the Church takes its origin from the disposition in

Schleiermacher's theory.

the regenerate to form a communion, and develops itself in its external form by the union of regenerate persons for systematic action upon and with one another. Since, however, regeneration is not a sudden transformation, an active resistance of the flesh against the Spirit remaining even in the regenerate, there is always in those who, collectively, form the Church, something belonging to the world. Hence, where the Church is, that is, faith and communion of faith, there is also the world, that is, sin, and communion with the general sinfulness. Here Schleiermacher finds the distinction between a *visible* and *invisible* Church. The invisible Church is not properly the collective whole of all the regenerate, but the collective whole of all operations of the Spirit in their due connection. The visible Church is not the collective whole of all the baptized, but the collective whole of all operations of the Spirit in their connection with counterworkings in all the regenerate arising from participation in the general sinfulness.

“Schleiermacher thus modifies the usual Protestant conception of the Church, according to which, as he remarks, what is called the invisible Church is for the most part not invisible, and what is called the visible is mostly not Church. The pure Church cannot, in his view, be made visible. It is everywhere essentially one, while the visible Church is always apparent in a state of separation and division. He describes the invisible Church as the *common effort* of all Christians, through the external, to attain to the knowledge and communion of the same Spirit; while the particular confessions, formularies, rituals, belong to the sphere of the visible Church, and form its separating element. Hence there is a plurality of visible churches in distinction from the undivided unity of the invisible. But every part of the visible is nevertheless a part of the invisible; that which unites the two is the Spirit, that which separates is the carnal mind; so that by virtue of the tendency of the spiritual principle to form a communion, there must needs arise a never-ceasing struggle to realize a reunion of the separated visible churches. Hence all divisions

in the Christian Church are only transient, and every Christian should love the particular form of Christianity to which he belongs only as a perishable form, but at the same time as a form of the one imperishable Church, comprising in itself his own temporal existence. Schleiermacher does not, accordingly, rest satisfied with the symbolical definition, according to which the Church is always *one communion*, partly of regenerate, partly of baptized persons. With him the Church is a *system* of spiritual and moral operations, a sum of states of life which arise either within (invisible Church) or without (visible Church). According to this description it is exceedingly difficult to see how the organization of the Church is to be effected, for we can conceive how persons, but not how states or conditions can organize themselves. How the organized Christian community comes into existence, on his fundamental principle, Schleiermacher has nowhere shown; he only presupposes its existence as matter of experience. (*Praktische Theologie* pp. 521, *sq.*) He moreover broached the question whether a Church organization according to evangelical principles be the best absolutely; and answered it thus: The more free the process of Church-formation is, and the less disturbed by foreign influences, the more perfect it must be; and every organization which most clearly brings out the fact that there is no other difference among evangelical Christians than that of the *delegated* discharge of certain functions is the best. He accordingly declares himself equally opposed to a *State Church*, and a spiritual *office-Church*, (one governed exclusively by the clergy,) and everywhere manifests a decided predilection for a *free Church-constitution*. He agrees with Rothe in the position that the most perfect condition for the State is that in which it feels itself to be perfectly secure through the prevailing power of intellectual motives, and thus doing away with the necessity of piety.

“If Schleiermacher has nowhere systematically developed his doctrine of the Church as fully as could be desired, he has yet contributed to open the way so far as to reassert, with great force, *first*, the *self-subsistence of the Church*, and its inde-

pendence of the State; and, *secondly*, the *unity of the Church-forming Christian* spirit in opposition to division into particular churches.

“His agreement with Rothe is therefore *only apparent*; in reality he pursues an altogether different path. His aim is not the resolution of the Church into the State and the reduction of piety to morality, but the free co-existence, without confusion, of the Church and the State, of the society organized for the development of piety, and that designed for the realization of morality. His conception of the Church may indeed be called spiritualistic, inasmuch as his Church does not properly consist of persons; but the materialistic conception which includes ungodly persons as real members of the body of Christ, he not without reason, and clearly not without Protestant grounds, opposes, but by rather overstraining the Protestant principle. This overstraining may be attended with danger, and, carried to extreme, (to which, however, Schleiermacher never went,) even dissolve all Church order; but it is far less pernicious in its effects than its opposite, the crystalizing of the Spirit in the form of Church organization; less dangerous than the error of making the Church, to use the striking words of Nitsch, ‘begin to search in the multitude of its members after its essence in the phenomenal form; and not only assumes the outward form for the essence, but exalts a hierurgic sacrament borrowed from heathenism above the Word, a changing Church order into a law of God.’

“More recent theologians have attempted to develop and describe, on Schleiermacher’s principles, the idea and nature of the Church. In general it may be said that his two leading

Recent  
views.

ideas respecting the independence and higher unity of Church communion are found to be ever more and more in harmony with each other, and

that the need of realizing that independence in a free organization, that unity in the union of the different churches, is making itself more and more felt. Even theologians who, like Hase, incline to rationalism, acknowledge that the Church is ‘a divine institution transcending all human will,’

(*Ev. Dogmatik*), and De Wette regards the Church as the depository of all the fulness of Christ in the collective communion of all individual Christians. (*Das Wesen des Christl. Glaubens*, p. 406, *sq.*) Reformed theologians down to the most recent times have particularly insisted upon this point, to place the *idea* of the Church and that which is invisible in it above the outward and visible; while it appears to us less Reformed to define the Church, with *Ebrard*, as "the communion of the means of grace; since communion with Christ, by which Church-membership is determined, does not, on Reformed principles, require as absolutely necessary the use of the means of grace." MARTENSEN'S conception of the nature of the Church is of a more mystical character, beholding in it, as he does, "a living organism of revelation and redemption." On the other hand, Lange, not without justice, remarks that the Church is not yet formed on Protestant principles, and his expressed expectation of a future more complete formation of the evangelical Church is far from meriting the scorn which theologians of the past have heaped upon him as a theologian of the future. We may dissent on particular points from the propositions of BUNSEN, in his work on "the constitution of the Church of the future;" but so deeply rooted is the need of a renovation and regeneration in the Church, that even the restorative theology, as we have seen, thinks itself competent, in this point, not merely to restore; and then forsooth recedes, in its views of the Church, some centuries behind the Reformation. Bunsen has shown in the work referred to that the time for Clergy-churches and State-churches is gone by. He has again recognized, in its full scope, the primitive Christian idea of the universal priesthood, which even the Reformers did not consistently carry out; and if the evangelical Church of Germany, when he wrote his book, accorded him its cordial approbation, yet, since that time, many changes have occurred. The dead, alas! have buried the living, and called forth the dead out of their graves. But still abundant means are at hand "for maintaining and strengthening faith in that world-transforming power which even yet survives in the German people, faith in it, too, as a

sure pledge and promise of a fair and glorious future for the evangelical Church of the Fatherland."

I cannot better conclude this sketch than in the words of the same writer, penned while he was yet in full sympathy with the spirit of Evangelical Protestantism, (1857.)

"The biblical and apostolic conception of the Church has been apprehended by Protestantism with essential conformity to truth, and any change in this Protestant conception must needs involve the obscuration and disfigurement of the essence of Protestantism itself. The Church, in its essence, is a *communion of the regenerate*, and every believer, but none other than he, has, in virtue of faith and regeneration, *membership in the Church*. Even in this most strict and proper sense of the word the Church is a communion; it is a definite number of persons who belong to it. *Who* these are is known only to God. This Church is invisible, not in the sense that its members are invisible, or that its corporate acts and operations are not to be perceived, but in the sense that its members are not to be discerned with certainty by human observation, are not to be united as an organism under an external constitution. But this does not prevent the Church, *as existing in truth and reality*, from exerting its full influence on the unbelieving and unregenerate. It is rather, and most properly, salt scattered through the mass of living men, and the divine light shining upon it. In this Church Protestantism *believes*, as in the reality of the humanity newly created by Christ, and on this rests its hope. Humanity would have been wasted and destroyed in corruption and utter wantonness, if the Church of the regenerate were not operating in it as the preserving, purifying, animating, and regenerating principle. Still, the Church, although the one, world-embracing, hallowed, true, genuinely apostolic Church, is not yet perfect and unerring; it cannot claim infallibility. It is rather undergoing a process of growth toward perfection, to continue until the coming of the Lord to set it forever free from the conflict with the world, sin, and death. From this *one* Church, whose members are scattered through the whole world, and not of absolute neces-

sity required to be embraced in the outward communion of Christendom, we justly distinguish the several *ecclesiastical societies*, organized under their respective constitutions, and composed of a definite number of the *baptized*. Of these societies the members, as baptized, *ought* also to be regenerate; but that they all are so, is not only incapable of proof, but experience proves the contrary. The particular churches in different countries are not, therefore, to be regarded as, of course, fragmentary component parts of the one true Church. We may well presume that they contain members of the true Church; and it should therefore be a leading aim to commit to these, wherever possible, the guidance of the Church-life. There is no order prescribed by the Lord in which this may best be done; the Spirit of truth and the power of the Word must here purge the threshing-floor. Thus much only is certain, that the churchly spirit is not transmitted in any official way, (for example, by ordination;) for it is from ordained official persons that the divisions in the Church have, for the most part, proceeded. The Spirit of Christ rests, not on persons of a particular order, but *upon the whole Church*; and Protestantism can, therefore, rightly develop itself in harmony with its conception of the Church, only when it establishes its Church-constitution on the basis of a well-organized congregational life. Its aim in the sphere of Church-organization must be *to form the particular churches into the one true Church*, to transform the Church of the baptized into the Church of the faithful."\*

In the briefest review of the ground over which we have rapidly passed in the foregoing pages, we cannot fail to take note, first of all, of the early development of a tendency, on the part of the Christian teachers of the post-apostolic age, to materialistic conceptions of the Church and ministry, in strongly marked contrast with the purely spiritual tone of the apostolic teaching. While the inspired writers lay almost exclusive stress upon the inward connec-

Conclusion.

\* HERTZOG, *Real-Encyclopädie*, vii., ss. 592-9.

tion of the individual believer with Christ, and, in Him, with all his mystical members, living and departed, forming collectively the one Body of Christ, the fathers of the second and the next succeeding century give special prominence to the maintenance of union with the regularly organized visible Christian community, out of which, as they affirm, there is no salvation. The apostolic formula—the forgiveness of sins and eternal life through faith in the name of Jesus—is now replaced by the patristic formula—“the remission of sins and eternal life through the Holy Church.” (*Cypr. Ep.* lxxvi. 6.)

The transition from this first form of departure from the simplicity of the apostolic teaching to the second was easy, as it was inevitable. The ministerial function, as exercised by the apostles and their immediate successors, is confessedly, by eminence, the prophetic function. The Christian minister, of whatever order or degree, is, in the language of the New Testament, a minister of the Word, a preacher of the gospel, a herald of the message of reconciliation, a teacher of the truth as embodied in the person and work of the Son of God incarnate. With the writers of the succeeding ages this function of the ministry comes more and more into practical subordination to the ministration of the sacred rites. In other words, the prophetic character of the ministerial office becomes more and more merged in the sacerdotal. The symbols of doctrine rather than the truths they represent are held up as possessing a life-giving efficacy. Upon a due reception of the material elements is made to depend the attainment of eternal blessedness, and due reception is conditioned by the priestly character of the administrator. “Not to be washed in the laver of regeneration, not to eat of the divine flesh, not to drink the blood, not to be anointed with the oil of remission, were to perish everlastingly.” The question of a man’s salvation or perdition is made to turn not so much upon his possession or non-possession of the graces of the Spirit, as upon his participation or non-participation of that which the priest may bestow or may withhold. Such was the early development of that form of deviation from the apostolic doc-

trine which proved the prime source of the manifold corruptions in doctrine and discipline which subsequently overspread the Church.

Side by side with the development of the sacerdotal system was that of the theory of the organic unity of the Church visible as realized in the one undivided episcopate; a theory which rapidly advanced to its logical culmination in the Papacy. According to this theory, as we have seen, not only is each particular church organically one in its supreme pastoral head, the person of the presiding bishop—the only form of visible Church-unity, properly so called, claiming Scriptural warrant—but the universal Church is, in like manner, one, an organized totality, in the collective episcopate; an abstract conception which soon assumed a concrete form in a bishop of bishops, or œcumenical patriarch, in whose person the supreme episcopate of the prince of the apostles is perpetuated.

In the light of these facts, Luther's memorable declaration, "The great question between the Papists and us is the question concerning the Church—which is the true Church?" stands fully vindicated. That this is indeed the fundamental question between the Romanist and the Protestant, sufficiently appears from the tenor of their respective answers.

The answer of the Romanist is, that the true Church, the Catholic Church militant, is that world-wide organization which has its centre of unity in the successor of St. Peter, in the apostolical see of Rome; that upon connection with this visible corporation depends the spiritual relation of the members of Christ's mystical members to the Head; that only through the mediation of this body, as represented by its priesthood, the sole dispensers of its sacred mysteries, is living union with Christ secured and maintained.

The Reformers of the sixteenth century, disregarding the tradition of centuries, and going back to the original tradition of the apostles, as preserved in the New Testament, give an answer to the question—What is the Church?—in the well-known definitions embodied in the first Protestant Confessions: The Church of Christ is the community of the children

of God, the collective body of the truly faithful—a body which, as an organized whole, must needs be invisible, even as its glorified Head is invisible; but which yet possesses a real, though imperfect visibility in the form of particular churches, which are severally distinguished by the notes of a true Church, and are thus identified as forming constituent parts of the one body of Christ in its earthly essence.

Between these two doctrines of the Church, the mediæval or Roman, and the evangelical or Protestant, there is no tenable middle ground. This is the great lesson of our history. One or the other of these two positions must be maintained: Either the Church Catholic is one and the same with the collective whole of the churches of the Roman obedience, exemplifying, as it does, in completeness, the theory of a visible organic unity, "Catholic unity," as its advocates claim, or the visible Church Catholic, so called, is one and the same with the collective whole of the particular churches which severally confess the faith of Christ crucified; a collective whole presumptively identified with the mystical body of Christ, visibly one considered as the aggregation of all particular churches, each maintaining in its purity the Faith once delivered to the saints.

# LITERATURE

OF THE

## DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH;

OR, A

### CATALOGUE OF WORKS RELATING TO THE SUBJECT.

THE TITLES ARRANGED CHRONOLOGICALLY, WITH NOTES, AND AN INDEX OF AUTHORS.

---

100. 1. *S. S. Patrum*, qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt, Opera. Ed. J. B. Cotelerius. Paris, 1672. Recud. curavit J. Clericus. Ed. 2, Amstelod. 1724. 2 vols. fol. This edition contains PEARSON'S *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*.
2. *Clementis Rom., S. Ignatii, S. Polycarpi*, Patrum Apostol. quæ supersunt, etc. Ed. Guil. Jacobson. 2 tom. 8vo. Oxon. 1838. Ed. 4, 1863.
3. *S. Clement* of Rome: The Two Epistles to the Corinthians. A revised text, with Introduction and Notes, by J. B. Lightfoot, D.D. 8vo. Lond. and Camb. 1869.
- Of the *Epistles of IGNATIUS* the longer Greek recension was first published by *Pacæus*, in 1557, then by Gessner, in 1559. Of the shorter Greek recension, the earliest edition is that of Abp. USHER, 4to. Oxon. 1644.
250. 4. *Cyprianus*, Thascius Cæcilius: De Unitate Ecclesiæ. Ed. Fell, Oxon. 1681. Ed. Krabinger, 1853. Opera. Ed. Goldhorn, 12mo. Lips. 1838. Pars II., pp. 117-134. Earliest edition, that of Erasmus, Basil. 1521. See GESS: *Die Einheit der Kirche im Sinne Cyprians*, [No. 819;] HUTHER: *Cyprians Lehre*, etc., [No. 820;] and J. W. NEVIN: *Four Articles in the Mercersburg Review*, 1852. [No. 761.]
5. — Epistolæ — xlii., liii., lv., lxiv., lxvi., lxvii., lxix., lxxiv., lxxvi.
280. 6. *Constitutiones Apostolicæ*. Ed. Guil. Ueltzen. Rostock. 1853. Eng. transl. by Chase. 8vo. N. Y. 1848.
370. 7. *Optatus Milevitanus*: De Schismate Donatistarum Libri septem. Ed. Dupin. Fol. Paris. 1702.
430. 8. *Augustinus Aurelius*: Epistola ad Catholicos contra Donatistas,

- vulgo De Unitate Ecclesiæ, Liber I. *Opera*. Ed. Benedict. 18 vol. 4to. Bassoni, 1807. In Vol. xii., pp. 427-493.
- 430 9. — Contra Epistolam Parmeniani, Libri tres. *Opera*, Vol. xii., pp. 15-103.
10. — De Baptismo contra Donatistas, Libri septem. *Ibid.*, pp. 103-265.
11. — Contra Litteras Petiliani, Donatistæ, Libri tres. *Ibid.*, pp. 265-427.
- 434 12. **Vincentius Lirinensis**: Commonitorium. *Opera*, in Vincentii Lirinensis et Hilarii Arelatensis *Opera*. 4to. Romæ, 1731.
- 450 13. **Leo I.**, Papa: *Opera*. Ed. Ballerini. 3 vols. fol. Venet. 1753-57. Vol. I. Epistolæ.
- 550 14. **Dionysius Exiguus**: Codex Canonum Ecclesiasticorum, sive Codex Canonum vetus Ecclesiæ Romanæ, ab Hadriano Papa I., Carolo Magno, Romæ quondam oblatus. In Bibliothecâ Juris Canonici Veteris. Ed. Justel. 2 vols. fol. Paris, 1661. Vol. i., pp. 97-175.
- 570 15. **Johannes Antiochenus**, Scholasticus dictus: Collectio Canonum. Gr. et Lat. In Biblioth. Jur. Can. Vet. uti sup. vol. ii., pp. 499-603.
16. — Nomocanon. Gr. et Lat. *Ibid.*, pp. 603-673.
- 600 17. **Gregorius I.**, Papa: *Opera*. Ed. Benedict. 4 vols. fol. Paris, 1705. The best edition. (Reprinted in 17 vols. 4to. Venet. 1768-76.) Vol. ii. Liber Regulæ Pastoralis, pp. 1-103.
18. — Registrum Epistolarum. *Id. Ibid.*, pp. 477-1305. The Epistles are 840 in number.
- 630 19. **Isidorus Hispalensis**: De Officiis Ecclesiasticis. Ed. Gryneus. Lat. 1736. *Opera*. Fol. Col. Ag. 1617.
20. — Originum, sive Ethymologiarum Libri xx., pp. 1-179. In *Opera*, uti supra.
- 850 21. **Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ**. First edition in Decreta et Concilia Generalia in unum collecta (a Isidoro Hispalense), edente Merlino. 2 vols. fol. Paris, 1523-4. Vol. i. Reprinted in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, tom. cxxx. Paris. New edition, 2 vols. 8vo. Leips. 1863.
- 880 22. **Photius**, Patriarch of Constantinople: Nomocanon, id est Canonum conciliatio. Gr. et Lat. In Bibliotheca Juris Canonici veteris. Ed. Justel. 2 vols. fol. Paris, 1661. Vol. ii., pp. 785-1140.
- 1000 23. **Gerbertus** — afterward Pope Sylvester II.: Sermo de Reformatione Episcoporum. Quoted by Gregory VII., Lib. xi., Ep. ii., under the title of *Ambrosii Pastorale*. It is found in editions of Ambrose's Works, entitled Liber de dignitate sacerdotali. Ambrosii *Opera*. 2 vols. fol. Paris, 1686-90. Vol. ii. Appendix, pp. 357-65.
- 1050 24. **Leo IX.**, Pope: Epistolæ xiii., etc. In Labbe and Mansi: *Concilia*, 23 vols. fol. Venet. 1728. 29 vols. Lucæ, 1748-52. Vol. xi., pp. 1317-1394.
- 1074 25. **Gregory VII.**, Pope: Epistolæ. In *Sacrosancta Concilia*. Studio Labbei, Cossartii, Coleti, et Mansi, uti supra. Vol. xii., pp. 229-537. S. Gregorii VII. Romani Pontificis Epistolæ et Diplomata Pontificia. 8vo. Paris, 1853. (Migne.)
- 1150 26. **Gratianus**: Concordantia Discordantium Canonum; or, Decre-

- tum. First edition, fol. Strasburg, 1471. About 80 editions have appeared. Best ed., forming first Part of Corpus Juris Canonici, 4to, Leips. 1833-39.
1200. 27. **Innocent III.**, Pope: Epistolæ. Libri i., ii., v., x.-xvi., in Epistolarum Innocentii III. Libri undecim. Ed. Baluze. Tom. ii. Fol. Paris, 1682. Lib. iii. v.-x., in Diplomata, Chartæ, Epistolæ et alia documenta, ad res Francicas spectantia, etc. T. i. et ii. Fol. Paris, 1791. Lib. iv., xvii.-xix., seem to have been lost. Nineteen Books are named — one for every year of Innocent's pontificate, 1198-1216.
1379. 28. **Wycliffe, John**: Dialog. Libri iv. Trialogus, Lib. iv. Cap. 15. De Sacramento Ordinis. Basil, 1525.
29. — Three treatises: 1. Of the Church and her Members. 2. Of the Apostasy of the Church. 3. Of Antichrist, etc. Svo. Dublin, 1851.
- 29 a. **Matthias of Janow**: Regulæ Veteris et Novi Testamenti. In Historia et Monumenta Jo. Hus atque Huron. Pragensis. Norimb. 1715. I. 473.
1400. 30. **Huss, John**: Tractatus de Ecclesia. Opera. 2 vols. fol. Norib. 1558. Vol. i., pp. 196-255.
31. — De Unitate Ecclesiæ et Schismate. Id. Pp. 476-9.
32. **Clemangis, Nicolas de**: Disputatio super materiâ Concilii Generalis. In Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum, etc. Ed. Brown. 2 vols. fol. Lond. 1690. Vol. i., pp. 393-406.
33. — De corrupto Ecclesiæ statu liber; vel, De Ruinâ Ecclesiæ. Ibid. Vol. ii., pp. 555-570. Erroneously ascribed to *Clemangis*. Author uncertain. Written in 1401.
34. — Vota pacis ac emendationis in Constantiensi Concilio quæsitâ. In Magnum œcumenicum Constantiense Concilium de Universali Ecclesiæ reformatione, unione, et fide. Ed. Von der Hardt. 7 vols. fol. Franc. et Lips. 1697, etc. Vol. i., pp. 1, sqq.
35. — Opusculum de Ruinâ Ecclesiæ circa tempora Concilii Constantiensis. Ibid.
36. **Gerson, John**: De Schismate. Opera. Vol. ii., pars 1.
37. — De Unitate Ecclesiastica, etc. Id. Ib.
38. — De Modis uniendi ac reformandi ecclesiam in Concilio universali. 1410. In reply to D'Ailly: De difficultate Reform., etc. Id. Pars 2.
39. — De Potestate ecclesiastica Considerationes. Id. Ibid.
40. — Declaratio Defectuum virorum ecclesiasticorum. Id.
41. — De Potestate Ligandi et Solvendi. Id. Pars 3. Opera. Ed. Du Pin. 5 vols. fol. Antw. 1706. Vol. ii., partes 1-3.
1439. 41 a. **Joannes de Turrecremata**: Summa de Ecclesia et ejus Auctoritate, Libri iv. Lugd. 1496. Venet. 1561.
1450. 42. **Cusanus, Nicholas**: De Concordantia Catholica. Opera. 3 vols. fol. Paris, 1514; and Basel, 1565.
43. **Goch, John of**: De Libertate Christiana. Ed. Græphus. Antwerp. 4to. 1521.
44. — De quatuor Erroribus circa Legem Evangelicam exortis Dialogus. In Walchii Monumenta Mediæ Ævi. Fasc. iv., p. 73.

1480. 45. **Wesel, John of**: Disputatio adversus Indulgentias. In Walchii Monumenta Medii Ævi. Fascic. i., pp. 111, sqq.
46. — De Auctoritate, Officio, et Potestate Pastorum Ecclesiasticorum. In Walch, vol. ii. Fasc. ii., pp. 115, sqq. This is otherwise entitled, Tractatus de Potestate Ecclesiastica. Upon some propositions in this work, the author, at his trial, underwent an examination. See *Paradoxa et Examen Magistrale ac theologiale D. Jo. de WESALIA* — Register of the Proceedings against Wesel — in *Orthuini Gratii Fascic. Rerum Expetendarum et Fugendarum*. Ed. Brown, vol. i., pp. 325–334. Wesel strongly affirms the formal principle of Protestantism — the supremacy of Scripture: “Above and before all, I protest that I desire nothing, I assert nothing which is in any way contrary to the verity of the faith, as contained in the Holy Scriptures. Nothing is to be held as de fide which is not contained in the canon of Scripture.”
1485. 47. **Wessel, John**: De Potestate Ecclesiastica. *Opera*, p. 153, sq.
48. — Quæ sit vera Communio Sanctorum. *Id.*, p. 807, sq.
- Opera*. Ed. Pappus. 4to. Groning. 1614. *Farrago Wesseli*, containing several of his treatises, was first published under the supervision of Luther, at Wittenberg. 4to. 1521 and 1522.
1500. 49. **Erasmus, Desiderius**: De Puritate Ecclesiæ Christianæ; enarratio Psalmi xiv. *Opera*. Vol. v., p. 291.
50. — De amabili Ecclesiæ Concordia liber. *Opera*. P. 469. *Opera*. 10 vols. fol. in 11. Lugd. Bat. 1703. The best edition.
1511. 51. **Cajetan, Thomas de Vio**: Tractatus de comparatione Auctoritatis Papæ et Concilii. Venet. 1531. *Opera*. Fol. Lyons, 1639.
1512. 52. **Almainus, Jacobus**: Tractatus de Auctoritate Ecclesiæ, et Conciliorum Generalium. In Gersonii *Opera*. Ed. Dupin, ii., p. 976.
1517. 53. **Isidorus de Isolaniis**: De Imperio Militantis Ecclesiæ, Libri iv. Fol. Mediolani. 1517.
1524. 54. **Onus Ecclesiæ**. Folio. Landshut, 1524. This work was compiled in 1519. (*Brunet*.)
1531. 55. **Melanchthon**: Apologia Confessionis Augustanæ. Wittenberg, 1531. German translation by Jonas, Wittenb. 1531. English translation in *Book of Concord*, Newmarket, Va., 1851. Pp. 53–276. Cap. iv. *De Ecclesia*. Cap. xiv. *De Potestate Ecclesiastica*.
1536. 56. **Calvin, John**: Christianæ Religionis Institutio. Svo. Basileæ, 1536. Author's last edit., (in Latin and French,) 1559. Eng. transl. by Norton, 1561, 1562, '72, '74, '80, '82, '87, '99, 1611, '51, etc.; by Allen, 1813; by Beveridge, Edinb. 1845–6. Book iv., chap. 1–12.
1549. 57. **The Form** and Manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Lond. 1549. Ed. Parker Soc. Camb. 1844. Pp. 159–186.
1557. 58. **Bucer, Martin**: De Regno Christi. Written at Lambeth, 1550; first published by Oporinus, in 1557. “It contains,” says Schenkel, “an outline of a Church constitution, according to the principles of the Reformation.”
1560. 59. **Beza, Theodore**: Confessio Christianæ Fidei. Genev. 1560.

The article on the Church, its organization, discipline, etc., is handled with special care and fulness.

1562. 60. **Jewel, John**: *Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*. 8vo. Lond. 1562. P. ii., c. ii.—vii. Eng. transl.: *The Apologie of the Church of England*. 4to. Lond. 1562. This translation is somewhat different from that of 1564, by Lady BACON: *An Apologie or Answer in defence of the Church of England*, with a briefe and plaine declaration of the true Religion professed and used in the same. 8vo. Lond. 1564.
1564. 61. **Harding, Thomas, D.D.**: *An Answer to Maister Ivelles Challenge*. 4to. Douay, 1564. In reply to Jewel's celebrated challenge to the Romanists at Paul's Cross, Nov. 26, 1559: that if, with respect to certain specified articles, "any learned man alive were able to prove any . . . by any one clear and plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures, or of the old doctors, or of any old general council, or by any example of the primitive Church . . . for the space of six hundred years after Christ," he would "give over and subscribe unto them." A challenge repeated, at the same place, the year following, with the addition of fresh articles, in a Sermon printed in 18mo, Lond. 1560. (*Works* i., pp. 1–25. P. Soc. ed. Camb. 1845.)
1565. 62. — A *Confutation of a Booke entitled, An Apologie of the Church of England*. 4to. Antwerp, 1565.
63. **Canones et Decreta**. Sacrosancti Œcumenici et Generalis Concilii Tridentini, sub Paulo III., Julio III., Pio III., P. P. Max. Fol. Romæ, 1564. (Also, 4to and 8vo, same place and date.) Sessio xxiii. De Sacramento Ordinis.
1566. 64. **Catechismus**, ex decreto Concilii Tridentini, ad Parochos, Pii Quinti. P. M. jussu editus. Fol. Romæ, 1566. Part I., cap. x., quest. i.—xxv. Part II., cap. vii., quest. i.—xxxi. Eng. transl. by Buckley. 12mo. Lond. 1852.
65. **Chemnitz, Martin**: *Exam̃inis Concilii Tridentini, opus integrum, quatuor partes, in quibus, præcipuorum capitum totius doctrinæ papisticæ firma et solida refutatio, tum ex S. Scripturæ fontibus, tum ex orthodoxorum patrum consensu collecta est. Pars II. De Sacramento Ordinis, cap. i.—iv.* Of this great work, Part I. appeared in 1565, Part II. in 1566, Part III. in 1572, Part IV. in 1573.
66. **Jewel**: *A Replie unto Mr. Hardinges Answere, entitled a Confutation, etc.* Fol. Lond. 1565. A rejoinder by *Harding*. Antw. 4to. 1566.
1567. 67. — *A Defence of the Apologie of the Church of Englande, containinge an Answere to a certaine Booke, lately set forth by M. Hardinge.* Fol. Lond. 1567. Part II., chap. ii.—vii.
68. **Harding**: *A Detection of sundry foule Errours, etc. . . . in "A Defence of the Apologie," etc.* 4to. Louvaine, 1568.
69. **Sanders, Nicolas, D.D.**: *The Rocke of the Church, wherein the Primacy of St. Peter and of his successors, the Bishops of Rome, is proved out of God's Worde.* 16mo. Louvain, 1567.

1570. 70. *Nowell, Alexander*: Catechismus, sive prima Institutio, Disciplinaque Pietatis Christianæ, Latine explicata. 4to, pp. 170. Lond. 1570. Eng. transl.: A Catechisme, or first Instruction and Learning of Christian Religion. 4to. Lond. 1570.
1571. 71. *Sanders, Nicolas*: De visibili Monarchia Ecclesiæ, Libri viii. Fol. Lov. 1571.
72. *Stapleton, Thomas*: Defensio Successionis Ecclesiasticæ, Lib. i.
73. *Bridges, John*: Supremacie of Christian Princes over all persons throughout their dominions, in all Causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal. 4to, pp. 1114. Lond. 1573. In answer to T. Stapleton and Nic. Sanders.
1572. 74. *Field, John, and Wilcocks, Thomas*: An Admonition to the Parliament, for the Reformation of Church Discipline. 8vo. Lond. 1572.
75. *Cartwright, Thomas*: A Second Admonition to the Parliament. 8vo, pp. 64. Lond. 1572.
1573. 75 a. *Acworth, George*: De visibili Rom. anarchia, contra Nic. Sanderi Monarchiam Προλεγόμενον. Libri duo. 4to. Lond. 1573.
76. *Whitgift, John*: An Answer to a certain Libel entitled An Admonition to the Parliament. 4to, pp. 246. Lond. 1572. Second edit. enlarged. 4to. 1573.
77. *Cartwright, Thomas*: A Replie to an Answer made of M. Doctor Whitgift agaynst the Admonition to the Parliament. 4to, pp. 224. Black letter. Lond. 1573.
1574. 78. *A Defence* of the Ecclesiastical Regiment in England, defaced by T. C. in his Replie agaynst D. Whitgift. 16mo. Lond. 1574. Anonymous — probably intended as an introduction to the elaborate volume next named.
79. *Whitgift, John*: The Defense of the Aunswere to the Admonition, against the Replie of T. C. Fol. Pp. 800, in black letter. Lond. 1574. (*Works*. Parker Soc. ed. 3 vols. 1851-3.)
1575. 80. *Cartwright, Thomas*: An Examination of M. Dr. Whitgiftes Censures contained in two Tables set before his Booke, entituled The Defense, etc. 16mo, pp. 53. Lond. 1575.
81. — *The Second Replie* of Thomas Cartwright agaynst Maister Doctor Whitgiftes Second Answer touching the Churche Discipline. 4to, pp. 666, in black letter, 1575. The production of a foreign press; the author being now in exile.
82. — The Rest of the Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright, etc. 4to, pp. 265. 1577.
83. *Travers, Walter*: De Disciplina Ecclesiastica; otherwise entitled Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra, ex Dei Verbo Descripta. Translated into English, and enlarged by Cartwright: A full and plaine Declaration of Ecclesiastical Discipline out of the Word of God, and of the declining of the Church of England from the same. 1573. Reprint. 1644.
1577. 84. *Du Plessis Mornay*: Traité de l'Eglise auquel sont disputées les principales questions qui ont este moues sur ce point en notre temps.

Svo. Geneve, 1577. Lond. 1578. Eng. transl.: A Notable Treatise of the Church, translated by J. Fielde. Svo. Lond. 1579. Also, 1580, 1606.

1581. 85. **Bellarmino, Robert Frs. Romulus**: Disputationes de Controversiis Christianæ Fidei adversus hujus temporis hæreticos. Vol. I. and II., Rome, 1581–82. Vol. III., 1593. Rome, 1832–40, IV. vols. 4to.

86. **Beza, Theodore**: Judgment concerning a Threefold Order of Bishops, etc.

87. — De Veris et Visibilibus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Notis. Genev. 1579. Discourse of the True and Visible Marks of the Catholic Church, translated by Thomas Wilcox. 16mo. Lond. 1582.

88. **Fulke, William**: A Discourse of the Dangerous Rocke of the Popish Church Commended by Nich. Sanders, D.D. 16mo. Lond. 1580.

1582. 89. **Brown, Robert**: A Treatise of Reformation without tarrying for any, and of the wickedness of those preachers which will not reform themselves and their charge, because they will tarry till the magistrate command and compel them. 4to. Middelburg, 1582. The first of the *Brownist* publications.

90. **Rainolds, John**: A Defence of the English Liturgy against Robert Brown his schismatical book. 1582.

1584. 91. — and **John Hart**: The Summe of the Controversy between John Rainoldes and John Hart: touching the Head and Faith of the Church. Wherein are handled sundry points, of the sufficiency and right expounding of the Scriptures, the ministry of the Church, the function of priesthood, the sacrifice of the mass, etc.; but chiefly and purposely, the point of Church-government, opened in the branches of Christ's supreme sovereignty, of Peter's pretended, the Pope's usurped, the Prince's lawful Supremacy. 4to. Lond. 1584, '88, '98, 1609. Latin transl. Fol. Oxon. 1616.

92. **Fulke, William**: De Successione Ecclesiastica et latente ab Antichristi Tyrannide Ecclesia. 16mo. Lond. 1584. In reply to Stapleton.

93. **A Dialogue** concerning the Strife of our Church, wherein are answered divers of those unjust accusations wherewith the godly preachers and professors of the Gospel are falsely charged; with a brief declaration of some such monstrous abuses as our bishops have not been ashamed to foster. 16mo, pp. 136. Lond. 1584.

94. **A briefe** and plaine Declaration concerning the desires of all those faithful ministers that have and do seek for the discipline and reformation of the Church of England, etc.; otherwise entitled A learned Discourse of Ecclesiastical Government. 16mo, pp. 148. Lond. 1584.

1587. 95. **Bridges, John**: A Defence of the Government established in the Church of England. 4to, pp. 1401. Lond. 1587. The author had published, in 1573, a volume entitled The Supremacy of Christian Princes.

96. **A Defence** of the Ecclesiastical Discipline ordained of God to be used in his Church. Lond. 1588. In reply to Bridges.

97. **Church Discipline**: Part of a Register containing sundry memorable matters written by divers godly and learned men in our time, which

stand for and desire the reformation of our Church in discipline and ceremonies. 4to, pp. 550. Edinb. 1587.

1587. 98. *A Demonstration* of the Truth of that Discipline which Christ hath prescribed in his Word for the Government of his Church, in all times and places until the end of the world. 4to, pp. 86; forming one volume with the *Church Discipline*. It is ascribed to JOHN UDALL, and also to JOHN PENRY, alias MARTIN MAR-PRELATE.

99. *Bancroft, Richard*: A briefe Discoverie of the Untruthes and Slanders against the true Government of the Church of Christ, in a Sermon. Feb. 8, 1588. Lond. Reprinted with the author's Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline, 1593; and in Hicckes' Biblioth. Script. Eccl. Angl. 1709.

100. *Rainolds, John*: Letter to Sir Francis Knollys, concerning some passages in Dr. Rd. Bancroft's Sermon. Lond. 1641. Reprinted in Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i., c. vii.

101. *Some, Robert*: A godly Treatise containing and deciding certain Questions touching the Ministry, Sacraments, and Church, and confutation of M. Penry. 4to. Lond. 1588.

102. *M. Some* laid open in his Coulers; wherein the indifferent reader may see how wretchedly and loosely he hath handled the cause against M. Penri: Done by an Oxford Man. J. G. 12mo, pp. 124.

103. *Penry, John*: A Defence of that which hath bin written in the Questions of the ignorant Ministerie, and the communicating with them. 16mo. Lond. 1588.

104. *Martin Mar-prelate*: An Epistle to the terrible Priests of the Convocation House, by Martin Mar-prelate, Gent. 4to. Lond. 1588.

105. — An Epitome of the first book of Dr. John Bridges's Defence of the Government of the Church of England in ecclesiastical matters. 4to, pp. 46, black letter. Lond. 1588.

106. *Pappe* with an Hatchet. 4to. Lond. 1589. In reply to Martin Mar-prelate. Ascribed to LYLly, and also to NASH.

107. *Cooper, Thomas*, Bishop of Winchester: An Admonition to the People of England against Martin Mar-prelate. 8vo. Lond. 1589. Reprinted, 8vo, Lond. 1847.

108. *Hay* any Worke for Cooper. 4to, pp. 58. Lond. 1589. In reply to the Admonition to the People of England.

109. *An Almond* for a Parrot. 4to, pp. 28. Lond. 1589. Ascribed to THOMAS NASH. In reply to Martin Mar-prelate.

110. *Wright, Leonard*: A Friendly Admonition to Martin Mar-prelate and his Mates. 4to. Lond. 1590.

110 a. A Countercuffe given to Martin Junior.

1589. 111. *Erastus, Thomas*: Explicatio Questionis gravissimæ, utrum Excommunicatio mandato nitatur divino an excogitata sit ab hominibus. 1589. Eng. transl. 1669. Reprinted, 1845.

112. *Beza, Theodore*: De Presbyteris.

113. — De Excommunicatione. In reply to Erastus.

114. *Saravia, Hadrian*: De diversis Ministrorum Evangelii gradi-

bus, authore Hadriano Saravia, Belga. 4to. Lond. 1590. Eng. translation: Treatise of the different Degrees of the Christian Priesthood. 4to. Lond. 1591. Reprinted at Oxford, 1840 and 1848, 18mo.

1589. 114 a. — *Diversio Tractatus de div. Min. Ev. grad.* 4to. Lond. 1594.

115. — *De Imperandi Autoritate, et Christianæ Obedientiæ, Libri iv.* 4to. Lond. 1593.

116. — *Diversi Tractatus Theologiæ; de diversis gradibus, etc.; de honore præsulibus debito, etc., etc.* 4to. Lond. 1641.

117. — *Treatise of the honor and maintenance due to ecclesiastical persons.* 8vo. Lond. 1629.

118. *Sutcliffe, Matthew: A Treatise of Ecclesiastical Discipline.* 4to. Lond. 1590-91.

119. — *De Presbyterio ejusque Nova in Ecclesia Christiana Politeia.* 4to, 1591.

119 a. — *De Catholica et Orthodoxa Christi Ecclesia.* Lib. II. Lond. 1592.

120. *Alison, R.: A plain Confutation of a treatise of Brownism, published by some of that faction, entitled a "True Description of the Visible Church," etc.* 4to. Lond. 1590.

121. *Barrowes, Henry: A brief Discovery of the False Churches; wherein the rights of the Christian Church are further asserted by the Holy Scriptures.* 4to, pp. 263. Lond. 1590. Reprinted, Lond. 1707, 8vo. From the name of the author, (executed in 1592,) the Brownists were sometimes denominated *Barrowists*.

122. — *A Platform which may serve as a preparative to drive away Prelatism.* 8vo. Lond. 1593.

123. — *A true Confession of the Faith, etc., which we, falsely called Brownists, do hold, etc.* Lond. 1596.

124. *Jacob, Henry: A Defence of the Churches and Ministry of England against the reasons and objections of Maister Francis Johnson, and others of the Separation, commonly called Brownists.* In two treatises. 4to. Middelburg, 1599.

125. — *Reasons taken out of God's Word and the best human testimonies, proving a necessity of reforming our Churches in England, etc.* 1604. Written while the author was in communion with the Church of England.

126. — *The divine beginning and institution of Christ's true visible and material Church.* Leyden, 1610.

127. — *An Explication and Confirmation of the above.* 1611.

128. *Hall, Joseph: A common Apology of the Church against the unjust challenges of the over-just sect, commonly called Brownists, etc.* 4to. Lond. 1610. Reprinted in *Works*, 3 vols. fol., 1647-62, and 12 vols. 8vo, Oxf. 1837. In reply to a pamphlet entitled *An Answer to a Censorious Epistle*, which is reproduced in the margin of this volume, and answered section by section.

1591. 129. *Cosin, Richard: Conspiracy for pretended Reformation, viz.,*

- Presbyterial Discipline; a treatise discovering the late designments and courses held for advancement thereof, by Wm. Hacket, Edm. Coppinger, and Henry Arthington. 4to, Lond. 1591-2, and 8vo, 1699.
1591. 130. **Beza, Theodore**: Responsio ad Tractationem de Ministrorum Evangelii gradibus ab Hadriano Saraviâ editam. 1592.
131. — De diversis Ministrorum gradibus, contra Saraviam. Geneva, 1594.
1593. 132. **Bancroft, Richard**: A Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline, containing the beginnings, success, parts, proceedings, authority, and doctrine of it; with some of the manifold and material repugnances, varieties, and uncertainties in that behalf. Faithfully gathered by way of historical narration out of the books and writings of principal favorers of that Platform. 4to. Lond. 1593.
133. — Dangerous Positions and Proceedings published and practised within this Island of Britain, under pretence of Reformation, and for the Presbyterial Discipline. 4to. Lond. 1595. Reprinted, as also the *Survey*, etc., in 1663. Lond. 4to.
134. **Bilson, Thomas**: The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church. 4to, pp. 414, black letter. London, 1693. Reprinted in 1610; in Latin, 1611. New ed., Oxford; 8vo, 1842.
1594. 135. **Hooker, Richard**: Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Four Books. Fol. Lond. 1594. Book V., 1597; Books VI. and VIII., 1648; Book VII., 1662. See Preface to Keble's edition, 4 vols. 8vo, 1836; 3 vols. 8vo, 1841, Lond. 3d edit., 3 vols. 8vo, Oxf. 1845. Ed. Hanbury, 3 vols. 8vo, Lond. 1830.
- 135 a. **Pithou**: Les Libertes de l'Eglise Gallicane. Paris, 1594.
1598. 136. **Rainolds, John**: Judgment concerning Episcopacy, whether it be God's ordinance. In a letter to Sir Francis Knollys, Sept. 19, 1598. Lond. 1641.
137. — Apologia Thesium de Sacra Scriptura et Ecclesia. Lond. 1602. 8vo.
138. **Sutcliffe, Matthew**: De Pontifice Romano, ejusque injustissima in Ecclesia dominatione, adversus Robertum Bellarminum, et universum Jesuitarum sodalitium, Libri V. 4to. Lond. 1599.
1600. 139. — De Vera Christi Ecclesiâ contra Bellarminum. 4to. Lond. 1600.
140. **Field, Richard**: Of the Church. Four Books. 4to. Lond. 1606. Book V., 4to, 1610; with an Appendix in three parts. *Second* edition: Five Books, very much enlarged in the III. Book, and in the Appendix. Fol. Oxford, 1628. *Third* edition: Oxf. 1635. Fol. Reprinted by Eccl. Hist. Soc., 4 vols. 8vo. Camb. 1847-52, and London, 1854.
1604. 141. **Cosin, Richard**: Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Politeia in Tabulas digesta. Fol. Lond. 1604. Editio ultima, prioribus longè emendatior; cui insuper de novo præfigitur succincta authoris eruditissimi vitæ narratio. Fol. Oxon. 1684.
1605. 142. **Morton, Thomas**: Apologia Catholica de Notis Ecclesiæ. 4to. Lond. 1605. The author, afterward Bishop of Durham, drew up, by command of Charles I., the famous Book of Sports.

1605. 143. *Bradshaw, William*: English Puritanism, containing the main opinions of the rigidest sort of those that went by that name in the realm of England. Lond. 1605.
144. *Ames, William*: *Puritanismus Anglicanus, sive præcipua dogmata eorum qui inter vulgo dictos Puritanos in Anglia rigidiores habentur.* 8vo. Frankfort, 1610. Also, 4to, Lond. 1641. This is a translation of the work last named. There is an abstract of it in Neal's Hist. of the Puritans.
1607. 145. *The Authority* of the Church in making Canons and Constitutions concerning things indifferent. Lond. 1607. Oxford, 1634.
1608. 146. *Bernard, Richard*: Christian Advertisements and Counsels of Peace. Also Dissuasions from the Separatists' Schism, commonly called Brownisme, etc. Lond. 1608.
147. *Ainsworth, Henry*: Counterpoysion. 4to. 1608. In reply to Bernard.
148. *Smyth, John*: Parallels, Censures, and Observations. 4to. 1609. Also in answer to Bernard.
149. *Knollys, Sir Francis*: Treatise against the Usurpation of the Papal Bishops. 8vo. Lond. 1608. Ascribed by some, says Wood, to Rainolds.
150. *White, John*: The Way to the True Church; wherein the principal motives persuading to Romanism, and Questions touching the nature and authority of the Church and Scriptures, are familiarly disputed, and driven to their issues, where, this day, they stick between the Papists and us, etc. 4to. Lond. 1608, and 1610. De hoc inter nos questio versatur, utrum apud nos, an apud illos, vera ecclesia sit. *Augustin.* De Unitate Ecclesiæ, c. ii. Fifth ed., together with a Defence of the *Way to the True Church*, against A. D. his Reply; and The Orthodox Faith and Way to the Church explained and justified: in answer to a Popish treatise, entitled *White dyed Black.* By FRANCIS WHITE, D.D., elder brother of JOHN WHITE. The three works in one volume, folio, Lond. 1624. This volume is a fair sample of the best theological writing of the beginning of the 17th century: it is at once thoroughly evangelical and thoroughly learned; its argumentation severely logical, clear, and convincing.
1609. 151. *Peury, John*: The History of Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, etc., applied to the Prelacy, Ministry, and Church Assemblies of England. Lond. 1609.
1610. 152. *Bernard, Richard*: Plain Evidences: the Church of England is apostolical; the Separation schismatical; directed against Mr. Ainsworth the Separatist, and Mr. Smyth the Se-Baptist: both of them severally opposing the booke called "The Separatists' Schism." Lond. 1610.
153. *Robinson, John*: A Justification of Separation from the Church of England: against Mr. Richard Bernard his Invective, intituled The Separatists' Schisme. 4to. s. l. 1610.
154. — Apologia Christianorum dictorum Brownistarum ac Barrowistarum. 1619. Eng. transl. 1625 and 1644: Just and Necessary Apology

- of certain Christians, etc. *Works*, vol. ii., and vol. iii., pp. 4-83. 12mo. Lond. 1851.
1610. 155. **Morton, Thomas**: Defence of the Innocency of the three Ceremonies of the Church of England, viz., Surplice, Cross after Baptism, and kneeling at the Sacrament. 4to. Lond. 1610.
- 155 a. **Stephanus, Matthias**: Tractatus de Jurisdictione. 4to. Franco. 1611.
1612. 156. **Becanus, Martin**: Dissidium Anglicanum de Primatu Regis cum brevi Prefatione ad Catholicos in Anglia degentes. 12mo. Mogunt. 1612. Assailing the Anglican dogma of the royal supremacy. Answered by
157. **Harris, Richard**: Concordia Anglicana de Primatu Ecclesiæ regio, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1612. In English, with additions, 4to, 1614.
158. **Salmeron, Alphonso**: De Ecclesiæ nascentis exordiis, et in Acta Apostolorum. *Opera*, Vol. XII. Fol. Col. Ag. 1612.
1613. 159. **Mason, Francis**: Of the Consecration of the Bishops of the Church of England; with their Succession, Jurisdiction, etc., as also of the Ordination of Priests and Deacons. Fol. Lond. 1613. Latin translation: *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, sive de legitimo ejusdem ministerio; id est, de Episcoporum Successione, Consecratione, Electione, et Confirmatione; item de Presbyterorum et Diaconorum Ordinatione, Libri V. Editio secunda, priore Anglicanâ longè auctior et emendatior.* Fol., 1625, Lond., and 1638. Of this an Eng. transl., with additions, was published in 1728, "by John Lindsay, a priest of the Church of England." Folio. Lond. Reprinted 1734. Appended is a Sermon of Dr. Mason's concerning the Authority of the Church in making Canons and Constitutions concerning things indifferent.
160. **Champney, Anthony**: Treatise on the Vocation of Bishops and other ecclesiastical Ministers, proving the Ministers of the pretended Reformed Churches to have no Calling. 4to. Douay, 1616. Latin translation: *Tractatus de Vocatione Ministrorum, etc.* 1618. In reply to Mason.
161. **Usher, James**: Gravissimæ Questiones de Christianarum Ecclesiarum in Occidentis præsertim partibus, ab apostolicis temporibus ad nostram usque ætatem, continuâ successione et statu, Historica Explicatio. 4to. Lond. 1613. Reprinted at Hanover, 8vo, 1658. Greatly enlarged in a new edition: *Opus integrum ab auctore auctum et recognitum.* Fol. Lond. 1687; together with his *Antiquities of the British Churches.* *Works*, vol. ii., pp. 1-415. 8vo. Dubl. 1847, sq. Replied to by Usher's uncle, Rd. Stanihurst.
162. **Stanihurst, Richard**, Hiberni Dubliniensis: Brevis Premonitio pro futurâ concertatione cum Jacobo Usserio, qui in suâ historicâ explicatione conatur probare Pontificem Romanum (legitimum in terris Christi Vicarium) verum et germanum Anti-Christum. 8vo. Douay, 1615. This was designed as a prelude to a larger work, which never appeared. Usher's book, presented by Abp. Abbott to King James I. as "the eminent first-fruits of the University of Dublin," was greeted with the warmest praise by contemporary scholars.
163. **Parker, Robert**: De Politeia Ecclesiastica Christi, et hierar-

chica opposita, libri tres. In quibus tam veræ disciplinæ fundamenta; quam omnes ferè de eadem controversia, summo cum iudicio et doctrina methodicè pertractantur. 4to. Francf. 1616.

1613. 164. **Perkins, William:** Exposition of the Creed: *The Holy Catholic Church*. Works. Vol. i., pp. 123–328. Fol. Lond. 1616.

165. **Bradshaw, William:** Unreasonableness of the Separation made apparent by an Examination of Mr. Johnson's pretended "Reasons," published anno 1608. 4to. Dort. 1614.

1617. 166. **De Dominis, Mark Antony:** De Republica Ecclesiastica. Part I. Fol. Lond. 1617. Written to prove that the Pope of Rome has no supremacy over other Bishops. Part II. was published in 1620. Fol. Lond. Part III. in 1622. Folio. Hanov.

167. **Smith, Richard:** De Auctore et Essentiâ Protestanticæ Ecclesiæ et Religionis. Lib. II. Svo. Paris, 1619. Eng. transl. Svo. 1621.

1618. 168. **Calderwood, David:** De Regimine Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ brevis relatio. Lond. 1618.

168 a. **Bellarmino:** De Potestate Romani Pontificis. Roma. 1618.

1620. 169. **Spotswoode, John:** Refutatio Libelli de Regimine Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ. Lond. 1620. In reply to Calderwood.

1621. 170. **Calderwood, David:** The Altar of Damascus, or the Pattern of the English Hierarchie and Church Policie obruded upon the Church of Scotland. Svo. 1621. Without author's name or place of publication. In rejoinder to Spotswoode. In Latin, greatly enlarged: *Altare Damascenum, seu Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Politia Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ obrusa*, etc. Studio et operâ Davidis Calderwood. 4to. 1623. Best ed. 4to. Lugd. Bat. 1708.

1622. 171. **Ames, William:** Reply to Bishop Morton's Defence of the three Ceremonies. Lond. 1620.

172. — Fresh Suit against Roman Ceremonies in God's Worship, or a Triplication to Dr. Burgess's Rejoinder for Dr. Morton. 4to. Lond.

1633. In reply to

173. **Burgess, John:** The lawfulness of kneeling in receiving the Lord's Supper. Lond. 1631.

1624. 174. **Abbot, George:** A Treatise of the perpetual Visibility and Succession of the True Church in all ages. 4to. Lond. 1624. Without author's name.

1625. 175. **Crakanthorp, Richard:** Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, contra M. Antonii de Dominis, D. Archiepiscopi Spalatensis injurias: Viri omni virtute, doctrinâque spectatissimi, D. Rich. Crakanthorp, S. T. D. Opus posthumum. 4to. Lond. 1625. Reprinted in *Libr. Anglo-Cath. Theol.* Svo, Oxon. 1847. "No book I have yet seen," says Bishop Barlow, "has so rational and short an account of almost all popish controversies." "Held for the most exact piece of controversy," says Wood, "since the Reformation."

1626. 176. **Jackson, Thomas:** A Treatise of the Holy Catholic Faith and Church. Lond. 1626. *Works*, 3 vols., fol., Lond. 1673. Vol. iii., pp. 811–963. A new edit., 12 vols., Svo, Oxf. 1844. Vol. xii., pp. 1–345. Reprinted

also in *Two Treatises* on the Church, etc., ed. by W. GOODE. 16mo, Lond. 1843; Phila. 1844. Jackson is pronounced by Dr. Pusey "one of the best and greatest minds our Church has nurtured."

1626. 177. **Morinus, John**: *Exercitationes Ecclesiasticæ. De Patriarcharum et Primatum origine, primisque orbis terrarum ecclesiasticis divisionibus.* 4to. Paris, 1626. Republished, editio nova, tertia parte auctior, fol. Paris, 1686.

1628. 178. **Blondel, David**: *Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus Vapulantes.* 4to. Genevæ, 1628. Exposing the spuriousness of the pretended Decretals against the Jesuit, TURRIEN. Blondel is, perhaps, most extensively known by his Treatise entitled, *Familier Eclaircissement de la Question, si une Femme a été assise au siège Papal de Rome, entre Léon IV. et Benoist III.* 8vo. Amsterd. 1647. New ed. enlarged and corrected, 1649. Latin transl. by Curcellæus: *De Joanne Papissâ, etc.* 8vo. Amsterd. 1657.

179. **Ames, William**: *Bellarminus Enervatus, sive Disputationes Anti-Bellarminianæ, a Gulielmo Amesio, S. S. Theol. Doct. in Acad. Franck.* 4 vols. 32mo (in 2), Amstel. 1627-8. *Opera*, 5 vols. 12mo, Amst. 1658. Vol. I., Lib. iii. Vol. II., Lib. i.-iii. In *Confutation of Bellarmine: De Controversiis.* Ames adhered to the rigid views of his master, Perkins.

1629. 180. **Gerhard, John**: *Loci Communes Theologici X.* vol. fol. Jena, 1629; Geneva, 1639. Vol. V., *De Ecclesiâ.* Vol. VI., *De Ministerio Ecclesiastico.*

181. **Forbes, John**: *Irenicum pro Ecclesia Scotiana.* Aberd. 1629, 4to. *Opera*, 2 vol. fol., Amst. 1703.

1631. 182. **Daillé, John**: *De l'Employ des Pères.* Genevæ, 1631. Eng. translation: *A Treatise concerning the right Use of the Fathers in Matters of Controversy.* 4to. Lond. 1651. Re-edited, 8vo, Lond. 1841. In Latin, enlarged by the author: *JOANNIS DALLÆI de usu Patrum ad Definienda Religionis capita, quæ sunt hodie controversa.* 4to. Genevæ, 1654. Daillé was preceded in this inquiry by DANIEL TOUSSAINT.

183. **Tossanus, D.**: *Synopsis de Patribus, quantum eis deferendum, quo tempore vixerint, quâ cum cautione legendi, quæque eorum dotes et nævi fuerint.* 4to. Heidelb. 1603.

184. **Scrivener, Matthew**: *Apologia pro Sanctis Ecclesiæ Patribus adversus Jo. Dallæum.* Lond. 1672. A critique is also found in Reeves' *Dissertation on the right Use of the Fathers*, prefixed to his translation of Justin M., Lond. 1709.

185. **Blunt, J. J.**: *The right Use of the early Fathers.* Lond. 1857. "Largely polemical against the depreciation of the Fathers by Daillé," whose errors are fairly exposed.

186. **Davenant, John**: *Determinationes Questionum quarundam theologicarum.* Fol. Cantab. 1634. Second ed. enlarged, 1634. Transl. by Allport, 8vo, Lond. 1844-46. Vol. II., p. 365, quest. xxviii.; p. 400, quest. xxxv.; p. 437, quest. xlii.; p. 474, quest. xlvi.; p. 479, quest. xlvii.

186 a. **Canne, John**: *Necessity of Separation from the Church of England.* Amst., 8vo, 1834; Lond., 8vo, 1849.

1631. 187. **Gillespie, George**: Dispute against the English Popish Ceremonies obruded upon the Church of Scotland. 4to. Edinb. 1637.
188. — The Rights and Liberties of the Church Asserted and Vindicated against the pretended Right and Usurpation of Patronage. Edinb. 1639.
189. **Maxwell, John**: Episcopacie not abjured in Scotland. Lond. 1640. The author was Bishop of Ross in Scotland; afterward of Killala, Ireland.
1640. 190. **Hall, Joseph**: Episcopacie by Divine Right asserted. In three Parts, 4to, Lond. 1640. Reprint, 8vo, Lond. 1808. *Works*, vol. x., 8vo, Oxford, 1837-9.
191. — An humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament. 4to. Lond. 1640.
192. — A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance against Smectymnus. 4to. Lond. 1641.
193. — A short Answer to the tedious Vindication of Smectymnus. 4to. Lond. 1641.
194. — A modest Offer of some meet Considerations tendered to the Assembly of Divines concerning Church Government. 4to. Lond. 1644, and 1660.
1641. 195. **Smectymnus**: An Answer to a Book entituled "An Humble Remonstrance;" in which the original of Liturgy and Episcopacy is discussed, and queries propounded concerning both. The parity of bishops and presbyters in Scripture demonstrated. The occasion of their imparity in antiquity discovered. The disparity of the ancient and our modern bishops manifested. The antiquity of ruling elders in the Church vindicated. The prelatical Church bounded. 4to, pp. 104. Lond. 1641. The pseudonym in the title is composed of the united initials of the authors' names, viz., Stephen Marshall, Edm. Calamy, Thos. Young, Matt. Newcomen, William Spurstow.
196. — A Vindication of the Answer to the Humble Remonstrance from the unjust imputations of frivolousness and falsehood, wherein the Cause of Liturgy and Episcopacy is further debated. 4to. Lond. 1641.
- 197-202. **A Collection of Tracts**, entituled Certain brief Treatises written by divers learned men, concerning the Ancient and Modern Government of the Church: wherein both the primitive institution of Episcopacy is maintained, and the lawfulness of the ordination of the Protestant ministers beyond the seas likewise defended. 4to. Oxford, 1641. This volume contains six Dissertations, entituled respectively: 1. A Summary View of the Government both of the Old and the New Testament, whereby the Episcopal government of Christ's Church is vindicated out of the rude draughts of Lancelot Andrews, late Bishop of Winchester. 2. The Original of Bishops and Metropolitans, briefly laid down by Martin Bucer, John Reynolds, and James, Archbishop of Armagh. 3. A Disquisition touching proconsular Asia and its Seven Churches, by Archbishop Usher. 4. A Declaration of the Patriarchal Government of the Ancient Church, by Edw. Brerewood.

5. A brief Declaration of the several Forms of Government received in the Reformed Churches beyond the seas; by John Duree. 6. The Lawfulness of the Ordination of the Ministers of those Churches, maintained against the Donatists; by Francis Mason.

1641. 203. **Usher, James**: Dr. Raynolds his Judgment touching the Original of Episcopacy more largely Confirmed out of Antiquity. 4to. Lond. 1641.

204. **Milton, John**: Of Reformation touching Church Discipline in England, and the Causes that hitherto have hindered it. In two Books. 4to. Lond. 1641.

205. — Of Prelatical Episcopacy, and whether it may be deduced from the apostolical times, by virtue of those testimonies which are alleged to that purpose in some late treatises; one whereof goes under the name of James, Archbishop of Armagh. 4to. Lond. 1641.

206. — The Reason of Church Government urged against Prelaty. In two Books. 4to. Lond. 1641.

207. — Animadversions upon the Remonstrant's Defence against Smectymnuus. 4to. Lond. 1641. In reply to Bishop Hall.

208. — An Apology for Smectymnuus: against a Pamphlet called "A modest Confutation of the Animadversions." 4to. Lond. 1642.

209. **Thorndike, Herbert**: Of the Government of Churches; a Discourse pointing at the primitive Form. Camb. 1641. Reprint, Lond. 1841. *Works*, Lib. Ang.-Cath. Theol. Oxf. 1844-54.

210. **Greville, Robert, Lord Brooke**: A Discourse opening the nature of that Episcopacy which is exercised in England. Lond. 1641. The author is described by Wood as "an active man of the Long Parliament, against the prerogative, bishops, and the established discipline of the Church;" that is to say, a "thorough-going Puritan."

211. **A Rent** in the Lawn Sleeves; or Episcopacy Eclipsed, by the most happy interposition of a Parliament. Discoursed dialogue-wise between a Bishop and a Jesuit. 4to. Lond. 1641.

212. **Edwards, Thomas**: Reasons against the Independent Government of particular Congregations. 4to. Lond. 1641. The author of the *Gangrana*, and an uncompromising Presbyterian, Edwards was gibbeted by Milton, as "Shallow Edwards."

213. **Blondel, David**: *Traité historique de la Primaute en l'Eglise*. Fol. Genève, 1641. In reply to Cardinal Duperron, who had written, as early as 1620, against James I. of England, in defence of the supremacy of the Pope.

214. **Henderson, Alexander**: The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland. Henderson was a leader in the (so called) *second* Reformation of the Church of Scotland: the first reformation having been from Popery, the second was from Prelacy. He was further distinguished by the chivalry of his attempt to convert Charles I. to Presbyterianism, and, as it is reported, by the narrowness of his escape from being converted by the king to Episcopacy. A full record of the discussion is preserved in a

volume entitled, The papers which passed at Newcastle betwixt his sacred Majesty and M. Alex. Henderson, concerning the Change of Church Government, A. D. 1646. 8vo. Lond. 1649. Reprinted in Works of King Charles I., 8vo, Hague, 1649, '51; Lond. 59, '62, etc.; and in Voice of the Church, 8vo, vol. i., Lond. 1840.

1641. 215. *Gillespie, George*: Assertion of the Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland. Edinb. 1641.

216. *Petavius, Dionysius*: Dissertationum Ecclesiasticarum Libri duo, in quibus de Episcoporum dignitate et potestate, deque aliis ecclesiasticis dogmatibus disputatur. Paris, 1641.

217. — De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia Libri quinque, in quibus potissimum de Episcopis et Presbyteris, deque eorum differentia disputatur. Fol. Paris, 1641. As early as 1622 this learned Jesuit and able polemic had come forth against Salmasius, under the pseudonym of Antonius Kerckœtius Aremoricus, in a volume entitled Animadversorum liber ad Cl. Salmasii notas in Tertullianum de Pallio. This was followed (1623) by numerous replies and rejoinders, on either side, in which all moderation was laid aside; the disputants vying with each other in the violence of their invective. In this controversy the most important work from the pen of Salmasius was the following:

218. *Walonis Messalini* de Episcopis et Presbyteris, contra D. Petavium Loliolitam Dissertatio prima. Sm. 8vo. Lugd. Bat. 1641.

219. *The First* and large Petition of the City of London, etc., for a Reformation in Church Government, as also for the Abolishment of Episcopacy; with a Remonstrance thereto annexed, of the many pressures and grievances occasioned by the Bishops, and the sundry inconveniences incident to Episcopacy. The tyranny and extortion practised in ecclesiastical courts, etc. 4to. Lond. 1641.

1642. 220. *Selden, John*: Versio et Comment. ad Eutychie Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ Origines. 4to. Lond. 1642, 1656-9.

221. *Hales, John* ("the ever-memorable"): A Tract concerning Schism and Schismatics; wherein is briefly discovered the original cause of all schism. Lond. 1642. Written as early as 1636, at the request of Chillingworth. The author's Tract concerning the Power of the Keys was published, with others, in 1677.

222. *Thorndike, Herbert*: Of Religious Assemblies, and the public Service of God; a discourse according to apostolical rule and practice. Lond. 1642. *Works*, vol. ii. Oxf. 1844.

223. *Taylor, Jeremy*: Of the sacred Order and Offices of Episcopacy, by divine institution, apostolical tradition, and Catholic practice, asserted against the Acephali and the Aerians, new and old. 4to. Oxford, 1642.

224. *Heylin, Peter*: The History of Episcopacy. In two Parts. By Theophilus Churchman. 4to. Lond. 1642-3.

225. — Aerius Redivivus: or the History of the Presbyterians, from 1536 to 1647. 2d ed. Fol. Lond. 1672.

1642. 226. *Cotton, John*: The Doctrine of the Church, to which are committed the Keys of the kingdom of heaven. 4to. Lond. 1642. 2d ed. Cotton, who wrote in defence of the interference of the civil power in support of the truth, was answered by
227. *Williams, Roger*: The bloody Tenet of Persecution for the Cause of Conscience. Replied to by
228. *Cotton, John*: The bloody Tenet washed and made white in the Blood of the Lamb. 1647.
229. *Williams, Roger*: The bloody Tenet yet more bloody by Mr. Cotton's endeavor to wash it white in the Blood of the Lamb. 1652.
230. — The Way of the Churches in New England.
231. *Rutherford, Samuel*: A peaceable and temperate Plea for Paul's Presbytery in Scotland; or a modest and brotherly Dispute of the Government of the Church of Scotland, wherein our discipline is demonstrated to be the true apostolic way of divine truth. 4to. Lond. 1642. As an active member of the Westminster Assembly, Rutherford comes in for a share of Milton's undying censure, in his Poem on the New Forcers of Conscience: "Because ye have thrown off your Prelate-Lord," etc.
232. *Usher, James*: The Bishop of Armagh's Direction concerning the Liturgy and Episcopal Government. 4to. Lond. 1642, and 1660.
233. *Apollonii*: Jus Magistratûs circa Sacra; sive Tractatus Theologicus de Jure Magistratûs circa Res Ecclesiasticas. Medioburgi Zelandorum, 1642. A standard work in the Erastian controversy. The author was minister of the Dutch Church, at Middelburg, in Holland.
1644. 234. — Consideratio quarundarum Controversiarum ad Regimen Ecclesiæ Dei spectantium, quæ in Angliæ Regno hodie agitantur. Lond. 1644. Eng. translation, A Consideration of certain Controversies, etc. Lond. 1645.
235. *Edwards, Thomas*: Antapologia, etc., wherein are handled many of the controversies of these times; viz., 1. Of a particular Visible Church. 2. Of Classes and Synods. 3. Of the Scriptures, how far a rule for Church Government. 4. Of Forms of Prayer, etc., etc. 4to. Lond. 1644.
236. *Chillingworth, William*: The apostolical Institution of Episcopacy. This tract, first published separately under this title, in 1644, without the author's name, first appeared in 1641, as an Appendix to Bishop Morton's Judgment of Protestant Divines in behalf of the Episcopal Degree in the Church; a volume published without the compiler's name, by Archbishop USHER, under the title of Confessions and Proofs of Protestant Divines of Reformed Churches; that Episcopacy is, in respect of the office, according to the word of God, and in respect to the use, the best; the editor adding his own treatise, Of the Original of Bishops, etc., with his name prefixed. The tract was reprinted in 1660, together with a *Speech* of Lord Falkland concerning Episcopacy, and entitled The Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy Demonstrated.
237. *Rutherford, Samuel*: The due Right of Presbyteries; or a peaceable Plea for the Government of the Church of Scotland. 4to. Lond. 1644. Chiefly against the Independents.

1644. 238. *Rutherford, Samuel*: *Lex Rex*: A Treatise of Civil Policy concerning Prerogative. 4to. Lond. 1644.
1645. 239. *Salmasius, Claude*: *De Primatu Papæ*. Lugd. Bat. 1645. A thesaurus of patristic testimony.
240. *Mather, Richard*, and *Thomson, William*: A modest and brotherly Answer to Mr. Chas. Herle his Book against the Independency of Churches. 8vo. Lond. 1644.
241. *Baillie, Robert*: A Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time. Part I., Against the Independents and other sects. 4to. Lond. 1645. Part II., Against the Anabaptists. 4to. Lond. 1647.
1646. 242. *Blondel, David*: *Apologia pro Sententiâ Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris*. 4to. Amst. 1646. Written to prove that in the earliest times the names *Presbyter* and *Episcopus* were synonymous; presenting the argument from antiquity with a remarkable display of erudition.
243. — De Formula regnante Christo in veterum monumentis usu. 4to. Amstel. 1646.
244. *Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*; or the Divine Right of Church Government asserted, and evidenced by the Holy Scriptures. By sundry ministers of Christ within the city of London. Sm. 4to. Lond. 1646. Am. Reprint, N. Y., 1844. A thorough Exposition of the Presbyterian Scheme of Polity, as held by the fathers of Presbytery in England.
245. *Maxwell, John*: The Burthen of Issachar; or the tyrannical Power and Practices of the Presbyterian Government in Scotland; in their 1, Parochial Session; 2, Presbytery; 3, Provincial Synods; 4, General Assembly. With the Articles of Presbyterian Faith inconsistent with Monarchy. Whereby it is evident that Presbyterian fingers are heavier than Episcopal loins; these correcting with a rod, those with a scorpion. 4to. 1646, s. l.
246. *Baillie, Robert*: An historical Vindication of the Government of the Church of Scotland, etc. 4to. Lond. 1646.
247. *Taylor, Jeremy*: A Discourse concerning Prayer extempore. 4to. Lond. 1646. Without author's name. Second ed., enlarged: An Apology for authorized and set Forms of Liturgy. 8vo. Lond. 1649; 4to, '53, '57, '73.
248. *Gillespie, George*: Aaron's Rod blossoming; or, The divine Ordinances of Church Government Vindicated, etc. Published by authority. 4to. Lond. 1646. "The most able, learned, systematic, and complete work on the Erastian controversy in existence." (*Bannerman*.)
249. *Rutherford, Samuel*: The divine Right of Church Government and Excommunication. 4to. Lond. 1646. Reprinted in *The Presbyterian's Armoury*. Edinb. 1846.
1647. 250. *Seaman, Lazarus*: A Vindication of the Judgment of the Reformed Churches concerning Ordination, and Laying on of Hands. Lond. 1647. The author took a leading part in the debate on Church government with King Charles I., in the Isle of Wight.
251. *Ferne, Henry*: Episcopacy and Presbytery considered. Lond. 1647.

1648. 252. *Hooker, Thomas, and Cotton, John*: A Survey of the Sum of Church Discipline. 4to. Lond. 1648.
253. *Rutherford, Samuel*: A Survey of the Survey of that Sum of Church Discipline, penned by Thomas Hooker. Lond. 4to. Pp. 529. 1848.
254. *Way of the Churches*; against Baillie and Rutherford. Lond. 1648.
255. *Charles I.*: His Majesty's final Answer concerning Episcopacie. Delivered to the Commissioners of Parliament the first of Nov., 1648. 4to. Pp. 29. Lond. 1648.
256. *Reasons* presented by the Dissenting Brethren against certain Propositions concerning Presbyterian Government; with the Answers of the Assembly of Divines to the Reasons of the Dissenting Brethren. Lond. 1648. The argument for the Independent theory, as put forth by the Independent members of the Westminster Assembly, accompanied with an answer by the framers of the Westminster Confession.
257. "*Of the Laves* of Ecclesiastical Policy; the Sixth and Eighth Books. By RICHARD HOOKER. A work long expected, and now published according to the most authentic copies. London. Printed by R. B., and are to be sold by Geo. Badger, in St. Dunstan's Churchyard in Fleet Street. Small 4to. Pp. 226." Keble, Pref. p. xvi.: "No trace of the Seventh Book appears until 1662."
258. *Blondel, David*: De Jure Plebis in regimine ecclesiastico. 8vo. Paris, 1648. Published as a Supplement to an edition of the work following:
259. *Grotius, Hugo*: De imperio summarum potestatum circa Sacra. *Opera*, vol. iii., pp. 203-297. Fol. Lond. 1679.
1649. 260. *Thorndike, Herbert*: A Discourse of the Right of the Church in a Christian State. Lond. 1649.
261. *Mestrezat, Jean*: Traité de l'Eglise. Geneve, 1649. The author was a learned minister of the French Reformed Church at Charenton.
262. *Bramhall, John* (Bishop of Derry): A fair Warning to take heed of Scotch Discipline, as being of all others most injurious to the civil magistrate, most oppressive to the subject, most pernicious to both. 4to. Lond. 1649.
263. *A Vindication* of the Presbyterian Government and Ministry. By the Ministers and Elders met in Provincial Assembly. Nov. 1649.
1650. 264. *Thorndike, Herbert*: Two Discourses; the one of the Primitive Government of the Churches, the other of the Service of God at the Assemblies of the Church. Lond. 1650.
265. *Calamy, Edmund*: A Vindication of Presbyterian Government. Lond. 1650.
1651. 266. *Charles I.*: Reliquiæ Sacræ Carolinæ; or the Works of King Charles I. collected together and digested in order, etc. 8vo. Hague, 1651. ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΑ. Larger ed., 2 vols., fol., Lond. 1662. Second ed., fol., Lond. 1687, pp. 611-647 — Papers which passed between the King and the Divines which attended the commissioners of the two Houses at the treaty

of Newport, concerning Church Government. This is the fuller and more careful discussion of the two held by the king with the Presbyterian ministers. (1648.) The first discussion (1646) is preserved in "Papers which passed between his Majesty and Mr. Alexander Henderson, concerning the Change of Church Government, at Newcastle." *Ibid.*, pp. 75-90. At this the king was unassisted; at the later, he had the assistance of Usher, Sanderson, Sheldon, and Duppa.

1651. 267. *Hammond, Henry*: *Dissertationes Quatuor, quibus Episcopatus Jura ex S. Scripturâ et Primævâ Antiquitate adstruuntur, contra sententiam D. Blondelli et aliorum.* 4to. Lond. 1651.

268. — Considerations of present use touching the Danger resulting from the Change of our Church Government. 4to. Oxford, 1644 and 1646.

269. — A View of the New Directory, and Vindication of the Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England. 4to. Oxf. 1645.

270. — Of the Power of the Keys; or of binding and loosing. 4to. Lond. 1647, and 1651.

271. — Of Schism; or, a Defence of the Church of England against the Exceptions of the Romanists. 12mo. Lond. 1653.

272. *Hobbes, Thomas*: *Leviathan*; or, the Matter, Form, and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil. Fol. Lond. 1651. Part III., chap. xxxix.-xliii. Part IV., chap. xlv.-xlvii. *Works*, 16 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1839, vol. iii.

273. *Ferne, Henry*: *Certain Considerations of present concernment touching the Reformed Church of England, against Ant. Champney, Dr. of the Sorbonne.* 12mo. Lond. 1653.

274. *Gauden, John*: *Hieraspistes*; a Defence by way of Apology, for the Ministry and Ministers of the Church of England, etc. 4to. Lond. 1653.

1654. 275. *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*; or, The Divine Right of the Gospel Ministry; published by the Provincial Assembly of London.

276. Part II.: *Jus Divinum Ministerii Anglicani*; or, The Divine Right of the Ministry of England. Lond. 1654.

277. *Hammond, Henry*: A Vindication of the Dissertations concerning Episcopacy from the Exceptions of the London Ministers, in their *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici.* 4to. Lond. 1654.

278. — Answer to the Animadversions on the Dissertations touching Ignatius's Epistles, and the Episcopacy in them asserted. 4to. Lond. 1654.

279. *Wood, James*: A little Stone, pretended to be out of the Mountain, tried, and found to be a Counterfeit. 1654. In reply to "A Stone cut out of the Mountain: a Lecture-Sermon preached at Edinburgh concerning the matter of a Visible Church," by Nicholas Lockyer, who was the first to introduce the Independent theory into Scotland. (1651.)

280. *Smith, Richard*: *Brief Survey of the Lord of Derry (Bramhall) his Treatise of Schism.* 8vo. Paris, 1655.

1655. 281. *Ferne, Henry*: A compendious Discourse upon the Case as it

stands between the Church of England and of Rome, on the one hand; and again, between the same Church of England and those Congregations which have divided from it, on the other. 12mo. Lond. 1655.

1655. 282. **Morinus, John**: *Commentarius de Sacris Ecclesiæ Ordinationibus Secundum Antiquos et Recentiores Latinos, Græcos, Syros, et Babylonios*. Fol. Paris, 1655. Best edit. Antwerp. Fol. 1675. *Opera*, 5 vols. 4to. Romæ, 1756.

283. — *Exercitationes Ecclesiasticæ et Biblicæ, de Patriarcharum et Primatum Origine, etc.* Fol. Paris, 1669. Originally printed in 4to, Paris, 1626.

1656. 284. **Usher, James**: *The Reduction of Episcopacy into the Form of Synodical Government received in the Ancient Church*. Lond. 1656. Reprinted, 1660. This volume sets forth a proposal to combine the advantages of the Episcopal and the Presbyterian scheme of polity. The plan (first proposed in 1641) contemplated the establishment of a parochial government in a body to be composed of the clergymen, churchwardens, etc.; the institution of chorepiscopi, in every rural deanery, to hold monthly assemblies, who should also be subject to the power of the diocesan synod, and this to the provincial or national Convocation. How near this scheme approaches to the constitution of our American Episcopal Church need not be pointed out.

1657. 285. **Heylin, Peter**: *Ecclesia Vindicata; or, The Church of England Justified*. 1. In the Way and Manner of her Reformation. 2. In Officiating by a Public Liturgy. 3. Set Forms before Sermons. 4. Tithes. 5. Episcopal Government. 6. Ordination of Priests and Deacons. 4to. Lond. 1657.

286. **Collinges, John**: *Vindicatæ Ministerii Evangelici Revindicatæ; or, The Preacher (pretendedly) sent back again, to bring a better account who sent him, and learn his errand; by way of reply to a late book, called Vindicatæ Ministerii Evangelici, etc.* 4to, pp. 134. Lond. 1658.

287. **Bramhall, John**: *The Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops Justified; the Bishop of Duresme (Morton) Vindicated; and that infamous fable of the Ordination at the Nag's Head, clearly confuted*. Lond. 1657. *Works*, 1677. Fol. Lond. Also, 5 vols., 8vo, Oxford, 1842-5. Vol. 3, pp. 3-241.

1659. 288. **Stillingfleet, Edward**: *Irenicum; a Weapon Salve for the Church's Wounds; or the Divine Right of particular Forms of Church Government discussed and examined according to the principles of the law of Nature, the positive laws of God, the practice of the Apostles, and the primitive Church, and the judgment of Reformed Divines. Whereby a foundation is laid for the Church's peace, and the accommodation of our present differences. Humbly tendered to consideration*. 4to. Lond. 1659. Reprinted, in 1662, with an Appendix: *The Power of Excommunication in a Christian State*. 8vo. Philada. 1842. *Works*, vol. ii., pp. 147-439. Fol. Lond. 1710.

289. **Pearson, John**: *An Exposition of the Creed*. 4to. Lond. 1659.

Enlarged, fol., Lond. 1662, 1659, 1682 — author's last edition. On Art. IX., The Holy Catholic Church.

1661. 290. **Bramhall, John**: A just Vindication of the Church of England from the unjust aspersion of criminal schism. Wherein the nature of criminal schism, the divers sorts of schismatics, the liberties and privileges of national Churches, the rights of sovereign magistrates, the tyranny, extortion, and schism of the Roman Court, with the grievances, complaints, and opposition of all princes and states of the Roman communion of old, and at this very day, are manifested to the view of the world. 8vo. Lond. 1661. In this work proof is furnished of the facts following: 1. That the separation of the Anglican Church from the Church of Rome was not made by Protestants, but by Romanists. 2. That the British Churches were ever, for the first six hundred years, exempted from all foreign jurisdiction; and had both sufficient authority and sufficient grounds to withdraw from Rome.

291. — A Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon's (Rd. Smith) Survey of the Vindication of the Church of England from criminous schism, clearing the English from the aspersion of cruelty. 8vo. Lond. 1666.

292. — Schism Guarded and Beaten back upon the Right Owners. 8vo. Lond. 1658. Showing that our great controversy about papal power is not a Question of Faith, but of interest and profit, not with the Church of Rome, but with the Court of Rome; wherein the true controversy doth consist, who were the first innovators, when and where these papal innovations first began in England, with the opposition that was made against them. This is an answer to a book entitled *Schism Dispatched by S. W.* (Wm. Sergeant.) Its leading object is to prove that the Pope has no legislative or judiciary power in England. As the name of Bramhall is often associated with that of Laud, as a supporter of high prerogative in Church and State, it would seem but just to his reputation to advert to the moderation of his views on a point of present interest. In giving orders to some Scottish presbyters who had received presbyterial ordination, he inserted in the formula the words following: *Non annihilantes priores ordines (si quos habuit)*, etc. "Not annulling his prior orders (if he had any), nor determining the validity or invalidity of the same; much less condemning all the holy orders of foreign churches, which we leave to the proper judge; but merely supplying whatever, as required by the canons of the Anglican Church, was previously lacking, and providing for the peace of the Church, that occasion of schism may be removed, and the consciences of the faithful satisfied; and that none may doubt concerning his ordination, or question the validity of his presbyterial acts." *Works*. Fol. Dublin, 1677. Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol., 5 vols. 8vo. Oxf. 1842-5.

293. **Sanderson, Robert**: The Divine Right of the Episcopate not Prejudicial to the Supreme Authority of the Civil Ruler. 8vo. Lond. 1661, 1673, 1683. Reprinted in *Tracts of the Anglican Fathers*, vol. i., p. 253. Otherwise entitled: Episcopacy, as established by law in England, not Prejudicial to the Regal Power.

294. **Bernard, Richard**: Clavi Trabales; or, Nails Fastened by

some great Masters of Assemblies, confirming the King's Supremacy, and Church Government under Bishops. I. Two Speeches of the late Lord Primate Ussher's—the one of the King's Supremacy; the other of the Duty of Subjects, etc. II. His Judgment and Practice in point of Loyalty, Episcopacy, Liturgy, and Constitutions of the Church of England. III. Mr. Hooker's Judgment of the King's Power in Matters of Religion, Advancement of Bishops, etc. IV. Bishop Andrews of Church Government, etc. V. A Letter of Dr. Hadrian Saravia's, of the like Subjects. Unto which is added a Sermon of Regal Power and the Novelty of the Doctrine of Resistance. With a Preface by Bishop Sanderson. Edited by Dr. Rich. Bernard. Lond. 1661.

1662. 295. *Hooker, Richard*: Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity—the SEVENTH Book, now first published, in a volume entitled, The Works of Mr. Rd. Hooker—vindicating the Church of England as truly Christian and duly reformed. In Eight Books of Ecclesiastical Polity. Now completed, as with the Sixth and Eighth, so with the Seventh, etc., out of his own manuscripts, never before published. With an account of his life, etc. By Dr. John Gauden, now Bishop of Exeter, etc. Folio. Lond. 1662.

296. *Hildebrand, Joachim*: Exercitationes de Episcopis. Helmst. 4to. 1662. Ed. 2, 1700.

297. *Owen, John*: A Discourse concerning Liturgies, and their imposition. Lond. 1662.

298. *Durel, John*: A View of the Government and Public Worship of God in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas; wherein is showed their conformity and agreement with the Church of England. 4to. Lond. 1662. Abridged, 8vo, Lond. 1705. This book excited a bitter controversy. In reply to his assailants, the author, seven years later, published the work next named.

299. — A Vindication of the Church of England against the unjust and impudent Accusations of the Schismatics. 4to. Lond. 1669. Published also in Latin: Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ adversus iniquas atque inverecundas Schismaticorum Criminationes, Vindicatæ.

300. *Hickman, Henry*: Apologia pro Ministris in Anglia (vulgo) Nonconformistis, anno 1662, Aug. 24 die, Bartholomæo dicto, ejectis. Adversus argutiolas putidasque calumnias Durelli, etc. Printed probably at Leyden, 1664.

301. — Bonasus Vapulans; or some Castigations given to Mr. John Durel for fouling himself and others in his English and Latin book. 8vo. Lond. 1672. Reprinted, in 1676, under the title, The Nonconformists Vindicated from the Abuses put upon them by Mr. Durel and Mr. Scrivener. The *Vindicatæ* was answered also in the volume next named.

302. *Dumoulin, Louis*: Patronus bonæ Fidei in causa Puritanorum, contra Hierarchos Anglos, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1672. Durel's *View*, etc., which occasioned this embittered dispute, was written to show the agreement subsisting between the foreign Reformed Churches and the Church of England, in regard to ceremonies, subordination of pastors, forms of prayer,

holy-days, fast-days, magnificent churches, organs, surplice, church-ornaments, cross in baptism, kneeling at communion, etc. An Appendix contains a letter to the author from the famous Peter Du Moulin, stating that, in 1651, Archbishop Usher informed the writer that David Blondel had concluded his *Apologia pro Sententia Hieronymi* with words to this effect: "By all that we have said to assert the rights of the Presbytery, we do not intend to invalidate the ancient and apostolical constitution of Episcopal pre-eminence. But we believe that wheresoever it is established conformably to the ancient canons, it must be carefully preserved; and wheresoever by some heat of contention, or otherwise, it hath been put down, or violated, it ought to be reverently restored." But Blondel's book having been written at the instance of the Westminster Assembly, the agents of that body, then at Paris, prevailed upon the author to suppress the concluding passage above quoted, and hence it does not appear in the published work. (Biog. Brit., DUREL.)

1662. 303. *Leugar*: Erastus Senior. 12mo. Lond. 1662. Against the Anglican form of ordination.

303 a. *De Marca*: De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii. Paris, 1663.

1668. 304. *Sanderson, Robert*: A Discourse concerning the Church in these particulars: 1. Concerning the Visibility of the True Church. 2. Concerning the Church of Rome, etc. 4to. Lond. 1668.

305. *Claudii Fonteji* (a pseudonym for Jacques Boileau): De antiquo Presbyterorum Jure in regimine Ecclesiæ. 8vo. Taurin. 1668. 2d ed. 1678. The author was "a celebrated theologian of the Parisian school."

306. *Philippi Rovenii*, Reipublicæ Christianæ Libri duo, tractantes de variis hominum statibus, gradibus, officiis, et functionibus in Ecclesia Christi. 4to. Antw. 1668.

1669. 307. *Scrivener, Matthew*: Actio in Schismaticos Anglicanos, etc. 4to. Lond. 1669. Printed at the end of Durel's Sanctæ Eccles. Anglic., etc.

1670. 308. *Morton, Thomas*: *Επισκοπος Αποστολικος*; or, The Episcopacy of the Church of England Justified, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1670.

309. *Parker, Samuel*: A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity; wherein the authority of the civil magistrate over the consciences of subjects in matters of external religion is asserted, and the mischiefs and inconveniences of toleration are represented, and all pretences pleaded in behalf of liberty of conscience are fully answered. 8vo, pp. 326. Lond. 1670. Without the author's name.

310. *Owen, John*: Truth and Innocence Vindicated; in a Survey of a Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity, etc. 8vo, pp. 410. Lond. 1670. In reply to Parker, (afterward, 1686, Bishop of Oxford,) who had represented the views of the Nonconformists as incompatible with the security of the government, for which he claimed the most exorbitant powers in all things, both civil and religious.

311. *Parker, Samuel*: A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Polity. 8vo. Lond. 1671. In rejoinder to Owen.

1672. 312. **Parker, Samuel**: A Preface to a posthumous work of Archbishop Bramhall, entitled, A Vindication of himself and the Episcopal Clergy from the Presbyterian Charge of Popery, as it is managed by Mr. Baxter in his Treatise of the Grotian Religion. 4to. Lond. 1672.
313. **Marvell, Andrew**: The Rehearsal Transposed; or, Animadversions upon a late book, entitled, *A Preface*, showing what grounds there are of fears and jealousies of Popery. 12mo. Lond. 1672. Without author's name. In this witty piece of satire, Parker figures under the character of Bayes, borrowed from *The Rehearsal*, a popular farce, ascribed to the Duke of Buckingham (1671). Hence the title, *The Rehearsal Transposed*—i. e., *turned out of Verse into Prose*, as the author himself explains it: "Putting verse into prose should be called *transprosing*."\* Act 1.
314. **Parker, Samuel**: A Reproof of the Rehearsal Transposed, in a Discourse to its author. 8vo. Lond. 1673.
315. **Marvell, Andrew**: The Rehearsal Transposed: The Second Part. 12mo. Lond. 1673.
316. **Cave, William**: Primitive Christianity; or, the Religion of the ancient Christians in the first ages of the Gospel. 8vo. Lond. 1672. Reprinted with the Dissertation on the Government of the Ancient Church, in 1 vol. 8vo. Lond. 1849.
1675. 317. **Croft, Herbert**: The Naked Truth; or, The true State of the Primitive Church. By an humble Moderator. 4to. Lond. 1675. 2d ed., fol., 1680. Frequently reprinted. Written to show that differences among Protestants are all about matters non-essential, and ought to be adjusted in the interest of peace and unity. The names of the three publications in reply to it—Nos. 318, 320, 321—are preserved.
318. **Animadversions** on a Pamphlet called The Naked Truth, etc. 4to. Lond. 1676. Written in a tone of excessive bitterness. This was replied to in the same strain, but with superior vivacity and wit, in the book next named.
319. **Marvell, Andrew**: Mr. Smirke, or the Divine in Mode; being certain annotations upon the Animadversions, written by Dr. F. TURNER, etc., with a short historical Essay concerning General Councils, Creeds, and Impositions in matters of Religion. 4to. Lond. 1676. Reprinted in 1680, '87, '89, etc.
320. **Lex Talionis**; or, the Author of the Naked Truth stripped naked. 4to. Lond. 1676. Ascribed to Bishop Gunning, but the authorship is uncertain.
321. **A Modest Survey** of the most considerable things in a Discourse lately published, entitled, The Naked Truth. 4to. Lond. 1676. Ascribed to Bishop BURNET, on authority somewhat uncertain.
322. **Voetius, Gisbert**: *Politica Ecclesiastica*. 4 vols. 4to. Amstelodami, 1663-76. This work displays "immense theological research, as well as intellectual power. It discusses, in an exhaustive way, almost all the

\* The dictionaries—Richardson, Webster, Worcester—give the converse definition.

points connected with the power of the Church, etc., as well as the question of Church government." (*Bannerman.*)

1677. 323. *Burnet, Gilbert*: A Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England. In which it is demonstrated, that all the essentials of ordination, according to the practice of the Primitive and Greek Churches, are still retained in our Church. 8vo. Lond. 1677.

324. *Ziegler, Caspar*: De Diaconis et Diaconissis veteris Ecclesie. 4to. Viterb. 1678.

1679. 325. *Dodwell, Henry*: Separation of Churches from Episcopal Government, as practised by the present Nonconformists, proved schismatical, etc. 4to. Lond. 1679.

1680. 326. *Baxter, Richard*: True and only Way of Concord of all Christian Churches. Lond. 1680.

327. — Of an Universal Church Supremacy. Lond. 1680.

328. *Dodwell, Henry*: A Reply to Mr. Baxter's pretended Confutation. Lond. 1681.

329. *Barrow, Isaac*: A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy; and a Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church. 4to. Lond. 1680. Edited by Dr. Tillotson, three years after the author's death.

330. *Clarkson, David*: Primitive Episcopacy; evincing from Scripture and ancient records, that a bishop in the Apostles' times, and for the space of the first three centuries of the Gospel Church, was no more than a pastor to one single church. 8vo. Lond. 1680. Reprinted by the Wycliffe Soc., 8vo, Lond. 1846.

331. *Stillingfleet, Edward*: Sermon on the Mischief of Separation. (Philip. iii. 16.) Preached at Guildhall, before the magistrates and judges, May 11, 1680.

332. *Owen, John*: A brief Vindication of the Nonconformists from the Charge of Schism. 4to. Pp. 56. Lond. 1680. In reply to Stillingfleet's Sermon.

333. *Baxter, Richard*: A Second true Defence of mere Nonconformists. Lond. 1680.

334. — A Treatise of Episcopacy. Lond. 1680.

335. — A Search for the English Schismatic. 1680. These tracts are all marked by the author's characteristic sharpness.

336. *Howe, John*: A Letter written out of the country to a person of quality in the city, who took offence at the late Sermon of Dr. Stillingfleet, Dean of St. Paul's, before the Lord Mayor. Lond. 1680.

337. *Alsop, Vincent*: Mischief of Imposition. 1680.

338. *Barrett, Joseph*: The Rector of Sutton (Stillingfleet's parish when he published the Irenicum) committed with the Dean of St. Paul's; or, a Defence of Dr. S.'s Irenicum against the late Sermon. Lond. 1680.

339. *Rule, Gilbert*: An Answer to Edw. Stillingfleet's Irenicum. 8vo. Lond. 1680.

1681. 340. *Stillingfleet, Edward*: The Unreasonableness of Separation; or an impartial account of the history, nature, and pleas of the present

Separation from the communion of the Church of England, etc. 4to. Lond. 1681.

1681. 341. **Owen, John**: An Answer to the Unreasonableness of Separation, and a Defence of the Vindication of the Nonconformists from the guilt of Schism. 4to. Lond. 1681.

342. — An Inquiry into the original Nature, Institutions, Power, Order, and Communion of Evangelical Churches. 4to. Lond. 1681. Nos. 341, 342 were published in 1 vol.

343. **Clarkson, Thomas**: No Evidence of Diocesan Episcopacy in Primitive Times. 4to. Lond. 1681.

344. **Sherlock, William**: A Discourse about Church-Unity; being a defence of Dr. Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation. In answer to several late pamphlets; but principally to Dr. Owen and Mr. Baxter. 4to. Lond. 1681. Without author's name.

345. — A Continuation and Vindication of the Defence of Dr. Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation. 4to. Lond. 1682.

346. **Zimmermann, Matthew**: De Presbyteris et Presbyterissis. 4to. Annaberg, 1681.

347. **Maurice, Henry**: A Vindication of the Primitive Church and Diocesan Episcopacy; in answer to Mr. Baxter's History of Bishops. 8vo. Lond. 1682.

348. **Baxter, Richard**: Vindication of the Church of England in her Rites and Ceremonies, and Discipline, and Church Orders. As faithfully taken out of his own writings, etc. 4to. Lond. 1682. An anonymous publication.

349. **Saywell, William**: Evangelical Unity. 8vo. Lond. 1682. The author also of *Means of Union*. 4to. Lond. 1681.

1683. 350. **Claude, John**: An Historical Defence of the Reformation, in answer to a book entitled, Just Prejudices against the Calvinists. 4to. Lond. 1683. The French original appeared in the same year, at Amsterdam. "The Fourth Part is especially worthy of careful study." Reprinted in 2 vols., 8vo, Lond. 1815.

351. **Dodwell, Henry**: A Discourse concerning the one Altar and the one Priesthood insisted on by the Ancients in their Disputes against Schism. 8vo. Lond. 1683.

352. **Cave, William**: A Dissertation concerning the Government of the Ancient Church by Bishops, Metropolitans, and Patriarchs. 4to. Lond. 1683.

353. **Parker, Samuel**: An Account of the Government of the Christian Church, for the first six hundred years, particularly showing: I. The Apostolical Practice of Diocesan and Metropolitan Episcopacy. II. The Usurpation of Patriarchal and Papal Authority. III. The War of two hundred years between the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople for universal Supremacy. 8vo. Lond. 1683.

354. **Mocket, Richard**: Tractatus de Politia Ecclesie Anglicane. Fol. Lond. 1616. 2d ed., 1677, 4to; 3d ed., cui accesserunt Richardi Zouch Descriptio Juris et Judicii Ecclesiastici. 8vo. 1683. 4th ed., 1705, 8vo.

1684. 355. *Lloyd, William*: An Historical Account of Church Government as it was in Great Britain and Ireland when they first received the Christian Religion. Second edition. 8vo. Lond. 1684. Defended against the exceptions of Sir George Mackenzie by Bishop Stillingfleet in his *Origines Britannicæ*, with which work it was reprinted, in 2 vols., 8vo, Oxf. 1842, with Notes, by T. P. Pantin.
356. *Baxter, Richard*: Whether Parish Congregations be true Christian Churches. 4to. Lond. 1684.
357. *Forrester, Thomas*: Rectius Instruendum; containing a Confutation of Episcopacy, and Vindication of the Truth owned by the true Protestant and Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Edinb. 1684. The author was principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews.
1685. 358. *Dodwell, Henry*: De Jure Laicorum sacerdotale, ex sententia Tertulliani, aliorumque veterum Dissertatio, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1685.
1686. 359. *Dupin, Louis Ellies*: De antiquâ Ecclesiæ disciplina Dissertationes historicæ. 4to. Paris, 1686. This learned work treats, from the Gallican point of view, of the Church questions of leading interest in the author's day: Of Patriarchs and Metropolitans; of the form of Ecclesiastical Trials and Appeals; of Excommunication, its ground in the Ancient Church; of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff; proof that the Judgment of the Pope is not unalterable; the Authority of a General Council superior to that of the Roman Pontiff; neither the Church nor the Pope has authority over kings.
360. *Ziegler, Caspar*: De Episcopis. 4to. Jena, 1686.
1687. 361. *Puffendorf, Samuel*: De habitu Religionis Christianæ ad vitam civilem. Bremæ, 1687. This is a classical work in the controversy concerning the relation of the Church to the State.
362. *Bellarmino's* Notes of the Church Examined and Refuted. 8vo. Lond. 1687. Republished in 1738, in Vol. I. of Bishop GIBSON'S *Preservative against Popery*, 3 vols., fol., and 18 vols., 12mo, Lond. 1849. Reprinted in 1840, Lond., 8vo. A Collection of Dissertations, seventeen in number, by fifteen divines of the Church of England; among them Archbishop Tenison, Bishops Kidder, Patrick, etc., Drs. Sherlock, Clagget, Scott, etc.
363. *Barrow, Isaac*: De Potestate Clavium. De Regimine Episcopali. Treatises among the author's *Opuscula* in his collected works. Vol. IV., fol., Lond. 1687; and 8vo, Edinb. 1841.
1688. 364. *Bossuet, Jacques Benigne*: Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes. Book XV. Paris, 1688. Eng. transl., Dublin, 1836.
- 364 a. ——— Defensio declarationis celeberrimæ quam de potestate ecclesiastica sanxit clerus Gallicanus. 2 vols., 4to. Luxemb. 1730.
365. *Pearson, John*: Opera posthuma; Dissertationes duæ de serie et de successione primorum Romæ Episcoporum.
366. ——— Ordo Episcopalis et Apostolicus.
367. ——— Ordinandi potestas solis competit Episcopis.
368. ——— Ordinatio Anglicana complet totam essentiam externæ Voca-

tionis ad Ministerium. Nos. 365-8 reprinted in *Minor Theol. Works*, 2 vols., 8vo, Oxf. 1844.

1688. 369. **Turretine, Francis**: *Institutio Theologiæ Elencticæ*. Pars III., Locus xviii., De Ecclesiâ, Quest. i.-xxxiv.

370. **Owen, John**: *The true Nature of a Gospel Church and its Government*. 4to. Lond. 1688. This is the Second Part of the *Inquiry*, etc., published in 1681.

371. **Saywell, William**: *The Reformation of the Church of England Justified*. 4to. Camb. 1688.

372. **Prideaux, Humphrey**: *The Validity of the Orders of the Church of England made out against the Objections of the Romanists*. 4to. Lond. 1688. Second ed. corrected, 8vo, Lond. 1716.

373. **Rule, Gilbert**: *A rational Defence of Nonconformity*. 4to. Edinb. 1688. In reply to Stillingfleet.

374. — *A Vindication of the Church of Scotland*. 4to. Edinb. 1691.

375. — *A Defence of the Vindication*, etc. 4to. 1694.

1689. 376. **Clarkson, David**: *Discourse concerning Liturgies*. 8vo. Lond. 1689.

377. **Park, Robert**: *The Rights and Liberties of the Church asserted*. 8vo. Edinb. 1689.

378. **Dodwell, Henry**: *Dissertationes in Irenæum*, etc. 8vo. Oxon. 1689.

379. — *Dissertationes Cyprianicæ*. Folio. Lond. Sine anno.

380. — *De Jure Laicorum sacerdotale, ex sententiâ Tertulliani aliorumque veterum Dissertatio*. 8vo. Lond. 1685.

381. — *De nupero Schismate Anglicano parænesis ad Exteros, tam reformatos quam etiam pontificios, quâ, jura Episcoporum vetera, eorundemque à magistratu seculari independentia omnibus asserenda commendantur*. 8vo. Lond. 1704.

1690. 382. **Overall, John**: *Convocation-Book, 1606, concerning the Government of God's Catholic Church, and the Kingdoms of the whole World*. 4to. Lond. 1690. Reprinted in *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, 8vo, Oxf. 1844. This work was approved by the Convocations of Canterbury and York; "and might therefore be considered as an authoritative exposition of the doctrine of the Church of England."

1691. 383. **King, Sir Peter**: *An Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church that flourished within the first three hundred years after Christ*. Faithfully collected out of the extant writings of those ages. Part I., 8vo, Lond. 1691. Part II., soon after. To this book John Wesley professed himself indebted, as early as 1745, for his settled conviction that the episcopate is not a distinct order, but only a distinct office in the Christian ministry; that bishops and presbyters are of the same order, and have essentially the same prerogatives; the bishop being only *primus inter pares* — a presiding officer. (*Stevens, Hist. Meth.*, vol. i., p. 314.)

384. **Maurice, Henry**: *A Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy*, in

answer to a book of Mr. David Clarkson, entitled *Primitive Episcopacy*. 8vo. Lond. 1691. 2d ed., 1709.

1691. 385. **Thomassin, Louis**: *Ancienne et Nouvelle Discipline de l'Eglise touchant les bénéfices et les beneficiers*. Translated by the author into Latin: *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina circa beneficia et beneficiarios*, etc. 3 vols. Fol. Paris, 1691. Each volume is divided into three parts. Vol. I. treats, 1, De primo cleri ordine; 2, De secundo cleri ordine; 3, De clericorum et monachorum congregationibus.\* Vol. II. treats of the calling and ordination of clergymen; the election, confirmation, cession, resignation, and translation of bishops; of pluralities; councils, visitations, etc. Vol. III. of the Church's temporalities, etc. This work, which has been often reprinted, is still regarded as among the most valuable in its department.
386. **Baxter, Richard**: *Of National Churches; their Description, Institution, Use, Preservation, Maladies, and Cure*. Lond. 1691.
1692. 387. **Burscough, Robert**: *A Treatise of Church Government; occasioned by some letters lately printed, etc.* 8vo. Lond. 1692.
388. **Ferguson, James**: *A brief Refutation of the Errors of Toleration, Erastianism, Independency, and Separation*. 8vo. Edinb. 1692, '98. Written in 1652.
389. **Milbourne, Luke**: *A Legacy to the Church of England, vindicating her Orders from the Objections of Papists and Dissenters*. 8vo. Lond. 1692. New ed., in 2 vols., 8vo, Lond. 1726.
390. **Leighton, Robert**: *A modest Defence of Moderate Episcopacy as established in Scotland at the Restoration of King Charles II.*
1694. 391. **King William**: *A Discourse concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God*. Dublin, 1694; Lond. 1697; Northampton, 1840, 16mo.
392. **Boyse, Joseph**: *Remarks on a late Discourse concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God*. 8vo. Lond. 1694-5.
393. **Owen, James**: *A Plea for Scripture Ordination, or Ten Arguments from Scripture and Antiquity, proving ordination by presbyters without bishops to be valid*. 12mo. Lond. 1694.
1695. 394. **Sage, John**: *The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery Examined and Disproved*. 8vo. Lond. 1695.
395. — *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age with regard to Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction asserted and recommended from the genuine writings of St. Cyprian himself, etc.* 8vo. Lond. 1695. Both the above without the author's name. Reprinted by the Spottiswood Soc., 8vo, Lond. 1844-47.
1696. 396. **Rule, Gilbert**: *The Cyprianic Bishop Examined, and found not to be a Diocesan*. 4to. 1696.
397. — *The good Old Way Defended*. 4to. 1697. Asserting the Divine Right of Presbytery.
398. — *Representation of Presbyterian Government*.
399. **Vitring, Campegius**: *De Synagoga Vetere, Libri tres, etc.*, 2

\* "Ordinationibus," as Jacobson, in Hertzog, gives it.

- vols. 4to. Francq. 1696. Aims to show that the form of government and ministry which obtained in the Synagogue was transferred to the Christian Church. [See No. 670.]
1696. 400. — *Doctrina Christianæ Religionis per aphorismos summatim descripta.* 9 vols. 4to. Vol. IX. treats of the Church—De Ecclesiæ attributis, notis, capite, ministris, ordinatione, decimis, regimine, libris symbolicis, conciliis.
1697. 404. **Jameson, William:** *Nazianzeni Querela et Votum Justum: The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy Examined and Disproved.* Jameson was lecturer on History in the University of Glasgow.
1699. 405. **Bennet, Thomas:** *An Answer to the Dissenters' Pleas for Separation; or, An Abridgment of the Collection of Cases and other Discourses to recover Dissenters to the Communion of the Church of England.* 8vo. Lond. 1699. 3d ed., 1701.
406. **Burscough, Robert:** *A Discourse of Schism; addressed to those Dissenters who conformed before the toleration, and have since withdrawn themselves, etc.* 8vo. Lond. 1699.
407. — *A Letter in answer to his Discourse of Schism.* 8vo. Lond. 1700.
408. — *A Vindication of a Discourse of Schism; in answer to a Letter lately published against it.* 8vo. Lond. 1701.
409. **Forrester, Thomas:** *The Hierarchical Bishop's Claim to a Divine Right tried at the Scripture Bar, (in answer to three authors, two of them bishops.)* Edinb. 1699. The authors referred to were Dr. Scott, Dr. Monro, and Mr. Honeyman.
1701. 410. **Sage, John:** *A Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age; a Reply to Gilbert Rule's Cyprianic Bishop Examined.* 4to. Lond. 1701.
- 410 a. **Van Espen, Zeger Bernhard:** *Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum.* Fol. Colon. Agripp. 1702. In support of *The Episcopal System.*
1703. 411. **Hoadly, Benjamin:** *Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England, represented to the Dissenting Ministers.* In two parts. 8vo. Lond. 1703. *Works*, fol., vol. i., pp. 183–299.
412. — *A Persuasive to lay Conformity, etc.* 8vo. Lond. 1704.
413. — *A serious Admonition to Mr. Calamy, occasioned by the first part of his Defence of Moderate Nonconformity.* 8vo. Lond. 1705.
414. — *A Defence of the Reasonableness of Conformity, in answer to Calamy.* 8vo. Lond. 1705.
415. — *A brief Defence of Episcopal Ordination. With a Reply to Calamy.* 8vo. Lond. 1708. The above five tracts, with others, were reprinted in one vol., 8vo., Lond. 1715. *Works*, fol., vol. i., pp. 395–528, Lond. 1773.
416. **Calamy, Edmund:** *A Defence of Moderate Nonconformity. In answer to Olyffe and Hoadly.* 3 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1703–5.
- 1704 417. **Burscough, Robert:** *A Discourse of the Unity of the Church, etc.* 8vo. Exeter, 1704.
418. — *A Vindication of the XXIII. Article from Bishop Burnet's Exposition of it.* Ascribed also to Trelawney.

1705. 419. **Jameson, William:** Cyprianus Isotimus or Idager; J. S.'s Vindication of his Principles of the Cyprianic Age confuted. 1705.
420. **Calder, Robert:** The Divine Right of Episcopacy. 8vo. Edinb. 1705.
421. — The Lawfulness and Expediency of Set Forms of Prayer. 8vo. 1706.
422. — Miscellany Numbers. 8vo. 1713. In defence of Episcopacy, Liturgy, etc.
423. **Buddens, John Fred.:** Exercitatio de Origine et Potestate Episcoporum. 4to. Jena, 1705. In reply to Dodwell's Separation of Churches, etc.
424. **Bull, George:** The Corruptions of the Church of Rome in relation to Ecclesiastical Government, the Rule of Faith, and Form of Divine Worship. In answer to BOSSUET'S *Queries*. Lond. 1705.
1706. 425. **Forrester, Thomas:** Causa Episcopatus Hierarchici lucifuga. 1706. In reply to Bishop Sage.
426. **Tindal, Matthew:** The Rights of the Christian Church Asserted against the Romish and all other Priests who claim an independent power over it, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1706.
427. **Wotton, William:** The Rights of the Clergy in the Christian Church asserted. In which the principles of a late book, entitled The Rights of the Christian Church asserted, are examined. A Sermon on 2 Tim ii. 2. Lond. 1706.
1707. 428. **A Defence** of the Rights of a Christian Church. 1707. In reply to Wotton. A *Second Defence* appeared in 1708.
429. **Nicholls, William:** Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. 12mo. Lond. 1707. Eng. translation: A Defence of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England. In two parts. Containing the objections of Dissenters fairly represented from their own celebrated writers; and fully answered. With an Introduction giving a succinct history of the Separation. Being a complete system of the whole controversy. 8vo. Lond. 1707. 3d ed., 8vo, Lond. 1730.
430. **Hickes, George:** Two Treatises, On the Christian Priesthood, and On the Dignity of the Episcopal Order, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1707. 4th ed., 3 vols., 8vo, Oxf. 1847. The Preface contains an Answer to Tindal's *Rights*, etc.
431. **Brett, Thomas:** An Account of Church Government and Governors, wherein is showed that the Government of the Church of England is most agreeable to that of the Primitive Church. 8vo. Lond. 1707. 2d ed., with large additions, 1710.
432. — The Constitution of the Catholic Church.
433. **Lauder, Alexander:** The Ancient Bishops Considered, both with respect to the extent of their jurisdiction, and the nature of their power, in answer to Mr. Chillingworth and others, etc. 12mo. Edinb. 1707.
434. — The Divine Institution of Bishops having Churches consisting of many Congregations, examined by Scripture. Edinb. 1711.

1707. 435. *Potter, John*: A Discourse of Church Government: wherein the Rights of the Church and the Supremacy of the Christian Princes are Vindicated and Adjusted. 8vo. Lond. 1707. Seventh ed., with additional notes and authorities, 8vo, Lond. 1839; 12mo, 1852. Tegg.
- 435 a. *Dupin*: *Traité de la Puissance Ecclesiastique et Temporelle*. Paris, 1707.
1708. 436. *Bennet, Thomas*: A Brief History of the Joint Use of precomposed Set Forms of Prayer, etc. 8vo. Camb. 1708.
437. — A Discourse of Joint Prayer. 8vo. Lond. 1708.
438. *The Saybrook Platform*. 1708. The Cambridge Platf. 1648.
1709. 439. *Hickes, George*: *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*; a collection of Tracts relating to the Government and Authority of the Church. 8vo. Lond. 1709. Among the tracts reprinted in this volume, Bancroft's Sermon at Paul's Cross, 1588, is one.
1710. 440. *Bingham, Joseph*: *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*; or the Antiquities of the Christian Church. Originally published in 10 vols., 8vo, 1710–22. Latin translation, with the quotations in full, by Grischovius, in 10 vols., 4to, Halæ, 1724–29; and again, in 1751. *Works*, 9 vols., 8vo, Lond. 1840.
441. *Robinson, Benjamin*: A Review of the Case of Liturgies and their Imposition. In answer to Bennet's Brief History, and Discourse of Joint Prayer. 8vo. Lond. 1710.
442. — A Letter to Mr. T. Bennet, in defence of the Review, etc. Pp. 72. 8vo. 1710.
1711. 443. *Bennet, Thomas*: The Rights of the Clergy of the Christian Church; or, a Discourse showing that God has given to the Clergy authority to Ordain, Baptize, Preach, etc. Wherein the pretended divine right of the Laity to elect their own pastors is disproved. 8vo. Lond. 1711.
444. *Laurence, Roger*: Lay-baptism Invalid; an Essay to prove that such baptism is null and void when administered in opposition to the divine right of the apostolical succession. 3d ed., enlarged. Without author's name, 8vo, Lond. 1711.
445. — The Second Part of Lay-baptism Invalid; showing that the ancient Catholic Church never had any ecclesiastical law, tradition, or custom, for the validity of baptisms by persons not commissioned by bishops. By the author of Lay-baptism Invalid. 8vo. Lond. 1713.
446. — A Supplement to the First and Second Parts of Lay-baptism Invalid, in answer to Bingham, with a Caveat against Dr. White Kennet. 8vo. Lond. 1714.
447. — Sacerdotal Powers; or the Necessity of Confession, Penance, and Absolution. Together with the Nullity of Unauthorized Lay-baptism, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1711.
448. — The Bishop of Oxford's Charge Considered. 8vo. Lond. 1712. On the same subjects, and also the Independence of the Church on the State.
449. — 'Dissenters' and other Unauthorized Baptisms Null and Void, by the Articles, Canons, and Rubrics of the Church of England. In answer to a pamphlet, called The Judgment of the Church of England in the

Case of Lay-baptism, and of Dissenters' Baptism. 2d ed., 8vo, Lond. 1713.

1712. 450. *Brokesby, Francis*: An History of the Government of the Primitive Church for the Three First Centuries and the beginning of the Fourth; showing that the Church in those first ages, as it has ever been since, was governed by Bishops. Wherein the suggestions of David Blondel to the contrary are considered. 8vo. Lond. 1712.

451. *Jameson, William*: The Sum of the Episcopal Controversy. 8vo. Edinb. 1712.

452. *Calder, Robert*: The True Difference between the Principles and Practices of the Kirk and the Church of Scotland. 8vo. Lond. 1712. Reprinted, 12mo, Lond. 1841.

453. *Boyse, Joseph*: A clear Account of the Ancient Episcopacy, proving it to have been Parochial, and not Diocesan. Lond. 1712, and 1726.

453 a. *Boehmer*: De Jure Episcopali Principum Evangelicorum. Halæ, 1712.

1713. 454. *Brett, Thomas*: An Inquiry into the Judgment and Practice of the Primitive Church in relation to Persons being Baptized by Laymen; wherein Mr. Bingham's Scholastical History is considered, etc. Lond. 1713.

455. *Waterland* and *Kelsall*: Letters on Lay-baptism. Lond. 1713-14. *Works* of Dr. Waterland, vol. x., Oxf. 1823-8. Reprint, 6 vols., 8vo, 1843. In these Letters the question of the validity of lay-baptism is discussed, on either side, with candor, ability, and learning. Bingham and Kelsall, following in the lead of Hooker, (Ecl. Pol., B. V., c. lxi.-lxii.,) on the one side, and Lawrence, Bennet, Brett, and Waterland, on the other, afford the student ample means of pursuing the investigation.

1714. 456. *Anderson, John*: A Defence of the Church Government, Faith, Worship, and Spirit of the Presbyterians. Reprinted, Edinb. 1820. "A remarkably acute and vigorously written book," says Bannerman.

1715. 457. *Mastricht, Peter Van*: Theologia Theoretico-Practica. 4to. Utrecht, 1715; Amstel. 1724. The VII. Book discusses the Doctrine of the Church under four heads: The Nature—The Ministers—The Sacraments—The Discipline and Government—of the Church.

458. *Wise, John*: A Vindication of the Government of the Congregational Churches. 4th ed., Boston, 1860.

459. *Prideaux, Humphrey*: Ecclesiastical Tracts, formerly published, viz.: The Validity of the Orders of the Church of England made out against the Objections of the Papists, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1715.

1717. 460. *Brett, Thomas*: The Independency of the Church upon the State as to its pure Spiritual Powers, proved from the Holy Scriptures and the Writings of the Primitive Fathers, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1717.

461. *Slater, William*: An Original Draught of the Primitive Church, in answer to a discourse entitled An Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church; by a Presbyter of the Church of England. 8vo. Lond. 1717. New ed., with the quotations

from the Fathers, etc., given at length, fcp. 8vo, Oxf. 1840. Am. ed., Columbus, Ohio, 1833.

1717. 462. **Law, William**: Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor (Hoadly). 8vo. Lond. 1717. The sole valued relique of the once famous Bangorian controversy.
463. **Lewis, Thomas**: The Scourge; in vindication of the Church of England. 8vo. Lond. 1717-20.
1718. 464. **Brett, Thomas**: The Divine Right of Episcopacy, and the Necessity of an Episcopal Commission for Preaching God's Word, and for the Valid Administration of the Christian Sacraments. The false principles of Papists, Lutherans, and Calvinists, concerning the dignity of Bishops and Presbyters. The valid succession of our English Bishops vindicated, and the Popish fable of the Nag's Head consecration refuted. 8vo. Lond. 1718. 2d ed., 8vo, Lond. 1728.
1719. 465. **Ainsworth, T.**: The Validity of Episcopal Ordination, and Invalidity of any other, considered in Three Letters between a Presbyter of the Church of England (T. Ainsworth) and a Dissenting Teacher (Asher Humphreys). 8vo. Pp. 28. Oxf. 1719.
466. **Pfaff, Christopher Matth.**: De Originibus Juris Ecclesiastici, veraque ejusdem indole, liber singularis. 4to. Tübing. 1719.
467. — De Successione Episcopali. 1720. Pfaff is the reputed author of the *Collegial System*.
468. **Dunlop, William**: Collection of Confessions, etc., of Public Authority in the Church of Scotland. 2 vols. Sm. 8vo. Edinb. 1719-20.
469. **Ward, Thomas**: The Controversy of Ordination truly stated. 8vo. Lond. 1719. Impugning the validity of Anglican orders.
1720. 470. **Rogers, John**: A Discourse of the Visible and Invisible Church of Christ. 8vo. Lond. 1720.
471. — Review of the Discourse; being a reply to Mr. Sykes's Answer to that Discourse. 8vo. Lond. 1722.
472. — Discourse and Reply. 8vo. 5th ed., 1738.
1721. 473. **The Divine** or Apostolical Institution, and Power of Jurisdiction of that Sacred Order of Men in the Church, now called Bishops, fully proved, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1721.
474. **Leslie, Charles**: A Discourse on the Qualifications requisite to Administer the Sacraments; wherein the cause of Episcopacy is briefly treated. Lond. 1721. *Works*, vol. vii., pp. 97-189, Oxf. 1832, 8vo. Also in *Voice of the Church*, vol. i.
1723. 475. **Cowayer, Peter Francis**: Dissertation sur la Validité des Ordinations des Anglois, etc. 2 vols. 12mo. Brux. 1723. Eng. translation: A Defence of the Validity of the English Ordinations, and of the Succession of the Bishops in the Church of England; together with proofs justifying the facts advanced, etc. 8vo. Lond. and Dubl. 1725.
476. — Defence de la Dissertation, etc. 4 vols. 12mo. Brux. 1726. Eng. translation: A Defence of the Dissertation on the Validity of the English Ordinations against the several answers made to it. 2 vols. 8vo.

- Lond. 1728. A revised edition of the Dissertation, (Eng. transl.,) 8vo, Oxf. 1844. The author, though a professed Romanist of the Gallican school, was a latitudinarian in his doctrinal views.
1723. 477. *Le Quien, Michael*: La Nullité des Ordinations Anglicanes, ou Refutation du Livre du P. Courayer. 2 vols. 12mo. Paris, 1725.
478. — La Nullité des Ordinations Anglicanes demontree de nouveau. 2 vols. 12mo. Paris, 1730.
479. *Dodd, Charles* (Rd. Tootle): Certamen Utriusque Ecclesiæ; or, a List of all the Eminent Writers of Controversy, Catholic and Protestant, since the Reformation. 4to. Lond. 1724. Reprinted in the Somers Tracts, vol. xiii.
1725. 480. *Grey, Zachary*: The Ministry of the Dissenters proved to be null and void, from Scripture and Antiquity. Lond. 1725. In answer to Dr. Calamy's Sermon, entitled The Ministry of the Dissenters Vindicated.
1730. 481. *Ayton, Thomas*: The Original Constitution of the Christian Church; wherein the extremes on either hand are stated and examined. To which is added an Appendix, concerning the rise of the *jure divino* prelatists, with answers to their arguments by Episcopal divines. Edinb. 1730.
- 481 a. *Bossuet*: Defensio Declarationis. Paris, 1730.
482. *Boehmer, Justus Henning*: Duodecim Dissertationes Juris Ecclesiastici, etc. 4to. Halæ, 1730.
483. — Jus Parochiale ad Fundamenta Genuina Revocatum, etc. Fourth edition. 4to. Halæ, 1730.
484. — Jus Ecclesiasticum Protestantium, usum modernum juris canonici juxta seriem decretalium ostendens, etc. 2da edit. correct. 5 vols. 4to. Halæ, 1720–36. Of this work the *Jus Parochiale* is numbered, in some editions, as volume vi.
485. — Entwurf des Kirchenstaats der drei ersten Jahrhunderte. 1733.
486. — Corpus Juris Canonici. 2 vols. 4to. Halæ, 1747. A well-known critical edition of the highest merit. Re-edited by A. L. Richter, 2 vols., 4to, Lips. 1836.
1731. 487. *Brown, Thomas*: The Story of the Ordination of our first Bishops in Queen Elizabeth's reign at the Nag's Head Tavern in Cheapside, thoroughly examined; and proved to be a late-invented, inconsistent, self-contradictory, and absurd fable. In answer to *Le Quien*, and to *Remarks on Le Courayer*. 8vo. Lond. 1731.
1733. 488. *Madox, Isaac*: A Vindication of the Government, Doctrine, and Worship of the Church of England, established in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, against the injurious reflections of Mr. Neal's late History of the Puritans. Together with a detection of many false quotations and mistakes in that performance. 8vo. Lond. 1733.
489. — A Review of the First Volume of Neal's History of the Puritans. 8vo. Lond. 1734.
1736. 490. *Grey, Zachary*: An Impartial Examination of the Second Volume of Mr. D. Neal's History of the Puritans, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1736.

1736. 491. **Grey, Zachary**: An Impartial Examination of the Third Volume of Mr. Neal's History. 8vo. 1737.
492. — An Impartial Examin. of the Fourth Volume, etc. 8vo. 1739.
493. — A Review of Neal's History. 1744.
494. **Warburton, William**: The Alliance between Church and State; or, the Necessity and Equity of an Established Religion and a Test-Law Demonstrated. In three Books. 8vo. Lond. 1736. 3d ed., enlarged, 8vo, 1748. 4th ed., with Postscript, 8vo, 1766. The author teaches, in opposition to Hooker, that "the Puritan premise—that the Church and the State are distinct, and originally independent societies—was and is the truth; but he denies the Puritan inference, that such independency must therefore be perpetual; affirming the existence of an 'alliance' between these two societies upon certain terms; and a resulting mutual inter-dependency of one on the other; whereby the (supposed) consequence from the position of the Puritans—an *imperium in imperio*, or subjugation of the State to the Church—and the consequence from the position of Hooker—the enslavement of the Church by the State—are equally precluded. The Church subordinates itself to the State upon faith of certain stipulations for support by the latter; and if the State violates, or withdraws from the fulfilment of, those stipulations, the Church is thereby remitted to her original independence."
1737. 495. **Episcopacy**. High-flown Episcopal and Priestly Claims freely Examined: in a Dialogue betwixt a country gentleman and a country vicar, etc. Pp. 40. 8vo. Lond. 1737.
1738. 496. **Mather, Samuel**: An Apology for the Liberties of the Churches in New England. Bost. 1738.
- 496 a. — **Increase**: A Disquisition on Ecclesiastical Councils. 16mo. Bost. 1716.
1739. 497. **Grey, Zachary**: Schismatics delineated from Authentic Vouchers; in reply to Neal; with Downing's Journal, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1739.
498. **Jackson, Lawrence**: A Dissertation on Episcopacy; showing in one short and plain view the grounds of it in Scripture and antiquity. 8vo. Lond. 1739. Appended to "An Examination of Chubb's True Gospel," etc. Reprinted in the Churchman's Remembrancer, vol. ii., 8vo, Lond. 1807. "A masterly argumentation."
1743. 499. **Chambre, de la, Itharrart**: Traité de l'Eglise de Jesus Christ. 6 vols. 12mo. Paris, 1743.
1746. 500. **Edwards, Jonathan**: An humble Inquiry into the Rules of the Word of God concerning the qualifications requisite to a complete standing and full communion in the visible Christian Church. Bost. 1746.
1747. 501. **Watts, Isaac**: The Rational Foundation, Form, and Order of a Christian Church, confirmed and improved by the directions and examples of the New Testament. Lond. 1747.
1749. 502. **Brown, Thomas**: An Answer to a Discourse by Bishop Stillingfleet, soon after the Revolution, entitled The Unreasonableness of a

New Separation on account of the oaths to King William and Queen Mary. Pp. 196. 8vo. Lond. 1749.

1753. 502 a. **Boehmer**: Entstehung des Kirchenstaats. 1753.

1757. 503. **Scholliner, Herm.**: De Magistratuum Ecclesiæ Origine, et creatione. 4to. 1757.

1758. 504. **Swedenborg, Emanuel**: De Nova Hierosolyma et ejus doctrina cœlesti: exauditis e cœlo. Quibus præmittitur aliquid de Novo Cœlo et Nova Terra. 4to. Lond. 1758. Pp. 156. (Compiled, for the most part, from the *Arcana Cœlestia*.)

1759. 504 a. A Letter from a Blacksmith to the Ministers and Elders of the Church of Scotland: in which the manner of public worship in church is considered, its inconveniences and defects pointed out, and methods for removing them humbly proposed; well worthy the most serious consideration of Christians of all denominations. Pp. xx., 68. 12mo. Edinb. 1759. 6th ed., Lond. 1845.

504 b. **Cenni**: Monumenta Dominationis Pontificis. 2 vols. 4to. Roma.

504 c. **Nicholas von Hontheim**: De Statu Ecclesiæ et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis Bullioni. 4to. (Franç.) 1763. A complete system of *Episcopatism*. Published under the name of *Justin Febronius*, 2d ed., 2 vols., 1770.

1764. 505. **Gruener, J. Fr.**: De Origine Episcoporum eorumque in Ecclesia Primitiva Jure. 4to. Halæ, 1764.

1766. 506. **Leaming, Jeremy**: A Defence of the Episcopal Government of the Church. 8vo. N. York, 1766.

507. **Blackburne, Francis**: The Confessional; or, a full and free inquiry into the right, utility, edification, and success of establishing systematical Confessions of Faith and Doctrine in Protestant Churches. 8vo. Lond. 1766. *Works*, vol. v. This work excited a heated controversy, occasioning the publication of seventy or eighty pamphlets. Of these the most important are named below — 508–512.

508. **Rutherford, Thomas**: A Vindication of the Right of Protestant Churches to require the Clergy to subscribe to an established Confession, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1766.

509. — A Second Vindication of the Right of Protestant Churches to require the Clergy to subscribe, etc.

510. **An Examination** of Dr. Rutherford's Argument respecting the Right of Protestant Churches to require the Clergy to subscribe to an established Confession, etc. By a Clergyman of the Church of England. 8vo. Lond. 1766.

511. **A Letter** to the Rev. Dr. Rutherford, occasioned by his Second Vindication, etc. From the Examiner of the First.

512. **A Short View** of the Controversies occasioned by the *Confessional*, etc. Pp. xxii., 24. 2d ed., 8vo, Lond. 1775.

1769. 513. **Fullwood, Francis**: Roma Ruit; the pillars of Rome broken; wherein all the several Pleas for the Pope's Authority in England, etc., are

- revised and answered. 8vo. Lond. 1769. Reprinted, Lond. 1847. Ed. C. Hardwicke.
1771. 514. **Chauncy, Charles**: A Complete View of Episcopacy, as exhibited from the Fathers of the Christian Church, until the close of the second century. 8vo. Boston, 1771.
1774. 515. **Danovii, E. J.**: Dissertatio de Episcopatu Ætate Apostolicâ. 4to. Jena, 1774.
516. **Henke, H. T. C.**: Historia Antiquior Dogmatis de Unitate Ecclesiæ. 4to. Helmst. 1781.
1782. 517. **White, William**: The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States considered. Reprinted, Phila. 1857.
1783. 518. **Nettelblatt, Daniel**: De tribus systematibus Doctrinæ de Jure Sacrorum dirigendorum domini territorialis evangelici quoad Ecclesias evangelicas sui territorii. Halæ, 1783. In the author's *Observationes Juris Ecclesiastici*.
1786. 519. **Campbell, William** (of Armagh): Vindication of the Principles and Character of the Presbyterians of Ireland. 8vo. 3d ed., Lond. 1786.
- 519 a. **Bowden, John**: A Letter to the Rev. Ezra Styles, Pres. of Yale College. 8vo. 1787.
1795. 520. **Hall, Archibald**: An humble Attempt to Exhibit a Scriptural View of the Constitution, Order, Discipline, and Fellowship of the Gospel Church. 8vo. Lond. 1795. Exhibits the Argument in support of Presbytery.
- 520 a. **Zachariæ**: Einheit des Staats und der Kirche. 1797.
1798. 521. **Daubeny, Charles**: A Guide to the Church; in several discourses on the Nature, Design, and Constitution of the Christian Church, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1798. 3d ed., 2 vols., 8vo, Lond. 1830.
522. **Ziegler, Caspar**: Versuch einer Pragmat. Geschichte der Kirchlichen Verfassungs-Formen in der Ersten vi. Jahrhunderten der Kirche. 8vo. Leipz. 1798.
1799. 523. **Whytock, George**: A short Vindication of Presbyterian Church Government, containing a summary view of the evidence in support of it from Scripture, together with an examination of the principal arguments of the Independents against it. The author was minister of the Associate Congregation, Dalkeith. 1799.
524. **Brown, John** (of Haddington): Letters on the Constitution, Government, and Discipline of the Christian Church. 1799.
1800. 525. **Campbell, George**: Lectures on Ecclesiastical History. 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1800. Lect. iii.-xi.
526. **Jones, William**: Essay on the Church. *Works*, vol. iv. of the ed. in 12 vols., 8vo, Lond. 1801.
527. **Overton, John**: The True Churchman Ascertained; or, An Apology for those of the regular Clergy of the Establishment who are sometimes called Evangelical ministers; occasioned by the publications of Drs. Paley, Hey, Croft, Messrs. Daubeny, Ludlam, Polwhele, Fellowes, the Reviewers, etc. 8vo. York, 1801. 2d ed., 1802.

1803. 528. **Daubeny, Charles:** *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, in which some of the false reasonings, incorrect statements, and palpable misrepresentations in a publication entitled *The True Churchman Ascertained*, etc., are pointed out. 8vo. Lond. 1803.

529. **Planck, Gottl. Jacob:** *Geschichte der Entstehung und Ausbildung der christlich kirchlichen Gesellschafts-Verfassung*. In 5 Bdn. Hanov. 1803-9. Of the five parts into which this work is divided, the *first* treats of the origin of the Church constitution in the Roman Empire; the *second* part, of the new States of the West to the middle of the 9th century; and the *third*, *fourth*, and *fifth* give the history of the Papacy to the Reformation.

530. **Skinner, John:** *Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated from Modern Misrepresentation*, etc. 8vo. Aberdeen, 1803. In reply to Dr. Campbell: *Lects. on Eccl. Hist.*

531. — A Layman's Account of his Faith and Practice as a Member of the Episcopal Church of Scotland. Edinb. 1801. Without author's name.

1805. 532. **Brown, John** (of Gartmore): *A Vindication of the Presbyterian Form of Church Government*, as professed in the Standards of the Church of Scotland, in reply to the Animadversions of Modern and Ancient Independents. Edinb. 1805. "A thorough discussion of the points at issue between Presbyterians and Independents."

533. **Gabler, J. Ph.:** *De Episcopis primæ Ecclesiæ Christianæ, eorumque origine*. 4to. Jenæ, 1805.

1806. 534. **Hobart, John Henry:** *A Collection of the Essays on the subject of Episcopacy* which originally appeared in the *Albany Centinel*. 8vo. N. Y. 1806. Containing Three Letters by Bishop White, and Essays by Dr. Linn, etc.

1807. 535. **McCrie, Thomas:** *Statement of the Difference between the Profession of the Reformed Church of Scotland, as adopted by Seceders, and the Profession contained in the New Testament and other Acts lately adopted by the General Associate Synod, particularly on the Power of Civil Magistrates respecting Religion*, etc. Edinb. 1807. "This work," says Bannerman, "comprises about the ablest discussion of the questions of national religion, the relation of Church and State, etc., with which I am acquainted."

536. **Churchman's Remembrancer:** Being a Collection of scarce and valuable Tracts in defence of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England. 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1807. In the first volume is reprinted Bishop BARLOW'S *Sum and Substance of the Conference at Hampton Court*; in the second volume, Lawrence JACKSON'S *Dissertation on Episcopacy*.

537. **Mason, John M.:** *Essays on the Church of God*. 12mo. N. Y. 1807. Reprinted in *Works*, 4 vols., 8vo, N. Y. 1832, vol. iv.

538. — Review of *Essays on Episcopacy*. This first appeared in the "Christian's Magazine," a monthly periodical edited by Dr. M. Reprinted

in *Works*, vol. iii., and in 12mo, N. Y. 1844. Eng. edition: *The Claims of Diocesan Episcopacy Refuted*, etc., 12mo, Lond. 1838.

1807. 539. **Hobart, John Henry**: An Apology for Apostolic Order and its Advocates; occasioned by the strictures and denunciations of the Christian's Magazine. In a Series of Letters addressed to the Rev. John M. Mason, D. D., editor of that work, 12mo, N. Y. 1807. New ed. 1844.

540. **Mason, J. M.**: Review of Hobart's Apology. In the Christian's Magazine. Reprinted with *Review of Essays on Episcopacy*, 12mo, N. Y. 1844.

541. **Miller, Samuel**: Letters concerning the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry. 12mo. N. Y. 1807. Reprinted with Continuation, etc., 8vo, 1830.

1808. 542. **Bowden, John**: The Apostolic Origin of Episcopacy Asserted. In a series of Letters addressed to the Rev. Dr. Miller. 12mo. N. Y. 1808. Reprinted, 12mo, N. Y. 1831.

1809. 543. **Miller, Samuel**: A Continuation of the Letters concerning the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry; being an Examination of the strictures of the Rev. Drs. Bowden and Kemp, and the Rev. Mr. How, on the former series. 12mo. N. Y. 1809. Reprinted with first series, 8vo, 1830.

544. **Bowden, John**: A Series of Letters addressed to the Rev. Dr. Miller, in answer to his Continuation of Letters concerning the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry. 12mo. N. Y. 1810. Reprinted with First Series, 12mo, 1831.

545. **Mitchell, Patrick**: Presbyterian Letters; addressed to Bishop Skinner of Aberdeen, on his Vindication of Primitive Truth and Order. To which is prefixed a Preliminary Discourse on the present state of the controversy concerning ecclesiastical government. 8vo. Lond. 1809. "It is far from being my intention," says the author, "to imitate our adversaries, by claiming apostolic honors for Presbytery. I leave the *jus divinum* to be scrambled for by senseless and arrogant bigots of all denominations."

546. **Elrington, Thomas**: The Clergy of the Church of England truly Ordained; or, The Validity of English Ordination Established. 8vo. 1809. This is an answer to WARD'S Controversy. [469.]

547. **Milner, John**: Letter to the Rev. Thomas Elrington, D. D., etc. 1809. Reprinted in Archbishop Kenrick's Anglican Ordinations, etc., pp. 293-307.

548. **Berington** and **Kirk**: The Faith of Catholics on certain points of controversy, confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the first five centuries of the Church, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1809. 2d ed., 1830. Reprint. Balt., 3d ed., enlarged by WATERWORTH, 3 vols., 8vo, Lond. 1846. Sec. I., Prop. vi.-xiii., treats of the Church, its Authority, Unity, etc. Berington was a Romish priest, noted in his day for his liberal views, his advocacy of measure of Church reform, and his determined antagonism to Bishop Milner.

1813. 549. **White, William**: Lectures on the Catechism of the Protestant

Episcopal Church. With Supplementary Lectures; one on the Ministry, the other on the Public Service. And Dissertations on Select Subjects in the Lectures. 8vo. Phila. 1813.

1815. 550. *The Churchman* Armed against the Errors of the Time. 3 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1814. A Collection of Tracts of various merit in defence of the Church of England.

551. *Marsh, Herbert*: A Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome. I. As to Doctrine. II. As to Church Ceremonies. III. As to Church Authority. 8vo. Camb. 1814.

552. *Hall, Robert*: On Terms of Communion, with a particular view to the case of the Baptists and Pædobaptists. Reprinted in *Works*, 6 vols., 8vo, Lond. 1831-3. Am. ed., N. Y., 4 vols., 8vo, 1844. This writer would not compromise his principles by joining in communion with a Church (the established Church of England) to which certain corruptions — not affecting the essence of the faith — in his apprehension, inseparably adhere; while he would throw wide open *his* door for the free admission of all who think more lightly of their peculiarities than he of his own; and on the strength of this one-handed charity, he claimed to be, and was generally accounted, a man of great liberality of views. See *Life of McCrie*, p. 227.

1816. 553. *Mason, John M.*: A Plea for Sacramental Communion on Catholic Principles. 8vo. N. Y. 1816. Eng. edition: A Plea for Catholic Communion in the Church of God. The 2d ed., with corrections, 8vo, Lond. 1816. The position maintained in this work is fundamentally the same as that of the volume *On Terms of Communion*, viz., that “the members who hold acknowledged communion with the HEAD, whatever be their subordinate variances, ought also to hold communion with each other in those ordinances which mark their communion with the Head.” The coincidence is remarkable that, without any previous concert, a discussion of this subject should have been commenced, nearly at the same time, in England and America, by two writers so eminently gifted as ROBERT HALL and JOHN M. MASON. As to the comparative merit of the two treatises, Hall’s generous acknowledgment of the superiority of that of his accomplished rival is deserving of remark. He accords to Mason’s “mode of conducting the argument a luminous simplicity, which forms a striking contrast not only to the tedious logomachies which” he, in dealing with the question in its bearing on the views of the Anti-Pædobaptists, had been “compelled to encounter, but to the manner in which he had attempted to confute them.” *Works*, vol. i., p. 395.

554. *How, Thos. Y.*: A Vindication of the Protestant Episcopal Church. N. Y. 1816. In reply to Dr. Mason.

1817. 554 a. *Oberthur, F.*: *Idea Biblica Ecclesiae Dei*. 2d ed. 6 vols. Sulzbach, 1817-28.

1818. 555. *Elrington, Thomas*: The Validity of English Ordinations Established, in answer to the Rev. P. Gandolphy’s Sermon on John x. 1. 8vo. Dublin, 1818.

1818. 555 a. *Conder, Josiah*: On Protestant Nonconformity. 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1818.
1819. 556. *De Maistre, Joseph* (Count): Du Pape. Paris, 1819. 2d ed., enlarged, 2 vols., Paris, 1821. English translation, Lond. 1850. This erratic writer — “a reactionary mystic,” as Reuchlin describes him (Hertzog, Real Encycl.) — regards the Pope as the impersonation of Divine Providence. In this work, he treats of the Papacy under the four several heads of its relation (*a*) to the Catholic Church; (*b*) to the secular sovereignties; (*c*) to civilization, and the welfare of nations; (*d*) to schismatic Churches. He maintains the necessity of the conservation of the Papal power, represents the Popes as the true founders of Christian civilization, and arrives at the sweeping conclusion, “No Pope, no Christianity; and, as a necessary corollary, the subversion of social order.”
557. *Greiling, —*: Apostolische Christengemeinen. Halberstadt, 1819.
1820. 558. *Bangs, Nathan*: Methodist Episcopacy. 12mo. N. York, 1820.
559. *De Maistre, Joseph* (Count): De l’Eglise Gallicane dans son rapport avec le Souverain-Pontife, pour servir de suite à l’ouvrage intitulé Du Pape. Paris, 1821. This work exhibits an equal disregard of the lessons of history and the events of the author’s own day, portending or precluding the decline and fall of the purely Catholic Powers, so called.
1821. 560. *McCrie, Thomas*: Two Discourses on the Unity of the Church, etc. Edinb. 1821. The chief object of these discourses is “to point out the fallacious and unscriptural character of modern plans of union;” among which the most to be dreaded, as the most imposing, says our author, is “that which proceeds on the scheme of principles usually styled latitudinarian.” Its abettors make light of the differences which subsist among religious parties, and propose to unite them on principles on which they are agreed, in the way of burying the rest in silence, or stipulating mutual forbearance with respect to everything about which they may differ in opinion or practice.
561. *Wilks, S. C.*: Correlative Claims and Duties; or, An Essay on the Necessity of a Church Establishment. 8vo. Lond. 1821.
1822. 562. *Bristed, John*: Thoughts on the Anglican and Anglo-American Churches; being a Reply to Mr. Wilks’s work on Correlative Claims and Duties. 8vo. N. York, and Lond. 1822.
563. *Wilson, James*: A Review of the Letters of the late Rev. John Bowden, D. D., to the Rev. Dr. Miller; or, Episcopal Claims calmly Considered. 8vo. Providence, R. I., 1822.
564. *Hey, William*: A Defence of Episcopacy derived from the New Testament. In a volume entitled, *Tracts and Essays, Moral and Theological*. 8vo. Lond. 1822. Reprinted in Wordsworth’s *Christian Institutes*, under the title *Authority of a Threefold Ministry*, vol. iii., p. 186, sq. As the production of an eminent layman, this presentation of the argument for Episcopacy is deserving of a careful examination.
1823. 565. *Pruen, Thomas*: An Analogical and Popular View of the

Church of the living God, its Ministry and Service, showing that a graduated threefold priesthood is found no less under the Christian than under the Jewish dispensation, etc. 2 vols., 8vo. Lond. 1823.

1825. 566. **Moehler, John Adam**: Die Einheit in der Kirche, oder das Princip des Catholicismus, dargestellt im Geiste der Kirchenväter der drei ersten Jahrhunderte. 8vo. Tübing. 1825.

1826. 567. **Ravenscroft, John S.**: The Doctrines of the Church Vindicated from the Misrepresentations of Dr. John Rice, etc. 8vo. Winchester, Va., 1826.

568. **Fletcher, John**: A Comparative View of the Grounds of the Catholic and Protestant Churches. 8vo. Lond. 1826. The author belonged to the more liberal school of Romish divines.

1828. 569. **Barrington, John Shute**: Essay on the Distinction between Apostles, Elders, and Brethren. *Works*, 3 vols., 8vo, Lond. 1828, vol. ii., pp. 1-180.

570. **Rose, Hugh James**: The Commission and Consequent Duties of the Clergy. 8vo. Lond. 1828.

571. **Chapman, George T.**: Sermons upon the Ministry, Worship, and Doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church. 12mo. 1828.

572. — Sermons to Presbyterians of all Sects. 12mo. Hartford, 1836. Supplementary to No. 571.

1829. 573. **Cooke, John Esten**: An Essay on the Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination. 8vo. Lexington, Ky., 1829. Reprinted in *Works on Episcopacy*, vol. ii., 12mo, N. Y. 1831. Review in *Bib. Rep. of Princeton*, N. J., Jan. 1830.

574. — Answer to the Review of an Essay, etc., in the *Bib. Rep.*, etc. 8vo. Lexington, 1830.

1830. 575. **Coleridge, S. T.**: On the Constitution of the Church and State, according to the Idea of each. 8vo. Lond. 1830. 3d ed., 1839. Reprint. in *Works*, vol. vi., 12mo, N. Y. 1853.

1831. 576. **Miller, Samuel**: An Essay on the Warrant, Nature, and Duties of the Office of the Ruling Elder in the Presbyterian Church. 12mo. Phila. 1831.

577. **Onderdonk, Henry Ustick**: Episcopacy Tested by Scripture. 12mo. Pp. 46. N. Y. 1831. First published in *Prot. Episcopalian*, 1830, Phila.

578. *Review* of Episcopacy Tested by Scripture, in the *Quarterly Christian Spectator*, March, 1834.

579. **Onderdonk, H. U.**: Answer to a Review in the *Christian Spectator*. *Prot. Episc.*, May, 1834.

580. **Barnes, Albert**: *Second* Review of Episcopacy, etc., in the *Christian Spectator*, March, 1835. By the author of the First. The two Reviews reprinted in a volume: *The Scriptural Argument for Episcopacy Examined*. 12mo. Phila. 1835.

581. **Onderdonk, H. U.**: Remarks on Rev. Mr. Barnes's Second Review of Episcopacy Tested by Scripture. Phila. 1835.

582. *Review* of Episcopacy Tested by Scripture in the Biblical Repository, April, 1835.

583. *H. U. O.*: Answer to a Review, etc., in the Bib. Rep., etc. Phila. 1835. The above-named seven tracts, (577-583,) with others, were republished in one volume, 12mo, N. Y. 1835. A fair and full discussion of the Argument for Episcopacy drawn from Scripture exclusively.

584. *Cawood, John*: The Church of England and Dissent. 12mo. Lond. 1831. 2d ed.

1832. 585. *Moehler, John Adam*: Symbolik, oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten nach ihren öffentlichen Bekenntnisschriften. 8vo. Tübing. 1832. 5th ed., 1838. Eng. translation, Symbolism; or, Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants, as evidenced by their symbolical writings. 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1843. Am. ed., 8vo., N. Y. 1844. Part I., chap. v., sect. xxxvi.-li. "An admirable specimen of what can be done by a thoroughly efficient and dexterous controversialist, in the way of omission, modification, plausible explanation, and defence, to maintain the cause of the Papacy. To any one wishing an excuse for going over to Rome, this is a work to be strongly recommended."

586. *Evans, Robert W.*: The Church of God; in a Series of Sermons. 8vo. Lond. 1832.

1833. 587. *Sinclair, John*: Dissertations Vindicating the Church of England, with regard to some essential points of Polity and Doctrine. 8vo. Lond. 1833. Of the four dissertations composing this volume — on Episcopacy, Liturgical Worship, Romish Infallibility, and the Atonement — the first named is the most complete, containing the substance of all that is to be gleaned from the early Fathers, the mediæval writers, and the divines of the Reformation, both Anglican and Continental, having a bearing upon the subject. While it exhausts the argument drawn from antiquity, it furnishes an answer to every objection which is to be found in modern writings. In maintaining the apostolicity of Episcopacy, the author disavows the purpose of excluding from the Church of Christ those Christian societies whose forms of discipline are less agreeable to apostolic precedent.

588. *Arnold, Thomas*: Principles of Church Reform. 8vo. Pp. 88. Lond. 1833. A defence of the established Church, containing a proposal of the means of its rescue from impending overthrow — *First*. By a plan for comprehending the Dissenters within the pale of the establishment, without compromise of principle on either side. *Second*. By the revival of the order of deacons as a link between the clergy and laity. *Third*. The union of laymen with clerical synods. *Fourth*. Of clergy with the civil legislature. *Fifth*. Permission granted to civil or military officers to administer the sacraments in congregations where the presence of clergy could not be procured. *Sixth*. Daily service. *Seventh*. Frequent communion, religious orders, etc., etc.

589. *Wilson, James P.*: The Primitive Government of Christian

Churches. 12mo. Phila. 1833. The author, a Presbyterian, combats alike the claims of Episcopacy and of a lay eldership.

1834. 590. *Horne, Thomas H.*: The Conformity of the Church of England in her Ministry, Doctrine, and Liturgy to the Apostolical Precept and Pattern. 12mo. Lond. 1834.

591. *Roskovany*: De Primatu Pontificis Romani. Augustæ Vindel. 1834.

1835. 592. *Miller, Samuel*: Presbyterianism the truly Primitive and Apostolical Constitution of the Church of Christ. 12mo. Phila. 1835. Edinb. 18mo, 1842.

593. *Taylor, Isaac*: Spiritual Despotism. 8vo. Lond. 1835. Pp. 500. N. York and Boston, 12mo, pp. 363, 1835.

594. *Nitzsch, K. J.*: Protestantische Beantwortung der Symbolik Dr. Moehler's. Nebst einem Anhang: Protestantische Theses. 8vo. Hamb. 1835. Moehler also found a powerful opponent in Dr. BAUR, his colleague at Tübingen, the author of *Der Gegensatz des Katholicismus und Protestantismus*. 1836.

595. *Hopkins, John Henry*: The Primitive Church Compared with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Present Day. 12mo. Burlington, Vt. 1835. 2d ed., 1836.

596. — The Church of Rome in her Primitive Purity Compared with the Church of Rome at the Present Day. Being a candid examination of her claims to universal dominion, addressed in the spirit of Christian kindness to the Roman Hierarchy. 12mo. Burlington. 1837. Lond., 8vo, 1839.

1836. 597. *Colton, Calvin*: Thoughts on the Religious State of the Country; with Reasons for preferring Episcopacy. 12mo. N. York, 1836. Rev. in Brit. Crit., vol. xxi. The writer of this book went over to England, in 1831, a Presbyterian; in 1835 he returned to New England, an Episcopalian. The process of his conversion is narrated in this volume.

598. *Bangs, Nathan*: The Original Church of Christ. 12mo. N. Y. 1836.

599. *Dodsworth, William*: The Church of England; a Protest against Romanism and Dissent. 18mo. Lond. 1836.

600. — Why have you become a Romanist? A Letter to Mr. Sibthorp. 8vo. 2d. ed., Lond. 1842. The author, not long after the publication of this Letter, himself became a Romanist, and published the volume next named.

601. — Anglicanism Considered in its Results. 12mo. Lond. 1851.

602. *Wiseman, Nicholas*: Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church. 8vo. Lond. 1836. 2d ed., 2 vols., 12mo, Lond. 1844. 5th Am. ed., 2 vols. in one, 12mo, Balt. 1857. Rev. in Brit. Crit., vol. xx. Lects. viii.—ix.

603. — Lectures on the Catholic Hierarchy. 8vo. Lond. 1850.

604. — Essays on Various Subjects. 3 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1853. The Essays on Ecclesiastical Organization; Anglican Claims of Apostolical Succession; The Catholic and Anglican Churches; The Anglican System, etc.,

claim special attention. These works (602-604) claim a high place among the doctrinal and polemical writings of the modern English-speaking Romanist divines. While they are characterized by a spirit of conciliation, they are yet open to the animadversion already passed upon the polemical writings of Moehler.

1836. 605. *Perceval, A. P.*: The Roman Schism Illustrated from the Records of the Catholic Church. 8vo. Lond. 1836. Rev. Brit. Crit., vol. xx. The general object of this work is thus stated by the writer: "One of the great difficulties with which the clergy of the Church of England have to contend in the controversy with Rome, now reopened, consists in the scarcity and costliness of the works from which alone accurate knowledge of the Roman doctrines is to be obtained. With a view to remedy this evil in part, there are presented to the reader in the following collection, extracted from all the councils authoritatively received in the Church of Rome, all the decrees upon the points in dispute between it and the Church of England; thus enabling the student upon this subject to substitute a small octavo volume for sixteen or seventeen folios."

606. *Lathbury, Thomas*: A History of the English Episcopacy; from the period of the Long Parliament to the Act of Uniformity. 8vo. Lond. 1836. Rev. in Brit. Crit., vol. xx., Edinb. lxiv. According to the author of this volume, the uncompromising assertion of Episcopacy was, as it were, *an afterthought* of the Reformation. The divine institution of the episcopate is not heard of for many years after the accession of Elizabeth. On this point the Anglican divines maintained a profound silence, until they were driven, by sheer stress of controversy, to define their position. They had been content to say, merely, that the Episcopal form of government is "agreeable to the word of God," until they heard the men of Geneva proclaim that *no* form of polity but their own was "agreeable to the word of God;" that their discipline resembled the tabernacle whose pattern was revealed in the mount, etc. Even Hooker himself, and all the writers of that day, affirmed that forms of Church government were to be numbered among things mutable and unessential. They held, indeed, that the Anglican Church adhered more closely than any other to the apostolic *precedent*; but as to asserting the necessity of the Episcopal system, they never thought of such a thing until long after the Reformation, and never would have thought of it, in all probability, if it had not been forced upon them by the arrogance of some of the early Puritans, in asserting the discipline of Calvin. Our author thus reaffirms the statement of the distinguished historian of the English Constitution, that, "it was not till afterwards, that the defenders of the established order found out that one claim of divine right was best met by another."

1838. 607. *Maurice, F. D.*: The Kingdom of Christ; or, Hints to a Quaker, respecting the Principles, Constitution, and Ordinances of the Catholic Church. 3 vols., sm. 8vo. Lond. 1838. New Edition, in 2 vols., 8vo, Lond. 1842 — not so much a second edition as a really new work, not altogether superseding the first, though superior to it in system and com-

pleteness. "Independently of the Oxford school, and by different methods, the author arrives at the doctrine of a Catholic Church, set up in the world as a visible polity, organized by an apostolical priesthood, developed in sacraments, holding one unchangeable creed, by fellowship with which we join in the eternal fellowship of the blessed, by separation from which we separate ourselves from the promises of God." Bannerman pronounces this work greatly inferior to Archbishop Whately's, in clearness, vigor, and accuracy of statement. The two agree, however, in contemplating the Church almost exclusively from the human stand-point. Am. ed. N.Y. 1843.

1838. 608. **Kenrick, F. P.:** The Primacy of the Apostolic See, and the Authority of General Councils Vindicated. In a series of Letters addressed to the Rt. Rev. J. H. Hopkins, etc. 12mo. Phila. 1838.

609. **Mitchell, John:** Guide to the Principles and Practice of the Congregational Churches of New England. 18mo. Northampton, Mass., 1838. Princeton Rev. viii. 243.

610. **Palmer, William:** A Treatise on the Church of Christ; designed chiefly for the use of students in theology. 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1838. 3d ed., revised and enlarged, Lond. 1842. Am. ed., with Notes by Bishop Whittingham, 2 vols., 8vo, N. York, 1841. Rev. in Brit. Crit., vol. xxiv. The author, well known as one of the early promoters of the Oxford movement, writes from the Anglo-Catholic point of view, with abundant display of erudition. The work is commended by Father Newman as a book "which no Anglican could write but Mr. Palmer himself." (*Apologia probata sua.*)

611. **Gladstone, W. E.:** The State in its Relations with the Church. 8vo. Lond. 1838. Fourth ed., revised and enlarged, 2 vols. 8vo, Lond. 1841. Rev. in Brit. Crit., vol. xxvi. Quart. Rev. lxx., xcvi. Macaulay's Essays, vol. iv., p. 116.

1839. 612. **Presbyterianism Defended.** Glasgow, 1839.

613. **Plea of Presbytery.** Belfast, 1840. 3d ed., 1843. These volumes (612, 613) are commended by Bannerman as able discussions of the main points in dispute, both as to government and worship, between Presbyterians and Episcopalians.

614. **Powell, Thomas:** An Essay on Apostolical Succession; being a defence of a genuine Protestant ministry against exclusive and intolerant schemes of Papists and High Churchmen. 12mo. Lond. 1839. 2d ed., 8vo, 1840; with Review of Perceval's *Apology*.

615. **Perceval, A. P.:** An Apology for the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession; with an Appendix on the English Orders. Sm. 8vo. Lond. 1839. 2d ed., 1841. Rev. in Brit. Crit., vol. xxvii. In the *Appendix*, which makes up more than one-half of this volume, the Romanist objections to the Anglican Succession — six in number, viz., 1. The Nag's Head story; 2. The defectiveness of our form of consecration of bishops; and 3. That of the ordination of priests; 4. The invalidity of the consecration of the bishops who consecrated Archbishop Parker; 5. The schismatic character of the English ordinations, as made in opposition to the Bishop of Rome;

6. And the fact that some of Archbishop Parker's consecrators were married men — are first passed in review, and satisfactorily disposed of. Then follows a list of between 400 and 500 English consecrations, from Cranmer and his consecrators inclusive, down to the date of the author's book, containing name, see, date of consecration, and names of consecrators in the case of each bishop. Next is exhibited the episcopal descent of Parker and Pole, respectively, traced, by way of contrast, for four successions. The author then traces up the episcopal descent of the Archbishops of Canterbury for four successions, all the consecrators being in this case known, and finds, as he expresses it, that "in transmitting the apostolical commission to the present Archbishop of Canterbury, there were, in the first step, four bishops concerned; in the second, twelve; in the third, twenty-seven; in the fourth, about fifty; so that not a single consecration, here and there, but all the consecrations in England, for successive generations, must be supposed to have failed, before the objection can be worthy of consideration, that the failure of the due consecration of any one single bishop in the line would destroy the whole theory."

1839. 616. *Beverley, R. M.*: The Heresy of Human Priesthood. 2d edit., Lond. 1839. This volume contains an account of the origin of the Oxford movement of 1833.

617. — A Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of York, on the present Corrupt State of the Church of England; of which the 12th edition appeared in 1831, pp. 39. 8vo. Beverley.

618. *Riddle, J. E.*: A Manual of Christian Antiquities; or, An Account of the Constitution, Ministers, Worship, Discipline, etc., of the Ancient Church, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1839.

1840-41. 619-637. *Tracts for the Times*, by Members of the University of Oxford. 6 vols. 8vo. Oxf. 1840. Vol. I., for 1833-34; new ed., 1840, containing Tracts i.-xlvi., and xviii., Records of the Church. Vol. II., for 1834-5, containing Tracts xlvii.-lxvii.; Nos. lxvii.-lxx. are not included in this edition. Vol. III., for 1835-6, Tracts lxxi.-lxxvii. Vol. IV., for 1836-7, Tracts lxxviii.-lxxxii. Vol. V., 1838-40, Tracts lxxxiii.-lxxxviii. Vol. VI., lxxxix.-xc. Tract i. The Ministerial Commission; ii. The Catholic Church; iv. Apostolical Succession; v. Nature and Constitution of the Church; vii. The Episcopal Church Apostolical; xi. The Visible Church; xii. Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; xv. Apostolical Succession in the English Church; xvii. The Ministerial Commission; xx. The Visible Church; xxiv. The Apostolical Commission; xxix.-xxx. Christian Liberty; xxxi. The Reformed Church; xxxiii. Primitive Episcopacy; xlvii. The Visible Church; xlix. The Kingdom of Heaven; lviii. The Church, as Viewed by Faith and by the World; lix. The Position of the Church in England.

638. *Sewell, W.*: Review of Tracts, in Lond. Quart., March, 1839, vol. lxiii., On Oxford Theology. Apologetic.

639. — The Church-of-England Divines in the 17th Century. Lond. Quart., March, 1842. In support of the Protestant, as opposed to the ultra Anglo-Catholic Position.

1840. 640. *Development* of the Church in the xviii Century. Brit. Critic, Oct. 1842. In reply to No. 639.

641. *Milman, Henry Hart*: On the Rubrics and Ritual of the Church of England. Lond. Quart. Rev., vol. lxxii., 1843.

642. *Pusey, Edw. Bouverie*: Extracts from Tracts for the Times; showing that to oppose ultra-Protestantism is not to favor Popery, etc. 8vo. Pp. 20. Lond. 1840. Anonymous.

643. *Palmer, William*: A Narrative of Events connected with the publication of the Tracts for the Times, etc. 8vo. Rev. in *Edinb. Rev.*, vol. lxxx.

644. *Perceval, A. P.*: A Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833. Pp. 107. 8vo. Lond. 1842. Among these papers is one On Apostolical Succession in Sweden, p. 64; and one on the Episcopacy of the Moravians, p. 77.

645. *Gladstone, W. E.*: Church Principles Considered in their Results. 8vo. Lond. 1840.

646. *Acton, Henry*: Three Lectures on the supposed Apostolic Succession, and Authority of a Christian Priesthood. Exeter, 1840.

647. *Miller, Samuel*: The Primitive and Apostolic Order of the Church of Christ Vindicated. 12mo. 1840.

648. *Voice of the Church*; or, Selections from the writings of the divines and other members of the Church in all ages, on subjects relating to doctrine, religious practice, and ecclesiastical history, etc. 2 vols. royal 8vo. Lond. 1840. Containing, among other treatises, the five next following:

649. *Beveridge, William*: On Church Government; now first translated.

650. *Leslie, Charles*: On Episcopacy.

651. *Sanderson, Robert*: Puritan Prejudices and Censures against the Clergy of the Church of England, Considered and Answered.

652. *Patrick, Symon*: The Dignity of the Christian Priesthood.

653. *Jones, William*: An Essay on the Church.

654. *Palmer, William*: The Apostolical Jurisdiction and Succession of the Episcopacy in the British Churches, vindicated against the exceptions of Dr. Wiseman in the Dublin Review. 8vo. Lond. 1840.

655. *McNeile, Hugh*: Lectures on the Church of England. 7th ed. 8vo. Lond. 1840. 8th ed., 12mo, Lond. 1842. In vindication and support of national Church establishments, that of England in particular, pointing out its defects, and suggesting the best remedies.

656. *Wardlaw, Ralph*: National Church Establishments Examined: a course of Lectures delivered in London in April and May, 1839. Royal 8vo. Lond. No date. Dr. McNeile's Lectures were delivered in London in March of the year following — 1840.

657. — Letters to the Rev. Hugh McNeile, M. A., on some portions of his Lectures on the Church of England. Lond. 1840. The Lectures and Letters ably advocate "the voluntary principle."

1840. 658. *Boyd, Archibald*: Episcopacy and Presbytery. Pp. 436. 8vo. Lond. 1840-1.  
 659. — Letters on Episcopacy, etc. 8vo. Lond.  
 660. — Sermons on the Church.  
 660 a. *Essays on the Church*. By a Layman. 12mo. Lond. 1840.
1841. 661. *Whately, Richard*: The Kingdom of Christ Delineated; in two Essays: On our Lord's own Account of his Person, and of the Nature of his Kingdom; and on the Constitution, Powers, and Ministry of a Christian Church, as appointed by Himself. 8vo. Lond. 1841. Am. ed., 8vo, N. Y. 1859.  
 662. *Smyth, Thomas*: The Prelatical Doctrine of Apostolical Succession Examined, and the Protestant Ministry defended against the Assumptions of Popery and High-churchism, in a series of Lectures. Pp. 568. 8vo. Boston, 1841.  
 663. — Presbytery and not Prelacy, the Scriptural and Primitive Policy. Pp. 568. 8vo. Boston, 1843; Glasc. 1844. Though too ponderous for their theme, these volumes contain a valuable collection of literary material and references.  
 664. *Kenrick, P. R.*: The Validity of the Anglican Ordinations Examined; or, A Review of certain Facts regarding the Consecration of Matthew Parker, first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury. 8vo. Phila. 1841. 2d ed., revised, 8vo, pp. 342, Phila. 1848.  
 665. *Wycliffe, John*: The Last Age of the Church. Now first printed. 18mo. Dublin, 1840-1. Wycliffe's first work, A. D. 1356.  
 666. *Vail, Thomas H.*: The Comprehensive Church; or, Christian Unity and Ecclesiastical Union. 18mo. Phila. 1841.
1842. 667. *O'Brien, James Thomas*: A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the United Dioceses of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, at his primary visitation in Sept., 1842. Am. ed., 8vo., pp. 100, Phila. 1843. A History of the Oxford Movement from its inception; and a concise Exposition of the whole Anglo-Catholic Scheme. Reprinted in Bricknell's Judgment of the Bishops, etc. [No. 722.]  
 668. *Brown, John* (of Langton): The Exclusive Claims of Puseyite Episcopalians to the Christian Ministry Indefensible; with an Inquiry into the Divine Right of Episcopacy and the Apostolical Succession; in a series of Letters to Dr. Pusey. Edinb. 1842.  
 669. *Newman, John Henry*: The Church of the Fathers. Second ed., sm. 8vo, Lond. 1842. Without author's name.  
 670. *Bernard, J. L.*: The Synagogue and the Church; being an attempt to show that the Government, Ministers, and Services of the Church were derived from those of the Synagogue. Condensed from the original Latin work of Vitringa. 8vo. Lond. 1842.  
 671. *Manning, Henry Edward*: The Unity of the Church. 8vo. Lond. 1842. Am. ed., 12mo, N. Y. 1844.  
 672. *Butler, William Archer*: Primitive Church Principles not Inconsistent with Universal Christian Sympathy. A Sermon; to which is

- added A Letter in corroboration of the argument of the Sermon. In vol. i. of Butler's Sermons, 8vo, Lond., 6th ed., 1864.
1842. 673. *Perrone*: Prælectiones Theologicæ. Tom. ii. Parisiis, 1842. This writer is of the school of Bellarmine, a representative of the more rigid and traditional class of Roman divines.
674. *Blomfield, Charles*: Sermons on the Church. 8vo. Lond. 1842. (See Christian Rememb., June, 1842.)
675. *Manual of Presbytery*; comprising, I. Presbyterianism, etc., by Dr. S. MILLER; II. The Character and Advantages of Presbyterianism Ascertained by Facts, etc., by J. G. LORIMER. 18mo. Edinb. and Lond. 1842.
1843. 676. *Kip, W. L.*: The Double Witness of the Church. 12mo. N. Y. 1843. "The Double Witness" is that "against Rome on the one hand, and mere Protestant congregations on the other." These words are borrowed from F. W. Faber, formerly a clergyman of the Church of England, now a priest of the Oratory in the Church of Rome.
677. *Alexander, W. L.*: Anglo-Catholicism not Apostolical; being an inquiry into the Scriptural authority of the leading doctrines advocated in the Tracts for the Times, etc. 8vo. Edinb. 1843. This is pronounced by Donaldson "the best reasoned of the productions that appeared in the Tractarian Controversy." Hist. Chr. Lit. i. 60.
678. *Smyth, Thomas*: Ecclesiastical Republicanism; or, The Republicanism, Liberty, and Catholicity of Presbytery, in contrast with Popery and Prelacy. 12mo. Boston, 1843.
679. *Barnes, Albert*: An Inquiry into the Organization and Government of the Apostolic Church; particularly with reference to the claims of Episcopacy. 18mo. Phila. 1843.
680. — The Position of the Evangelical Party in the Episcopal Church. 12mo. Pp. 70. Phila. 1844. The reprehensible character of this publication, in its main drift and tendency, is well set forth in the Princeton Review, vol. xvi., pp. 319–24. Among the grounds of censure are the following: 1. The whole tendency of the book is to throw the influence of other denominations against the interests of true religion in the Episcopal Church. 2. The assumption on which the whole book is founded, viz., that Puseyism is the true doctrine of the Episcopal Church, and, consequently, that the Evangelical party are in conflict with their own doctrinal standards—an assumption wholly erroneous and unjust. 3. The main position of the book—that a form of prayer is destructive of true piety—a transparent sophism. 4. The change of the ground of controversy between Presbytery and Episcopacy: for the claim of the exclusive validity of Episcopal orders substituting the charge of unscriptural doctrine and liturgical worship.
681. *Plea of Presbytery*. Third edition. Belfast, 1843. Discusses the leading points of difference between Presbytery and Episcopacy.
682. *Whytock*: Vindication of Presbytery; with Twelve Essays on the Church. Edinb. 1843.
1844. 683. *McIlvaine, Charles Pettit*: The Holy Catholic Church; or,

The Communion of Saints, in the Mystical Body of Christ: A Sermon, etc., with an Appendix. 18mo. Phila. 1844. Republished in an enlarged form, under the title, The Temple of God; or, The Holy Catholic Church and Communion of Saints, in its Nature, Structure, and Unity. 12mo. Phila. 1860. Pp. 143.

1844. 684. *Buel, Samuel*: The Apostolical System of the Church Defended; in a Reply to Dr. Whately on the Kingdom of Christ. 12mo. Phila. 1844.

685. *Whately, Richard*: Thoughts on Church Government; being the substance of a Charge, 1844. 8vo. Lond. 1844.

686. *Arnold, Thomas*: Fragment on the Church. 8vo. Lond. 1844. A posthumous and unfinished publication.

687. *Wordsworth, Christopher*: Theophilus Anglicanus; or, Instructions concerning the Church, and the Anglican branch of it. For the use of schools, colleges, and candidates for orders. 8vo. Lond. 1844. 6th ed., 1850. Am. edition, entitled Theophilus Americanus; or, Instruction for the young Student concerning the Church, and the American branch of it. 12mo. Phila. 1851. Part III. is by the Am. editor, H. DAVEY EVANS.

688. *Marshall, Tho. W.*: Notes on the Episcopal Polity of the Holy Catholic Church; with some account of the development of the modern religious systems. 8vo. Lond. 1844. Am. ed. by Dr. Wainwright, 12mo, N. Y. 1844. Not long after the appearance of this volume, the author joined the Church of Rome, and published the controversial tract next named.

689. — Development of Protestantism, etc. Lond. 1849.

690. *Ward, W. G.*: The Ideal of a Christian Church considered in comparison with existing practice, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1844. Rev. in Lond. Quart., vol. lxxv. Eng. Rev., vol. ii. A labored but carelessly written volume, assailing the principles and practices of the English Church. The author, soon after its publication, joined the Romish Communion.

691. — The Anglican Establishment Contrasted, in every principle of its Constitution, with the Church Catholic of every Age. Pp. 143. 8vo. Lond.

692. *Madge, Thomas*: Lectures on certain High Church Principles commonly designated by the term Puseyism. 8vo. Lond. 1844.

693. *King, David*: The Ruling Eldership of the Christian Church. 12mo. Edinb. 1844. Am. ed., 16mo, N. Y. 1860.

694. *Gresley, William*: Anglo-Catholicism; a short treatise on the theory of the English Church: with remarks on its peculiarities; the objections of Romanists and Dissenters; its practical defects; its present position; its future prospect; and the duties of its members. Sm. 8vo. Lond. 1844. A defence of the Anglo-Catholic system, as originally propounded, and in opposition to the extreme views of its later advocates.

695. *The Primitive Church* in its Episcopacy. By the author of "Dr. Hookwell." 12mo. Lond. 1844.

696. *Moberly, George*: The Sayings of the great Forty Days be-

tween the Resurrection and Ascension, regarded as the outline of the Kingdom of God. 8vo. Lond. 1844. Second ed., with an Examination of Mr. Newman's Theory of Development, 8vo, Lond. 1846. Marked by learning and wealth of thought.

1844. 697. **Stebbing, Henry**: The Church and its Ministers, as represented in the Christian writers of the primitive ages. 8vo. Lond. 1844.

698. **Scherer, Edmond**: Esquisse d'une Theorie de l'Eglise Chretienne. Paris, 1844.

699. — De l'Etat actuel de l'Eglise Reformee de France. Paris, 1844.

700. **Boardman, H. A.**: The Prelatical Doctrine of the Apostolical Succession Examined; with a delineation of the High-Church System. Pp. 350. 12mo. Phila. 1844.

701. **Windsor, Lloyd**: An Inquiry into the Nature of the Ministerial Commission. Buffalo, 1844.

702. **Wisner, William**: Prelacy and Parity, discussed in several Lectures; comprising a review of the Rev. L. Windsor's argument, etc. N. Y. 1844.

703. **Evans, Hugh Davey**: Essays to prove the Validity of Anglican Ordinations; in answer to the Rt. Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick, R. C. Bishop of St. Louis. 12mo. Balt. 1844.

704. **Ives, L. S.**: The Apostles' Doctrine and Fellowship. Five Sermons, etc. Pp. 189. N. Y. 1844.

705. **Miller, Samuel**: The Warrant, Nature, and Duties of the Office of Ruling Elder in the Presbyterian Church. A Sermon, etc., with an Appendix. 12mo. Phila. 1844.

706. **Coleman, Lyman**: A Church without a Bishop. The apostolical and primitive Church, popular in its government, and simple in its worship. 12mo. Boston, 1844. New edition, carefully revised, and adapted to recent discussions, forming a Manual on Prelacy and Ritualism. 12mo. Phila. 1869.

707. **Drs. Potts and Wainwright**: No Church without a Bishop; or, the Controversy between the Rev. Drs. Potts and Wainwright. Edited by J. M. (James Richmond). 8vo. N. York, 1844.

708. **Hopkins, John Henry**: The Novelties which Disturb our Peace. Four Letters addressed to the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church. 12mo. Phila. 1844. The *first* of these Letters vindicates the Validity of Lay-baptism; the *second* confutes "the unchurched dogma," so called—that Episcopacy is of the Essence of the Church; the *third* is directed against the Anglo-Catholic theory of the Real Presence, and of Sacerdotal Power; the *fourth* controverts the startling novelty in theology that the dogmas of the Council of Trent may be reconciled with sound Catholic, or orthodox and primitive doctrine.

709. **Waylen, Edw.**: The Novelties which Disturb our Unity. A volume purporting to be a polemical reply to Bishop Hopkins—chiefly remarkable for its coarseness of taste and style.

1844. 710. *Snodgrass, W. D.*: Discourses on Apostolical Succession. 12mo. Troy, N. Y., 1844.
711. *Tydings, Richard*: A Refutation of the Doctrine of Uninterrupted Apostolic Succession, etc. In answer to Rev. G. T. Chapman, D. D., and others. 8vo. Louisville, Ky., 1844.
712. *Woods, Leonard*: Lectures on Church Government; containing Objections to the Episcopal Scheme. 12mo. N. York, 1844.
713. *Upham, T. C.*: Ratio Disciplinæ; or, The Constitution of the Congregational Churches Examined, etc. 12mo. Portland, 1844.
714. *Punchard, George*: A View of Congregationalism, its Principles and Doctrines, etc. 12mo. Andover, 1844.
715. — History of Congregationalism, etc. 2d ed., 2 vols., cr. 8vo, N. Y. 1865-67.
716. *Breckinridge, Robert J.*: Presbyterian Government not a Hierarchy, but a Commonwealth; and Presbyterian Ordination not a Charm, but an Act of Government. The substance of two arguments delivered before the Synod of Philadelphia, met in Baltimore, Oct., 1843. 12mo. Phila. 1844.
717. *The Elder Question*. In Bib. Rep. and Princeton Rev., vol. xvi.
1845. 718. *Schaff, Philip*: The Principle of Protestantism, as related to Romanism and the Present State of the Church. Translated from the German; with an Introduction by J. W. Nevin, D. D. 8vo. N. York, 1845.
719. *Marsden, J. B.*: The Churchmanship of the New Testament: An Inquiry, Historical and Theological, into the Origin and Progress of certain Opinions which now agitate the Church of Christ. In Three Parts. 12mo. Lond. 1845. The leading object of this volume is to show that the leading errors of the Tractarian system originate in a defective acquaintance with the Gospel as a system, and an entire misapprehension of the true character of the Church of Christ; a corruption of Christianity which can triumph only on the ruins of the Word of God. The aim of the author is avowedly of the highest — “to exhibit some of the leading principles by which all the great controversies which agitate the Church must be decided.”
720. *Harington, E. C.*: Apostolical Succession, and the Necessity of Episcopal Ordination, as held by the Primitive Church, and maintained by the Reformers of the Church of England. Being two Sermons, with copious illustrative notes. 8vo. Lond. 1845. Second ed., with large additions, 8vo, Lond. 1847.
- 720 a. *Manuel du Droit Ecclesiastique*. 4th ed. Paris, 1845.
721. *Chapin, A. B.*: A View of the Organization and Order of the Primitive Church as presented in Scripture and History. 12mo. N. Haven, 1845. New ed., 1867.
722. *Bricknell, W. S.*: The Judgment of the Bishops upon Tractarian Theology. A complete analytical arrangement of the Charges delivered by the Prelates of the Anglican Church from 1837 to 1842 inclusive; so far as they relate to the Tractarian movement, etc. 8vo. Oxford, 1845.

1845. 723. *Smyth, Thomas*: The Name, Nature, and Functions of Ruling Elders, etc. 12mo. N. York, 1845.
1846. 724. *A Full Catechism* of the Orthodox Catholic, Eastern Church; being the Longer Russian Catechism. On the Ninth Article of the Creed. In a volume entitled "A Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East," etc. With an Appendix. 8vo. Aberdeen, 1846. The original was published at Moscow, 1839.
725. *McNeile, Hugh*: The Church and the Churches; or, The Church of God in Christ, and the Churches of Christ Militant here on Earth. 8vo. Pp. 574. Lond. 1846.
726. *Russell, John Fuller*: Anglican Ordinations Valid; a refutation of certain statements in the second and third chapters of "The Validity of Anglican Ordinations Examined, by the Very Rev. P. R. Kenrick, V. G." 8vo. Lond. 1846.
727. *Harington, E. C.*: The Succession of Bishops in the Church of England Unbroken; or, The Nag's Head Fable refuted. With a Postscript, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1846. 2d ed., enlarged, 1852.
- 727 a. *Garratt, Wm. Albin*: An Inquiry into the Scriptural View of the Constitution of a Christian Church, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1846.
728. *Stone, John S.*: The Church Universal: a Series of Discourses on the true comprehension of the Church, as exhibited mainly in the Holy Scriptures, and subordinately in the Standards of the Protestant Episcopal Church, etc. 8vo. N. York, 1846. A new edition, entitled *The Living Temple*, etc., 8vo, N. Y. 1866.
729. *Wilson, W. D.*: A Manual of Church Principles. 12mo. Balt. 1846.
730. *Allies, T. W.*: The Church of England cleared from the Charge of Schism, upon Testimonies of Councils and Fathers of the first six centuries. 8vo. Lond. 1846. 2d ed., Oxf. 1848.
731. — The See of St. Peter, the Rock of the Church, Source of Jurisdiction, and the Centre of Unity. Pp. 160. 8vo. Lond. 1850.
732. *Coleman, Lyman*: The Antiquities of the Christian Church. 8vo. N. York, 1846.
733. *McKerrow, John*: The Office of the Ruling Elder in the Christian Church; its Divine Authority, Duties, and Responsibilities. 8vo. Edinb. 1846.
1847. 734. *Bunsen, C. C. J.*: The Constitution of the Church of the Future. A practical explanation of the correspondence with the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone on the German Church, Episcopacy, and Jerusalem, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1847. Translated from the German.
735. *Stanley, A. P.*: Sermons and Essays on the Apostolical Age. 8vo. Oxford, 1847.
736. *Thompson, Edw. Healy*: The Unity of the Episcopate, considered, in reply to the work of the Rev. T. W. Allies, entitled *The Church of England cleared from the Charge of Schism*, etc. Lond. 1847.
737. — Remarks on Certain Anglican Theories of Unity. Lond. 1847.

1847. 738. *The Apostolic Succession* Explained: a short Treatise in which certain theological questions of the day are calmly examined and resolved. By a Priest of the Order of Charity. Lond. 1847. Of the three last-named publications, the first [No. 736] reaffirms the statements of Bellarmine respecting the Papal Supremacy, as exhibiting the views of the English adherents of the Papacy: "Bishops succeed not properly to the Apostles, for they have no part of the true apostolic ministry . . . all ordinary jurisdiction of bishops descends immediately from the Pope; the Pope has, full and entire, that power which Christ left on earth for the good of the Church."

739. *Review* of Nos. 736-738, in ENGLISH REVIEW, vol. viii., pp. 354-399: "The Romish Theory of Unity Examined." 8vo. Lond. 1847.

740. *Landon, E. H.*: Tentativa Theologica. Episcopal Rights and Ultramontane Usurpations. By Father ANTONIO PEREIRA DE FIGUEREDO, Priest and Doctor of Lisbon. Translated from the original Portuguese, with Notes, etc. 8vo. Lond. 1847. The original work, which appeared in 1766, was condemned by the Pope, and was publicly burnt at Rome. It maintains the full apostolical power of every bishop in his own diocese; and affirms that "the episcopal jurisdiction considered in itself, that is, in its institution, and apart from any law, use, or reservation to the contrary, is a jurisdiction absolute and unlimited in respect of each diocese."

1848. 741. *Argyll, Duke of*: Presbytery Examined: An Essay, critical and historical, on the ecclesiastical history of Scotland since the Reformation. 8vo. Lond. 1848.

742. *London Quarterly Review*: Duke of Argyll. Presbytery Examined. Vol. lxxxiv., pp. 78-106.

743. *Noel, Baptist W.*: An Essay on the Union of Church and State. 8vo. Lond. 1848. Am. ed., 12mo, N. Y., 1849.

744. *Davidson, Samuel*: The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament Unfolded, and its points of coincidence or disagreement, with prevailing systems indicated. 8vo. Lond. 1848. 2d ed., 12mo, 1854.

745. *Wardlaw, Ralph*: Congregational Independency, in contradistinction to Episcopacy and Presbyterianism: the Church Polity of the New Testament. 12mo. Lond. 1848. "This treatise," says the author's biographer, Dr. Alexander, "contains nothing positively new. . . . The very clearness and simplicity of Dr. W.'s reasoning only make it more apparent that . . . the evidence that Congregationalism, in its extant form, is the Church polity of the New Testament is painfully slender." (*Life*, p. 433.) A confession remarkable for its candor—a virtue signally illustrated in Dr. Wardlaw's volume as compared with that of Dr. Davidson. The contrast between these two writers, in this respect, will appear from a comparison of the Eccles. Polity, p. 74, with Congreg. Indep., p. 50.

19. 746. *Mines, Flavel S.*: A Presbyterian Clergyman looking for the Church. By one of three hundred. 12mo. N. York, 1849.

747. *Pantin, T. P.*: The Church of England Apostolical in its

Origin, Episcopal in its Government, and Scriptural in its Belief, etc. 12mo. Pp. 48. Lond. 1849.

1850. 748. *Pusey, E. B.*: The Royal Supremacy not an arbitrary Authority, but limited by the Laws of the Church, of which kings are members. Part I. Ancient Precedents. 8vo. Oxford, 1850.

749. *Newman, John H.*: Lectures on certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in submitting to the Catholic Church. 8vo. Lond. 1850. Am. ed., 12mo, N. Y., 1851.

750. *Browne, E. Harold*: Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. 8vo. Lond. 1850. 2 vols. On Articles XIX. and XXIII.

751. *Ward, W. G.*: The Anglican Establishment Contrasted, in every principle of its constitution, with the Church Catholic of every age. 8vo. Pp. 143. Lond. 1850.

752. *Schuyler, M.*: The Ministry and Worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church. 12mo. Buffalo, 1850.

1851. 753. *Wycliffe, John*: Three Treatises: I. Of the Church, and her Members. II. Of the Apostasy of the Church. III. Of Anti-Christ, etc. Now first published from the manuscript by J. H. Todd. 12mo. Dublin, 1851.

754. *Litton, E. A.*: The Church of Christ in its Idea, Attributes, and Ministry; with a particular reference to the controversy on the subject between Romanists and Protestants. 8vo. Lond. 1851. Am. ed., 8vo, Phila., 1856. As indicated in the title, the leading object of this work is to bring out the fundamental points of difference between the Protestant theory of the Church, on the one hand, and that of the Romanists and Anglo-Catholics, on the other. As a polemic treatise against the Romish system, it is of a high order of merit. But in its exhibition of the primitive scheme of polity, it fails to develop the argument for Episcopacy drawn from the New Testament; or, rather, it depreciates that argument to the point even of its full surrender; so that the author is claimed by the Presbyterians as substantially their advocate.

755. *Goode, William*: A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Validity of the Orders of the Scotch and Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches. 8vo. Lond. 1851.

756. *Dodsworth, William*: Anglicanism Considered in its Results. 12mo. Lond. 1851.

757. *Walcott, M. E. C.*: The English Ordinal: its History, Validity, and Catholicity; with an Introduction on the three holy Orders of Ministers in the Church. 8vo. Lond. 1831.

758. *Guericke, H. E. F.*: Lehrbuch der christlich-kirchlichen Archäologie. 8vo. Leipz. 1847. Translated and adapted to the use of the English Church under the title Manual of the Antiquities of the Church. 16mo. Lond. 1851.

759. *Harington, E. C.*: A Letter, etc., on the LV. Canon, and the Kirk of Scotland; with an Appendix, etc. 8vo. Pp. 99. Lond. 1851.

1851. 760. *Alexander, J. A.*: Essays on the Primitive Church Officers. 12mo. N. York, 1851.
1852. 760 a. *Stanley, A. P.*: Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age. 8vo. Oxf. 1852.
761. *Nevin, J. W.*: Cyprian: Four Articles in the Mercersburg Review. 1852.
762. *Hare, J. C.*: The Contest with Rome. 8vo. Lond. 1852. This volume consists mainly of a body of Notes, pp. 73-346, "especially in answer to Dr. Newman's recent Lectures." Able and valuable.
763. *Bunsen*: Hippolytus and his Age; or the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus, and Ancient and Modern Christianity and Divinity compared. 4 vols. 12mo. Lond. 1852. 2d ed., 2 vols., 8vo, 1854.
764. *Shimeall, R. C.*: The End of Prelacy; or, A Treatise on Ministerial Parity, etc. 8vo. N. Y. 1852.
1853. 764 a. *Gosselin, M.*: The Power of the Pope during the Middle Ages; or, An Historical Inquiry into the Origin of the Temporal Power of the Holy See, and the Constitutional Laws of the Middle Ages relating to the Deposition of Sovereigns. 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1853.
765. *Coleman, Lyman*: Ancient Christianity Exemplified in the Private, Domestic, Social, and Civil Life of the Primitive Christians. 8vo. Phila. 1853.
766. *King, David*: Exposition and Defence of the Presbyterian Form of Church Government. In reply to Episcopal and Independent writers. 18mo. Edinb. 1853.
767. *Norton, G. H.*: An Inquiry into the Nature and Extent of the Holy Catholic Church. 18mo. Phila. 1853.
1854. 768. *Pretyman, J. R.*: The Church of England and Erastianism. 8vo. Lond. 1854.
- 768 a. *Apostolical* Succession Overthrown, and Evangelical Succession Established, etc. By a Clergyman of the Established Church. 8vo. Lond. 1854.
769. *Wilberforce, R. J.*: An Inquiry into the Principles of Church Authority, etc. Lond. 1854.
770. *Atkinson, W.*: The Church: An Explanation of the meaning contained in the Bible. 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1854.
- 770 a. *Andrews, W. W.*: The True Constitution of the Church and its Destination. 12mo. N. York, 1854.
1855. 771. *Kenrick, F. P.*: A Vindication of the Catholic Church; in a series of Letters addressed to Bishop Hopkins. 12mo. Balt. 1855.
772. *Kaye, John*: Some Account of the External Government and Discipline of the Church of Christ, during the first three centuries. 8vo. Lond. 1855.
1856. 773. *Greenwood, T.*: Cathedra Petri. 4 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1856-60.
1857. 773 a. *Pusey, E. B.*: The Councils of the Church, from the Council of Jerusalem, A. D. 51, to the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381; chiefly

as to their constitution, but also as to their objects and history. 8vo. Oxf. 1857.

1857. 774. **Hodge, Charles**: Essays and Reviews selected from the Princeton Review. 8vo. N. Y. 1857. Article on The Church, etc.
1858. 775. **Bartol, C. A.**: Church and Congregation: a Plea for their Unity. 12mo. Boston, 1858.
- 775 a. **Robinson, Stuart**: The Church of God, as an essential Element of the Gospel, and the Idea, Structure, and Functions thereof. 12mo. Phila. 1858.
- 775 b. **Blunt, J. J.**: On the Right Use of the Early Fathers. 8vo. Lond. 1858.
1859. 776. **Killen, W. D.**: The Ancient Church; its History, Doctrine, Worship, and Constitution, traced for the first three hundred years. 8vo. Lond. 1859.
- 776 a. **Dupanloup**: La Souverainete Pontificale. 2d ed., Paris, 1860.
777. **Wilson, William**: The Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ: a practical Exposition of Matt. xvi. 13, etc., etc. 12mo. Edinb. 1859.
778. **Dagg, J. L.**: A Manual of Theology. Second Part: a Treatise of Church Order. 8vo. Charleston, 1859.
1860. 779. **Wilson, W. D.**: The Church Identified by a Reference to the History of its Origin, Perpetuation, and Extension into the United States. 12mo. N. Y. 1860.
780. **Friedberg, Æmilius**: De finium inter Ecclesiam et Civitatem regundorum iudicio quid medii ævi doctores et leges statuerint. Leips. 1861.
1862. 781. **Theiner**: Codex Diplomaticus. 3 vols. fol. Roma, 1862.
1863. 782. **Meyrick, Frederick**: CHURCH: Article in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. I. 8vo. Lond. 1863.
783. **Coxe, A. C.**: Calendar of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. N. York, 1863.
784. **Cunningham, W.**: Discussions on Church Principles: Popish, Erastian, and Presbyterian. 8vo. Edinb. 1863.
785. — Historical Theology. 2 vols. 8vo. Edinb. 1863. Vol. i., chap. i.
1865. 786. **Manning, H. E.**: Essays on Religion and Literature, by various writers. 1st series, 1865; 2d series, 1867. Exhibit the views of the modern Romanists of the Ultramontane school regarding the Church, etc.
787. **Dexter, H. M.**: Congregationalism: What it is; whence it is; how it works; why it is better than any other form of Church government, and its consequent demands. 8vo. Boston, 1865. 2d ed., 1868.
788. **Joyce**: The Sword and the Keys. Lond. 1865.
789. **Pusey, Edw. B.**: The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of restoring Visible Unity: An Eirenicon. 8vo. Lond. 1865; N. Y. 1866.
1866. 790. **Coxe, A. C.**: The Criterion: a Means of Distinguishing Truth from Error in Questions of the Times; with Four Letters on the Eirenicon of Dr. Pusey. 12mo. N. Y. 1866.

1866. 791. *Cooper, B.*: The Free Church of Ancient Christendom. 18mo. N. D. Lond.
792. *Ecclesia Dei*: The Plan and Functions of the Church in the Divine Order of the Universe, and its Relations with the World. 8vo. Lond. 1866.
793. *Drumm, J.*: Vox Ecclesiæ; or, The Doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church, on Episcopacy and Apostolical Succession, embracing a refutation of the work known as "Goode on Orders." 12mo. Phila. 1866.
- 793 a. *Campbell, Peter Colin*: The Theory of Ruling Eldership; or, The Position of Lay Ruler in the Reformed Churches Examined. 12mo. Pp. 109. Edinb. and Lond. 1866.
1867. 794. *Harrison, John*: Whose are the Fathers? or, The Teaching of Certain Anglo-Catholics, on the Church and its Ministry, contrary alike to the Holy Scriptures, to the Fathers of the first six centuries, and to those of the Reformed Church of England. With a *Catena Patrum* of the first six centuries, and of the English Church of the latter half of the 16th century. 8vo. Lond. 1867.
795. *Guettée, R. F.*: The Papacy; its Historic Origin and Primitive Relations with the Eastern Churches. 12mo. N. York, 1867. Translated from the French: *Papauté Schismatique*.
796. *Ripley, H. J.*: Church Polity: a Treatise on Christian Churches and the Christian Ministry. 18mo. Boston, 1867.
- 796 a. *Luthardt, Kahnis, and Brückner*: The Church: its Origin, its History, its Present Position. 8vo. Edinb. 1867.
1868. 797. *Lightfoot, J. B.*: St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. A revised Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations. 8vo. Lond. 1868. Dissertation I., The Christian Ministry. Pp. 179-267.
798. *Bannerman, James*: The Church of Christ: A Treatise on the Nature, Powers, Ordinances, Discipline, and Government of the Christian Church. 2 vols. 8vo. Edinb. 1868. "This work is characterized by unusual comprehensiveness, thoroughness, and unity. From the author's point of view it has special interest, being a fresh statement of the fundamental principles of the Presbyterian system in their application to the whole range of questions discussed; the treatment having reference, throughout, to the form which recent controversies have assumed." (*Dr. Rainy, in Pref.*)
- 798 a. *Gallagher, Mason*: The Primitive Church, etc. 12mo. N. Y. 1868.
799. *Theoklesia*; or, The Organization and Perpetuity, Conflicts and Triumphs of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. By a Presbyter of the West. 12mo. N. Y. 1868.
800. *Sumner, Geo. Henry*: Principles at Stake: Essays on Church Questions of the Day. 8vo. Lond. 1868.
801. *McClintock* and *Strong*: Church: Article in Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Vol. I. Royal 8vo. 1868.

1868. 801 a. *Ecce Ecclesia*: An Essay showing the essential identity of the Church in all Ages. 12mo. N. Y. 1868.
1869. 802. *Religious Republics*: Six Essays on Congregationalism. Lond. 1869. An exposition of the principles and practice of the Independents, with a view to the removal of prejudices and misapprehensions.
803. *Maskell, William*: The Present Position of the High-Church Party in the Established Church of England, considered in a Review of "The Civil Power in its Relations to the Church," and in Two Letters on the Royal Supremacy, and the Want of Dogmatic Teaching in the Reformed Church. Lond. 1869.
- 803 a. *Joyce, J. W.*: The Civil Power in its Relations to the Church. 8vo. Lond. 1869.
804. *Garbett, Edw.*: Voices of the Church of England against Modern Sacerdotalism; being a Manual of Authorities on the Nature of the Lord's Supper and the Christian Ministry, selected and arranged, with an Introduction. Lond. 1869.
- 804 a. *Kettlewell, S.*: The Rights and Liberties of the Church, viewed in relation to the present controversy. 8vo. Lond. 1869.
805. *Haddan, A. W.*: Apostolical Succession in the Church of England. 8vo. Lond. 1869.
806. *Janus*: The Pope and the Council. 12mo. Lond. 1869. Am. ed., 12mo, N. Y. 1870. Translated from the German: Der Papst und das Concil. Leipz. 1869.
807. *Kelly, W.*: Lectures on the Church of God. New ed. 12mo. Lond. 1869.
- 807 a. *Birks, T. R.*: Church and State; or, National Religion and Church Establishments considered with reference to present controversies. 12mo. Lond. 1869.
1870. 808. *Wier, Archibald*, and *Maclagan, W. D.*: The Church and the Age: Essays on the Principles and Present Position of the Anglican Church. 8vo. Lond. 1870.
809. *Reynolds, H. Robt.*: *Ecclesia*: Church Problems Considered in a Series of Essays. 8vo. Lond. 1870.
810. *Huntingdon, W. R.*: The Church-Idea. An Essay towards Unity. 18mo. N. Y. 1870.
811. *Smith, Rd. Travers*: Church Membership on Church Principles. An Essay on the Gifts and Functions of the Christian Society. 12mo. Lond. 1870.
- 811 a. *Lindsay, Lord*: *Œcumenicity*, in relation to the Church of England. Four Letters: I. On the Catholicity of the Anglican Church. II. On the Claims of England *versus* Rome. III. On the Futility of Attempts at Reconciliation with the Church of Rome. IV. On the (so called) *Œcumenical Council of 1869-70*, etc., etc. 8vo. Lond. 1870.
- 811 b. *Legge, Alfred Owen*: The Growth of the Temporal Power of the Papacy. An Historical Review, with Observations upon the Council of the Vatican. 12mo. Lond. 1870.

1870. 811 c. **Stanley, A. P.**: Essays chiefly on Questions of Church and State. 8vo. Lond. 1870.
- 811 d. **Reichel, O. J.**: The See of Rome in the Middle Ages. 8vo. Lond. 1870.
- 811 e. **Vinton, Francis**: A Manual Commentary on the General Canon Laws and the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. 8vo. N. Y. 1870.
812. **Schmucker, S. S.**: The True Unity of Christ's Church, etc., etc. N. Y. 1870.
1871. 812 a. **Hergenrother**: Anti-Janus; an Historico-Theological Criticism of the Work entitled "The Pope and the Council." Eng. transl., Dubl. and Lond., 1871.

## GERMAN WORKS. 1819—1871.

1819. 813. **Greiling**: Apostolischen Christengemeinen. Halberstadt, 1819.
1825. 814. **Moehler, John Adam**: Die Einheit in der Kirche, oder das Princip des Catholicismus, dargestellt im Geiste der Kirchenväter der drei ersten Jahrhunderte. 8vo. Tübing. 1825-44.
1831. 815. **Hüllmann**: Ursprünge der Kirchenverfassung des Mittelalters. 8vo. Bonn, 1831.
1833. 816. **Kist, N. C.**: Über den Ursprung der bischöflichen Würde in der Christliche Kirche, im Verbande mit der Entstehung und dem Zustande der frühesten Christengemeinden. Ein Beweis für die Echtheit und Wichtigkeit der Briefe des H. Ignatius. 8vo. Münster, 1833. From the Dutch.
1836. 817. **Rothensee**: Der Primat des Papstes in allen Christlichen Jahrhunderten. 3 vols.
1837. 818. **Rothe, Richard**: Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung. Ein geschichtlicher Versuch. Erster Band. Buch I.-III. Nebst einer Beilage über die Echtheit der Ignatianischen Briefe. 8vo. Pp. 786. Wittenberg, 1837.
1838. 819. **Kist, N. C.**: Die Christliche Kirche auf Erden, nach der Lehre der heiligen Schrift und der Geschichte. 8vo. Leipz. 1838. From the Dutch.
820. **Baur, F. C.**: Ueber den Ursprung des Episcopats in der Christlichen Kirche. Prüfung der neuestens von Hrn. Dr. Rothe aufgestellten Ansicht. Tübing. 1838. This is a critical examination of Rothe's view of the origin and development of the Episcopal system.
821. **Gess**: Die Einheit der Kirche im Sinne Cyprians. (In Stud. der Ev. Geistl. Würt. Stuttgart, 1838.)
1839. 822. **Huther, J. G.**: Cyprians Lehre von der Einheit der Kirche. 8vo. Hamb. u. Gotha, 1839.
823. **Klee, F. W.**: Das Recht der einen allgemeinen-Kirche, aus dem in der heiligen Schrift gegebenen-Begriff entwickelt. 2 Bde. Magdeb. 1839-41.

1840. 824. *Puchta, G. F.*: Einleitung in das Recht der Kirche. Leipzig, 1840.
825. *Ellendorf*: Der Primat der Romischen Päpste.
826. *Meyer, M.*: Grundsätze der Kirchenverfassung für die Protestant-Evangel. Kirche im Allgemeinen, und Anwendung derselben auf die von Zwingli Reformirte Kirche insbesondere. Zurich, 1840.
827. *Stahl, F. G.*: Die Kirchenverfassung nach Lehre und Recht der Protestanten. Erlang. 1840. Zweit. Ausg. 1862.
828. *Petersen, A.*: Die Idee der Christlichen Kirche. Drei Theile. 8vo. Leipz. 1839-46.
1842. 829. *Chlebus, M.*: Ueber das Verhältniss der Bischoflichen Kirche von England zu der ursprünglichen Apostolischen. Leips. 1842.
830. *Uhlen, H. F.*: Die Zustände der Anglicanischen Kirche, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Verfassung und des Cultus dargestellt. 8vo. Leips. 1843. "The fairest, the fullest, and the most accurate account of the English Church, as far as we know, that has yet appeared in Germany." *Eng. Rev.*, vol. i. There is what purports to be an English translation of this volume: The Anglican Church of the Nineteenth Century; indicating her relative position to dissent in every form, and presenting a clear and unprejudiced view of Puseyism and orthodoxy. 8vo. Lond. 1844.
1844. 831. *Thiele, H.*: Die Kirche Christi in ihrer Gestaltung auf Erden. Zurich, 1844.
1845. 831 a. *Löhe*: Drei Bücher von der Kirche. 1845.
1847. 832. *Delitzsch, Franz*: Vier Bücher von der Kirche. 1847.
- 832 a. — Vom Haus Gottes. 1849.
1848. 833. *Hundeshagen, C. B.*: Der deutsche Protestantismus, seine Vergangenheit, und seine heutigen Lebensfragen. Frankf. 1848. 3 Aufl., 1850.
1849. 834. *Nitzsch, C. J.*: Ueber die Organization der Evangelischen Gemeinden. Berlin, 1849.
1850. 835. *Mueller, J.*: Die Unsichtbare Kirche. In Deutsche Zeitschrift der Christl. Wissensch. No. II.
- 835 a. *Ritschl*: Die Entstehung der alt catholischen Kirche. 1850. Neue Aufg., 1857.
- 835 b. *Löhe*: Aphorismen über neutestamentl. Aemter. 1850.
1851. 836. *Brömel, A.*: Der Grund der Kirche. Grimma, 1851.
837. *Richter, Am. L.*: Geschichte der Evangelischen Kirchenverfassung in Deutschland. Leipz. 1851.
838. *Löhe*: Kirche und Amt. Erlang. 1851.
1852. 838 a. *Walther*: Die Stimme unsrer Kirche in der Frage von Kirche und Amt. 1852.
1853. 839. *Höfing, J. W. F.*: Grundsätze Evangelischen Lutherisch. Kirchenverfassung. Erlang. 1850. 3 Aufl., 1853.
840. *Süsskind, K. F.*: Blicke auf die Anfänge einer Presbyterial- und Synodalverfassung in der Evangel. Kirche, mit Rücksicht auf Geschichte und Kirchenrecht. Eisleben, 1853.

1853. 841. *Baur, F. C.*: Das Christenthum der drei ersten Jahrhunderten.  
 842. *Köstlin, J.*: Luther's Lehre von der Kirche. Stuttg. 1853-4.  
 843. *Harless, G. C. A.*: Kirche und Amt nach Lutherischer Lehre. Stuttg. 1853.
1854. 844. *Hansen*: Die Lutherische und die Reformirte Kirchenlehre von der Kirche. 1854.  
 845. *Kliefoth, Th.*: Acht Bücher von der Kirche. Schwerin, 154-55.  
 845 a. *Scharpff*: Entstehung des Kirchenstaats. 1854. Eng. transl., Balt. 1860.  
 845 b. *Sugenheim*: Geschichte des Kirchenstaats. 1854.  
 846. *Münchmeier*: Das Dogma von der sichtbaren und der unsichtbaren Kirche. Götting. 1854.  
 847. *Hundeshagen, C. B.*: Ueber die Erneuerung des evangel. Aeltesten- und Diaconen-Amtes. Heidelb. 1854.  
 847 a. *Lechler, G. V.*: Geschichte der Presbyt. Verfassung seit der Reformation. Leyden, 1854.
1855. 848. *Kostlin, J.*: Das Wesen der Kirche nach Lehre und Geschichte des N. T. 1854. Die Catholische Auffassung von der Kirche, in ihrer ersten Ausbildung. In Deutsch. Zeitschrift. 1855-6.  
 848 a. *Reuter*: Abhandlung zur System. Theol. I. Zur Controvers. über Kirche und Amt. 1855.  
 849. — Das Wesen der Kirche. 1855.  
 849 a. *Hasse*: Vereinigung der geistlichen und weltlichen Obergewalt. 1855.
1856. 850. *Böhringer*: Die Kirche Christi. Vier Bände. 8vo. 1856.  
 851. *Kohlbrügge, H. F.*: Ueber das Amt der Presbyter. Elberfeld. 1856.
1857. 852. *Lechler, C.*: Neutestamentliche Lehre vom heiligen Amte. Stuttg. 1857.  
 853. *Rückert, L. J.*: Ein Büchlein von der Kirche. 8vo. Jena, 1857.  
 854. *Schenkel, D.*: Kirche. In Hertzog: Real-Encyclop. vol. vii., pp. 560-599.  
 855. *Hauber, A.*: Kirchen-Verhältniss zum Staat. Ibid., pp. 599-607.  
 856. — Kirchenverfassung. Ibid., pp. 686-690.  
 857. *Daniel*: Kirchenagende im Allgemeinen und preussische Kirchenagende im Besondern. Ib., pp. 607-618.  
 858. *Jacobson, H. F.*: Kirchengewalt. Ibid., pp. 634-6.  
 859. — Kirchengut. Ib., pp. 636-642.  
 860. — Kirchenordnungen. Ib., 662-5.  
 861. — Kirchenstaat (Patrimonium Petri). Ib., 676-81.  
 862. — Bischof. Bisthum. Id., vol. ii., pp. 241-48.  
 863. — Gemeinde, kirchliche. Id., vol. iv., pp. 790-3.  
 863 a. *Preger*: Die Geschichte der Lehre vom geistlichen Amte, etc. 1857.  
 863 b. *Wendt*: Zwei Bücher von der Kirche. 1859.

1857. 864. *Ritschl*: Die Begriffe sichtbare und unsichtbare Kirche. In Stud. und Krit. 1857. Reviewing Münchmeier.
1858. 864 a. *Krausold*: Amt und Gemeinde. 1858.
1861. 865. *Döllinger, Joh. Jos. Ign.*: Kirche und Kirchen, Papstthum und Kirchenstaat. München, 1861. Transl., 1863.
1862. 866. *Harnack, Th.*: Die Kirche ; ihr Amt, ihr Regiment. Grundlegende Sätze mit durchgehender Bezugnahme auf die symbolischen Bücher der Lutherischen Kirche. Nürnberg. 1862.
867. *Schenkel, D.*: Die kirchliche Frage, und ihre politische Lösung im Zusammenhange mit den nationalen Bestrebungen, und mit Beziehung auf die neuesten Schriften J. J. von Döllinger's und von Kettlers. Elberf. 1862.
1864. 868. *Amen*: Grundbestimmungen der evangelischen Kirchenverfassung. Leipz. 1864.
869. *Ahrens, K. L.*: Das Amt der Schlüssel. Hanover, 1864.
1865. 870. *Kuper*: Das Priestertheilung des alten Bundes. 1865.
1869. 871. *Janus*: Der Papst und das Concil. Leipz. 1869. Eng. transl., 12mo, Lond. 1869.
1870. 872. *Pichler, A.*: Die wahren Hindernisse und die Grundbedingungen einer durchgreifenden Reform der katholischen Kirche, zunächst in Deutschland erörtert. Leipzig, 1870.
873. *Otto, William*: Evangelische Practische Theologie. 2 vols. Vol. II. Of the Doctrine of Church Order. A complete view of the subject.



# INDEX.

- ABROGATION of Papal Supremacy in England, 157.
- Absolution, Cranmer on, 170.
- Accommodation, principle of, 366.
- Admonition to Parliament, 202.
- Aerius, 222.
- Alexandria, origin of episcopate at, 74; presbyterial ordination at, 80, 81.
- Almainus, on the fallibility of the Pope, 125; on the infallibility of Councils, *ib.*
- American Episcopate, *the*, 345.
- Andrews, Bishop, 281.
- Angels of churches, 235, 236.
- Anglican Church, 157; Confession of, 159.
- Anglo-Catholicism, distinctive principles of, 357.
- Apology of the Augsburg Confession, 138; Barclay's, 300; Jewel's, 179; defence of, 182.
- Apostles, successors of the, 237.
- Apostolical Constitutions, 48; on the episcopate, *ib.* 60.
- Apostolicity of the Church, 31, 34, 46; Romish note of the Church, 189.
- Apostolic commission, Laud on, 276.
- Apostolic succession, Bilson on, 241; Laud on, 277; Law on, 341; Anglo-Catholic view of, 358.
- Aquinas on papal infallibility, 110.
- Archbishops, 95, 96.
- Arnold's theory of the Church and State, 336.
- Articles, the XIII., 161; the XLII., 162, 163; the XI. of 1559, 179.
- Attributes of the Church, 27, 28.
- Augsburg Confession, 136; the Variata, 137; on Church order, *ib.*; papal confirmation of, *ib.*
- Augustine, 63; on the maternity of the Church, 64; unity, 65; holiness, 66, 69; his distinction between *in* and *of* the Church, 68.
- Augustinian and Protestant view compared, 70.
- Bacon, Lord, on Church government, 269.
- Baillie, his character of John Robinson, 262; on Independency, 263.
- Bancroft, his Sermon at Paul's Cross, 220; exceptions to, by Knollys, 221; defence of, 222; review of, by Raynolds, *ib.*; his Survey, 231; on lay eldership, *ib.*
- Baptism, lay, Tertullian on, 38; heretical, Firmilian on, 59; schismatical, Cyprian on, 55, 56.
- Baptismal symbol, 48.
- Barclay's Apology, 300.
- Baronius, 208.
- Basle, Council of, 113.
- Baur, quoted, 66.
- Baxter, his reply to Stillingfleet, 315.
- Belgic Confession, 150.
- Bellarmino, Disputations, 208; his definition of the Church, *ib.*; notes of, 209; on papal infallibility, *ib.*; the great expounder of Roman doctrine, 213.
- Beza on lay eldership, 232.
- Bilson, his interpretation of Jerome, 76; his Perpetual Government, 239; on presbytery, 240; on apostolic succession, 241.
- Biographia Britannica, 215.
- Bishop of bishops, 39; universal, 94.
- Bishop, office of, defined, by Hooker, 249; by Chillingworth, 287.
- Bishops at large, 249.
- Bishop and presbyter, one order, 75, 165, 167, 192, 223.
- Bishops, equality of, 75.
- Blondel, on the ruling eldership, 297.
- Bonner, 168.
- Bradford, 173.

- Breckinridge, R. J., on lay eldership, 353.  
 Broad Church, 361.  
 Brownists, 214.  
 Buel, his reply to Whately, 362.  
 Bull, the papal, *Unam Sanctam*, 112.  
 Bunsen, his theory of the Church, 338, 379.  
 Burnet's Exposition condemned, 320.  
 Butler, W. A., on Church principles, 364.
- Calderwood, Altar of Damascus, 265.  
 Calvin, of the Church, 151; of belief in, 152; of the ministry, 153; of the grades of, 154; of lay eldership, 296.  
 Campbell, Geo., an advocate of Independency, 354; his betrayal of trust, 355; Bp. Skinner on, *ib.*  
 Campbell, Colin, on lay eldership, 353.  
 Canons, collections of, 107; of the Church of England, 258.  
 Cartwright, 202, 234.  
 Catechism, Cranmer's, 170; Greek, 196; Heidelberg, 151; Nowell's, 179, 182; Roman, 186.  
 Catena Martyrum, 172.  
 Catholic Church, 23.  
 Catholicity, primary import of, 27; a note of the Church, 189.  
 Chalcedon, Council of, xxviii. canon of, 87.  
 Chillingworth on Episcopacy, 287.  
 Chrysostom on Episcopacy, 80.  
 Church, the, apostolicity of, 31, 34, 46; catholicity of, 23, 27, 189, 200; definition of, 19, 23, 30, 45; exclusiveness of, 19, 30, 44, 45, 50, 61, 63, 185, 199; holiness of, 46, 58, 66, 67, 189; indefectibility of, 110, 199; infallibility of, 118, 199; ministers of, 95, 154; notes of, Protestant, 137, 138, 150, 151, 162, 173, 174, 184, 258; Romish, 188, 209; powers of, 55, 121; relation of, to the State, 92, 101, 111, 121, 123, 140, 142, 144, 242, 246, 294, 308, 330, 334, 336, 337, 338; unity of, see Unity.  
 Church, the, depositary of grace, 30; an article of faith, 139, 150, 152, 196, 208, 209, 219; the invisible, 218, 254, 266, 297; the visible, 162, 174, 183; militant, 130, 186; sleeping, 129; triumphant, 129, 186.  
 Churches, non-episcopal, orders of, 140, 154, 228, 250, 251, 255, 256, 264, 268, 274, 284, 290, 299, 310, 348, 349.  
 Clemangis, 130.  
 Clemens Alexandrinus, his definition of the Church, 44; of its unity, 145.  
 Clemens Romanus, definition, 19; exclusiveness, *ib.*; unity, 20; ministry, *ib.*; clergy and laity, 21; episcopacy, 22.  
 Clementine Homilies, 47; recognitions, *ib.*  
 Clergy and laity, 21, 38.  
 Coleridge, his theory of Church and State, 334.  
 Collegial system, 144.  
 Communion of Saints, 72; King's comment on, *ib.*; Romish view of, 190.  
 Confession of Augsburg, 136; Anglican, 150; Belgic, *ib.*; Helvetic, 148; Saxon, 149.  
 Confirmation, presbyteral, 256.  
 Confutation, papal, of the Augustana, 137.  
 Congregational Independency, 263.  
 Constance, Council of, 113; affirms the supremacy of councils, *ib.*  
 Constantinople, Council of, canon iii. of, 87.  
 Constitutions, Apostolical, 48.  
 Convocation, rights of, 317; of Canterbury, 257; canons of, 258; proceedings of (1700), 320.  
 Councils, general, above the Pope, 119; infallibility of, 124.  
 Corpus Juris Canonici, 106, note.  
 Cranmer, on the function of bishops, 167; on orders, 169; power of the keys, 170.  
 Cyprian, on the unity of the Church, 50; the episcopate, 52; Peter's chair, 53; headship of the Church of Rome, 54; primacy of Peter, 55; powers of the Church, *ib.*; the priesthood, 56.  
 Cyprianic theory, 27, 51, 53; defect of, 57; triumph of, 58; notes, 61, 62.
- Davenant, Bishop, his definition of the Church, against Bellarmine, 265; on the invisible Church, 266; on orders, 267; presbyteral ordination, 268.  
 Decretals, the Pseudo-Isidorian, 98.  
 Decretalists and Decretalists, 107, note.  
 Delitzsch, 373.  
 De Wette, 379.  
 Dionysius Exiguus, 84.  
 Discipline, a note of the Church, 163, 184.  
 Divine Right, 203, 206, 207, 215, 245, 272, 278, 284, 309; four pleas for, 310, 342.  
 Divisions of the History, 17.

- Donatistic theory of the holiness of the Church, 66.
- Ebrard, 379.
- Ecclesia in Episcopo, 51.
- Eldership, lay, 231, 232, 296, etc. See Lay eldership.
- Ellicott, Bishop, quoted, 239.
- England, Church of, 157.
- Epaphroditus, 304.
- Epiphanius, 223.
- Episcopacy, 22, 24, 30, 47, 48, 73.
- Episcopal system, the, in the Lutheran Church, 141; in the Church of Rome, 114, 116, note.
- Episcopus Universalis, 94.
- Erastianism, 294; in the Westminster Assembly, 295.
- Eutychius of Alexandria, 81.
- Facundus, on the utility of councils, 83.
- Febrius, 115.
- Field, of the Church, 253; definition of, 254; notes of, 255; on ordination by presbyters, 256.
- Firmilian, at one with Cyprian, 59; condemns Stephen, Bishop of Rome, *ib.*; note, 62.
- Florence, Council of, 125; defines papal supremacy, 126.
- Friends' doctrine of the Church, 301.
- Fulke, 237.
- Gallicanism, 115.
- Gelasius, 93.
- General councils, 81; authority of, 82; utility of, 83; canons of, *ib.*
- Germany, Church questions in, 367; Puseyism, 375.
- Gerson, John, 118; asserts the Church's infallibility, *ib.*
- Gieseler, quoted, 124.
- Gladstone, his theory of the Church and State, 337.
- Goch, John of, 130; on the Church's maternity, 131; sacerdotal life, *ib.*
- Gratiani Decretum, 99; note, 107.
- Greek Church, 196; peculiar privileges of, 199.
- Gregory the Great, 94.
- Gregory Nazianzen, on councils, 83.
- Gregory VII., advanced claims of, 100; Dictates of, *ib.*; note, 106.
- Hagenbach, quoted, 66.
- Hall, Bishop, his Episcopacy by divine right, 272; revised by Laud, 274; on *ius divinum*, 278.
- Hallam, quoted, 244.
- Hammond, 302; his Dissertations, *ib.*; Annotations, 303.
- Harbingers of the Reformation, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132.
- Hardwick, quoted, note, 106, 158, 160.
- Harmony of Protestant Confessions, 148.
- Hase, 378.
- Headship of the Church, 54, 55, 86, 93, 99, 102, 104, 105, 126, 129, 149, 161, 163, 183; Roman doctrine of the, 188; Greek doctrine, 197.
- Heidelberg Catechism, 151.
- Helvetic Confession, 148.
- Hengstenberg, 374.
- Hierarchy, degrees of the, 95.
- High Church and Low Church, 322.
- Hoadly, Bishop, his interpretation of Jerome, 79.
- Höfling, quoted, 142.
- Holiness of the Church, 27, 46, 58; Donatistic view of, 66; Catholic view of, *ib.*, and 67; Protestant view, 182; Romanist view, 189; of the Greek Church, 198.
- Homilies, the, quoted, 162.
- Hontheim, Nicholas von, 115.
- Hooker, 57; his interpretation of Jerome, 77; his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, 242; his elevated tone, 244; his distinction between the Church mystical and visible, 245; his theory of Church and State, 246; of episcopacy, 249; of presbyterial ordination, 250; Keble's gloss corrected, 252.
- Hooper, 174.
- Howe, John, his answer to Stillingfleet, 315.
- Hugo of St. Victor, 106.
- Hunt, quoted, 289, 303.
- Huss, of the visible headship, 129; three-fold form, 315.
- Ignatian theory, 23; note, 29.
- Imposition of hands, Calvin on, 155.
- Indefectibility of the Church, 110, 199; of faith in Peter's chair, 108.
- Independency, 260, 261.
- Infallibility of the Church, 118; of councils, 124, 125; of the Pope, asserted, 108, 110; denied, 109, 125, 135.
- Innocent III., advanced claims of, 104.
- Institution of a Christian Man, 158.
- Invisible Church, 254.
- Invocation of saints, 198.

- Irenæus, 30; on the oneness and the unity of the Church, *ib.*; apostolicity of the Church of Rome, 32; primacy of, *ib.*; note, 39.
- Isidore of Seville, on degrees in the hierarchy, 95.
- Jacobson, quoted, 107, 144, 146.
- Jerome, 73; on the origin of episcopacy, 74; equality of bishops, 75; the identity of bishop and presbyter, *ib.*
- Jewel, his Apology, 179; defence of, 182.
- John Scholasticus, 84.
- Jus divinum, 206, 221, etc. See Divine Right.
- Justin Martyr, on unity, 42; universal priesthood, *ib.*; Church officers, 43; order of Sunday service, *ib.*
- Kahnis, 374.
- Keble, quoted, 227, 229, 242, 243, 251, 252; corrected, 229, 252.
- Keys, power of the, 137, 170.
- King, on "the Communion of Saints," 72; his "Inquiry," 323; answered, 326.
- Kissing the foot, note, 106.
- Knollys, Sir F., his exceptions to Whigtift on episcopacy, 206; to Bancroft's sermon, 221.
- Lactantius, 61.
- Laity and clergy, 21, 38.
- Latimer, 172.
- Laud, Archbishop, his revision of Hall on episcopacy, 274; exposition of Matt. xxviii. 20, 276; on apostolical succession, 277.
- Law, W., 341; on an invisible Church, *ib.*; on succession, *ib.*; on divine right, 342.
- Lay eldership, Bancroft on, 231; Blondel on, 297; Beza on, 232; Breckinridge on, 352; Calvin's view of, 296; rejected by the Westminster Assembly, *ib.*; Campbell on, 353; Miller on, 351; Vitringa on, 297; Wilson on, 350; theory of, untenable, 354.
- Leo I., 86; asserts papal supremacy, *ib.*; grounds of the claim, 88; on the relation of the Pope to other bishops, 91; of the Church to the State, 92.
- Leslie, 339; on episcopacy, 340.
- Löhe, 373.
- Luther, statements of, 147.
- Manichæan view, 66.
- Martensen, 379.
- Mason, Frs., on Anglican orders, 282; genuineness of, *ib.*; on divine right, 284; presbyteral ordination, *ib.*
- Matthias of Janow, 128.
- Maurice, quoted, 334.
- Melanchthon, his *Loci Theologici*, 139; affirms the Church's visibility, *ib.*; denies its invisibility, 340.
- Metropolitans, 96.
- Miller, 351.
- Milman, quoted, 99.
- Milton, his part in the Puritan controversy, 285; quoted, *ib.*
- Ministry, orders in the, 164, 167, 192.
- Möhler, on the unity of the Church, 367.
- Montanistic theory, 57.
- Mornay, Du Plessis, 207, 291.
- Münchmeyer, 374.
- Nationalty, the, 334.
- Neander, quoted, 40, 58, 66, note, 106.
- Necessary Doctrine, etc., the, 160.
- Necessity, the plea of, Field on, 256; Hooker on, 251; Saravia on, 228; Taylor on, 290.
- Neo-Lutheranism, 375.
- New Jerusalem, Church of the, 343.
- Nicholas de Clemangis, 130.
- Nicholas of Cusa, 113; quoted, 124.
- Notes of the Church, Protestant, 137, 138, 150, 151, 162, 173, 174, 184, 258; Roman, 188, 209; Independent, 264.
- Novatianist theory, 58.
- Nowell's Catechism, 182.
- O'Brien, Bishop, quoted, 364.
- Ecumenical councils, 81; Augustine's theory of, 82; Vincent of Lerins', *ib.*; utility of, 83; canons of, 84.
- Oneness of the Church, 19, 30, 44, 46, 50, 59, 61, 63.
- Optatus of Milevis, on the headship of Peter, 60; in agreement with Cyprian, 61.
- Orders, a sacrament, in the Greek Church, 201; in the Roman Church, 191; greater and minor, 192; minister of, 193; effects of, *ib.*; canons of Trent on, 194.
- Ordinal, the Anglican, (1549-1552,) 164, 167; reconstruction of, 305.
- Ordination by presbyters, 76, 81; Saravia on, 228; Hooker on, 251; Field on, 256.

- Origen, on the oneness, apostolicity, and holiness of the Church, 46.
- Overall, Bishop, Convocation-Book, 260.
- Owen, his reply to Stillingfleet, 314.
- Papa, title of, 93.
- Papal aggressions in England, 158.
- Papal infallibility, 108; plenitude of power, 111; prerogatives, 106.
- Papal system, 92, 103.
- Paris, university of, 114.
- Patriarchs, 96.
- Pelagian view of the Church, 65.
- Peter, St., his episcopate at Rome, 53, 216; primacy of, Cyprian on, 55; Optatus on, 60; Augustine on, 65; Leo I. on, 85, 88; Gelasius on, 93; Gregory I. on, 94; Pseudo-Isidore on, 99; Cusanus on, 124.
- Pfaff, 145.
- Philpot, 176.
- Pius IV., Creed of, 186.
- Pope, title of, 93; unique, 102; primacy of, 55, 85; supremacy of, 86, 93, 99, 101, 104; vicar of Christ, 104; the source of all law, 105.
- Powers of the Church, Cyprian on, 55.
- Priesthood, the Christian, 56; degrees in, 192; functions of, *ib.*; twofold, *ib.*; internal and external, 192.
- Priesthood of all believers, 37, 42, 135, 192, 338.
- Primacy of the Bishop of Rome. See Pope.
- Primacy of the Church of Rome, 32, 54, 85.
- Primacy of jurisdiction, note, 106; of honor, note, 107.
- Princeton Review, quoted, 352.
- Pseudo-Isidoriana, 98; quoted, *ib.*
- Puffendorf, on the Collegial System, 143, 145.
- Puritan controversy, the, 202; leading points of, 203.
- Quakers' doctrine of the Church, 300.
- Querimonia Ecclesiæ, 230.
- Randolph, Bishop, quoted, 176.
- Raynolds, John, 215; on St. Peter's episcopate at Rome, 216; six conclusions, 217; quoted, 235.
- Recognitions of Clement, 47.
- Reconstruction of the English Ordinal, 305.
- Reformation, harbingers of the, 127.
- Relation of the Church to the State, 92, 101, 111, 121, 141, 142, 144, 242, 246, 294, etc. See Church.
- Revision of the Liturgy, 318.
- Ridley, 173.
- Robertson, quoted, 92.
- Robinson, John, 262; on Church government, 263.
- Rome, Church of, primacy of, 32, 54, 85.
- Rothe, 22, 367; on Möhler's *Einheit*, etc., *ib.*; his theory of the Church, 369; of the origin of episcopacy, 371; quoted, 22, 23, 28, 59, 64, 65, 69, 70.
- Saints, invocation of, 198.
- Saravia, 226; on episcopacy, *ib.*; on divine right, 227; on presbyteral ordination, 228; Keble's misconstruction of, 229.
- Saxon Confession, 149.
- Schaff, quoted, note, 28.
- Scheibel, 373.
- Schenkel, quoted, 369, 373, 375, 380.
- Schleiermacher, 375; his theory of the Church, *ib.*
- Sclater, his reply to King, 326.
- Selden, John, 295.
- Sextus, *Decretalium Liber*, note, 107.
- Sherlock, 261; opposes liturgical revision, 319.
- Skinner, Bishop, his vindication of episcopacy, against Campbell, 355.
- Smectymnuus, 279, on the ruling eldership, 296, 297.
- "Spiritual Despotism," Taylor's, 363.
- Stahl, his theory of the Church, 373.
- Stephani, 142.
- Stillingfleet, 308; on divine right, 309; mischief of separation, 313; Unreasonableness of Separation, 315.
- Succession, apostolical, 241, etc. See Apostolic Succession.
- Succession of doctrine, Tertullian on, 35.
- Supremacy, papal, 86, 93, 99, 101, 104; royal, 142, 163.
- Survey, Bancroft's, of the Puritan Discipline, 231.
- Sutcliffe, 229.
- Swedenborg, 343; of the New Jerusalem, *ib.*
- Taylor, Jeremy, 289; of episcopacy, *ib.*; plea of necessity, 290; —, Isaac, 362; on episcopacy, 363.
- Tenison, advocates liturgical revision, 320.
- Territorial system, 142.

- Tertullian, 34; of apostolicity, *ib.*; universal priesthood, 37; the Bishop of Rome, 39.
- Thirlwall, Bishop, on High Anglicanism, 359.
- Thomasius, 153.
- Tichonius, 70.
- Tracts for the Times, 357; distinctive principles of, *ib.*; on apostolic succession, 358; in connection with the sacraments, 358.
- Trent, Council of, 186.
- Tyndale, 172.
- Unam Sanctam, the Bull, 112.
- Unity of the Church, 20, 23, 27, 30, 42, 45, 51, 60, 65, 188, 197, 325; Möhler on, 367.
- Universal Bishop, 94.
- Usher, Archbishop, 281, 286, 287, 302; his letter to Hammond, 303.
- Valentinian, law of, 86.
- Vincent of Lerins, 82.
- Visible Church, the, 162, 174, 184, 245.
- Visible head of the Church, 86, 127, 129, 133, 149, 159, 180, 188.
- Vitringa, 297.
- Vogel, quoted, 71.
- Warburton, 330; his theory of the relation of the Church to the State, 330.
- Wesel, John of, 132; distinguishes between the Church visible and invisible, 133.
- Wessel, John, on the communion of saints, 133; on unity, 134.
- Westminster Assembly, Erastianism in the, 295; ruling eldership in, 296.
- Westminster Confession, statements of, 297.
- Whately, Archbishop, his Kingdom of Christ, 361.
- White, William, 346; his scheme of organization, *ib.*; on divine right, 348; his moderate views, 349.
- Whitgift, his answer to Cartwright, 202; censured by Knollys, 206.
- Wilberforce, Bishop, quoted, 346.
- Wilson, B., 347.
- Wilson, J. P., on lay eldership, 350.
- Wolff, 374.
- Wordsworth, C., quoted, 283.
- Wycliffe, his definition of the Church, 127; on the visible headship, *ib.*; orders in the ministry, 128.
- Zwingli, 155, 156.

# INDEX

## TO THE BIBLIOGRAPHY.

---

- ABBOTT, 174.  
 Acton, 646.  
 Ahrens, 869.  
 Ainsworth, 147, 465.  
 Alexander, W. L., 677; J. A., 760.  
 Alison, 120.  
 Allies, 730, 731.  
 Almainus, 52.  
 Alsop, 337.  
 Amen, 868.  
 Ames, 144, 171, 172, 179.  
 Anderson, 456.  
 Andrews, 770 a.  
 Apollonii, 233, 234.  
 Apostolical Succession, 738, 768 a.  
 Argyll, 741.  
 Arnold, 588, 686.  
 Atkinson, 770.  
 Augustinus, 8, 9, 10, 11.  
 Authority, Church, 145.  
 Ayton, 481.
- Baillie, 241, 246.  
 Bancroft, 99, 132, 133.  
 Bangs, 558, 598.  
 Bannerman, 798.  
 Barnes, 578, 580, 679, 680.  
 Barrett, 338.  
 Barrington, 569.  
 Barrow, 329, 363.  
 Barrowes, 121, 122, 123.  
 Bartol, 775.  
 Baur, 820, 841.  
 Baxter, 326, 327, 333, 334, 335, 348, 356, 386.  
 Becanus, 156.  
 Bellarmine, 85, 168 a, 362.  
 Bennet, 405, 436, 437, 443.  
 Berington and Kirk, 548.  
 Bernard, R., 146, 152, 294; J. L., 670.
- Beveridge, 649.  
 Beverley, 616, 617.  
 Beza, 59, 86, 87, 112, 113, 130, 131.  
 Bilson, 134.  
 Bingham, 440.  
 Birks, 807 a.  
 Blackburne, 507.  
 Blacksmith, 504 a.  
 Blomfield, 674.  
 Blondel, 178, 213, 242, 243, 258.  
 Blunt, J. J., 185, 775 b.  
 Boardman, 700.  
 Boehmer, 453 a, 482-486, 502 a.  
 Böhlinger, 850.  
 Boileau, 305.  
 Bossuet, 364, 481 a.  
 Bowden, 519 a, 542, 544.  
 Boyd, 658, 659, 660.  
 Boyse, 392, 453.  
 Bradshaw, 143, 165.  
 Bramhall, 262, 287, 290, 291, 292.  
 Breckinridge, 716.  
 Brett, 431, 432, 454, 460, 464.  
 Bricknell, 722.  
 Bridges, 73, 95.  
 Bristed, 562.  
 Brokesby, 450.  
 Brömel, 836.  
 Brown, R., 89; T., 487, 502; J., 523, 532, 668.  
 Browne, 750.  
 Bucer, 58.  
 Buddeus, 423.  
 Buel, 684.  
 Bull, 424.  
 Bunsen, 734, 763.  
 Burgess, 173.  
 Burnet, 321, 323.  
 Burscough, 387, 406, 407, 408, 417, 418.  
 Butler, W. A., 672.

- Cajetan, 51.  
 Calamy, 265, 416.  
 Calder, 420, 421, 422, 452.  
 Calderwood, 168, 170.  
 Calvin, 56.  
 Cambridge, 438.  
 Campbell, W., 519; G., 525; P. C.,  
     793 a.  
 Canne, 186 a.  
 Canons of Trent, 63.  
 Cartwright, 75, 77, 80, 81, 82.  
 Catechism, Greek, 724.  
 Catechismus Romanus, 64.  
 Cave, 316, 352.  
 Cawood, 584.  
 Chambre, 499.  
 Champney, 160.  
 Chapin, 721.  
 Chapman, 571, 572.  
 Charles I., 255, 266.  
 Chauncy, 514.  
 Chemnitz, 65.  
 Chillingworth, 236.  
 Chlebus, 829.  
 Church Discipline, 97.  
 Churchman Armed, 550.  
 Churchman's Remembrancer, 536.  
 Clarkson, 330, 342, 373.  
 Claude, 350.  
 Claudius Fontejus, 305.  
 Clemangis, 32, 35.  
 Clement of Rome, 2, 3.  
 Coleman, 706, 732, 765.  
 Coleridge, 575.  
 Collinges, 286.  
 Colton, 597.  
 Conder, 555 a.  
 Constitutiones Apostolicæ, 6.  
 Cooke, 573, 574.  
 Cooper, T., 107; —, B., 791.  
 Cosin, 141.  
 Cotton, 226, 228.  
 Countercuffe, 110 a.  
 Courayer, 475, 476.  
 Coxe, 783, 790.  
 Crakanthorp, 175.  
 Croft, 317.  
 Cunningham, 784, 785.  
 Cusanus, 42.  
 Cyprian, 4.  
  
 Dagg, 778.  
 Daille, 182.  
 Daniel, 857.  
 Danovius, 515.  
 Daubeny, 521, 528.  
 Davenant, 186.  
  
 Davidson, 144.  
 Declaration, 94.  
 Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ, 21.  
 De Dominis, 166.  
 Defence, etc., 78, 96.  
 Delitzsch, 832, 832 a.  
 De Maistre, 556, 559.  
 Demonstration, etc., 98.  
 Development, etc., 640.  
 Dexter, 787.  
 Dialogue, 93.  
 Dionysius Exiguus, 14.  
 Discipline, 97.  
 Divine Institution, etc., 473.  
 Dodd, 479.  
 Dodsworth, 599, 600, 601, 756.  
 Dodwell, 325, 328, 351, 358, 378, 379,  
     380, 381.  
 Döllinger, 865.  
 Drumm, 793.  
 Dumoulin, 302.  
 Dunlop, 468.  
 Dupanloup, 776 a.  
 Dupin, 359, 435 a.  
 Du Plessis Mornay, 84.  
 Durel, 298, 299.  
  
 Ecce Ecclesia, 801 a.  
 Ecclesia Dei, 792.  
 Edwards, 212, 235, 500.  
 Elder Question, 717.  
 Ellendorf, 825.  
 Elrington, 546, 555.  
 English Review, 739.  
 Episcopacy, 495.  
 Epitome, 105.  
 Erasmus, 49.  
 Erastus, 111.  
 Essays, 661 a.  
 Evans, 586, 703.  
  
 Ferguson, 388.  
 Ferne, 251, 273, 281.  
 Field, Rd., 140.  
 Field and Wilcocks, 74.  
 Fletcher, 568.  
 Forbes, 181.  
 Forrester, 357, 409, 425.  
 Friedberg, 780.  
 Fulke, 88, 92.  
 Fullwood, 513.  
  
 Gabler, 533.  
 Gallagher, 798 a.  
 Garbett, 804.  
 Garratt, 727 a.  
 Gauden, 274.

- Gerbertus, 23.  
 Gerhard, 180.  
 Gerson, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41.  
 Gess, 821.  
 Gillespie, 177, 188, 215, 248.  
 Gladstone, 611, 645.  
 Goch, 43, 44.  
 Goode, 755.  
 Gosselin, 764 a.  
 Gratianus, 26.  
 Greenwood, 773.  
 Gregory I., 17.  
 Gregory VII., 25.  
 Greiling, 557, 813.  
 Gresley, 694.  
 Greville, 210.  
 Grey, 480, 490-493, 497.  
 Grotius, 259.  
 Gruner, 505.  
 Guericke, 758.  
 Guettée, 795.  
 Gunning, 320.  
 Haddan, 805.  
 Hales, 221.  
 Hall, A., 520; —, Bp., 128, 190, 191,  
 192, 193, 194; —, R., 552.  
 Hammond, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 277,  
 278.  
 Hansen, 844.  
 Harding, 61, 62, 68.  
 Hare, 762.  
 Harington, 720, 727, 759.  
 Harless, 843.  
 Harnack, 866.  
 Harris, 157.  
 Harrison, 794.  
 Hasse, 849 a.  
 Hauber, 855, 856.  
 Henderson, 214.  
 Henke, 516.  
 Hergenrother, 812 a.  
 Hey, 564.  
 Heylin, 224, 225, 285.  
 Hickes, 430, 439.  
 Hickman, 300, 301.  
 Hildebrand, 296.  
 Hoadly, 411-415.  
 Hobbes, 272.  
 Hodge, 774.  
 Höfling, 839.  
 Hooker, Rd., 135, 257, 295; —, Thos., 252.  
 Hopkins, 595, 596, 708.  
 Horne, 590.  
 How, 554.  
 Howe, 336.  
 Hülmann, 815.  
 Hundeshagen, 833, 847.  
 Huntington, 810.  
 Huss, 30.  
 Huther, 822.  
 Ignatius, 2.  
 Innocent III., 27.  
 Isidorus de Isolanis, 153.  
 Isidorus Hispalensis, 19.  
 Ives, 704.  
 Jackson, 176, 498.  
 Jacob, 124, 125, 126, 127.  
 Jacobson, 858-863.  
 Jameson, 404, 419, 451.  
 Janus, 806, 871.  
 Jewel, 60, 66, 67.  
 Joannes de Turrecremata, 41 a.  
 Johannes Antiochenus, 15.  
 Jones, 526, 653.  
 Joyce, 788, 803 a.  
 Jus Divinum, 244, 275, 276.  
 Kaye, 772.  
 Kelly, 807.  
 Kelsall, 455.  
 Kenrick, 608, 664, 771.  
 Kettlewell, 804 a.  
 Killen, 776.  
 King, D., 693, 766; —, P., 383; —, W., 391.  
 Kist, 816, 819.  
 Klee, 823.  
 Kliefoth, 845.  
 Knollys, 149.  
 Kohlbrügge, 851.  
 Kostlin, 842, 848.  
 Krausold, 864 a.  
 Kuper, 870.  
 Landon, 740.  
 Lathbury, 606.  
 Lauder, 433, 434.  
 Laurence, 444-449.  
 Law, 462.  
 Lawn Sleeve Rent, 211.  
 Leaming, 506.  
 Lechler, 847 a, 852.  
 Legge, 811 b.  
 Leighton, 390.  
 Leo I., 13; — IX., 24.  
 Le Quien, 477, 478.  
 Leslie, 474, 650.  
 Lewgar, 303.  
 Lewis, 463.  
 Lex Talionis, 320.  
 Lightfoot, J. B., 797.  
 Lindsay, 811 a.

- Litton, 754.  
 Lloyd, 355.  
 Löhe, 831 a, 835 b, 838.  
 London Petition, 219.  
 London Quarterly, 742.  
 Luthardt, 796 a.
- Maclagan, 808.  
 Madge, 692.  
 Madox, 488, 489.  
 Manning, 671.  
 Manual of Presbytery, 675.  
 Manuel du Droit Ecclesiastique, 720 a.  
 Marca, De, 303 a.  
 Marsden, 719.  
 Marsh, 551.  
 Marshall, 688, 689.  
 Martin Marprelate, 104-110 a.  
 Marvell, 313, 315, 319.  
 Maskell, 803.  
 Mason, F., 159; —, J. M., 537, 538, 540, 553.  
 Maastricht, 457.  
 Mather, R., 240; —, S., 496, 496 a.  
 Matthias of Janow, 29 a.  
 Maurice, H., 347, 384; —, F. D., 607.  
 Maxwell, 189, 245.  
 McClintock and Strong, 801.  
 McCrie, 535, 560.  
 McIlvaine, 683.  
 McKerrow, 733.  
 McNeile, 655, 725.  
 Melancthon, 55.  
 Mestrezat, 261.  
 Meyer, 826.  
 Meyrick, 782.  
 Milbourne, 389.  
 Miller, 541, 543, 576, 592, 647, 705.  
 Milman, 641.  
 Milner, 547.  
 Milton, 204-208.  
 Mines, 746.  
 Mitchell, J., 609; —, P., 545.  
 Moberly, 696.  
 Mocket, 354.  
 Moehler, 566, 585, 814.  
 Morinus, 177, 282, 283.  
 Morton, 142, 155, 308.  
 Mueller, 835.  
 Münchmeier, 846.
- Naked Truth, 318, 321.  
 Nettelblatt, 518.  
 Nevin, 761.  
 Newman, 669, 749.  
 Nicholls, 429.  
 Nicholas Von Hontheim, 504 b.
- Nitzsch, 594, 834.  
 Noel, 743.  
 Norton, 767.  
 Nowell, 70.
- Oberthur, 554 a.  
 O'Brien, 667.  
 Onderdonk, 577, 579, 581-583.  
 Onus Ecclesiæ, 54.  
 Optatus, 7.  
 Ordinal, Anglican, 57.  
 Otto, 873.  
 Overall, 382.  
 Overton, 527.  
 Owen, 297, 310, 332, 341, 342, 370, 393.
- Palmer, 610, 643, 654.  
 Pantin, 747.  
 Park, 377.  
 Parker, R., 163; —, S., 309, 311, 312, 314, 353.  
 Patrick, 652.  
 Patrum Opera, 1.  
 Pearson, 289, 365-368.  
 Penry, 103, 151.  
 Perceval, 605, 615, 644.  
 Perkins, 164.  
 Perrone, 673.  
 Petavius, 216, 217.  
 Petersen, 828.  
 Pfaff, 466, 467.  
 Photius, 22.  
 Pichler, 872.  
 Pithou, 135 a.  
 Planck, 529.  
 Polycarp, 2.  
 Potter, 435.  
 Potts and Wainwright, 707.  
 Powell, 614.  
 Preger, 683 a.  
 Presbytery, 363, 612, 613, 681.  
 Pretzman, 768.  
 Prideaux, 372, 459.  
 Primitive Church, 695.  
 Pruen, 595.  
 Puchta, 824.  
 Puffendorf, 361.  
 Punchard, 714, 715.  
 Puritan Discipline Tracts, 104-110.  
 Pusey, 642, 748, 773 a, 789.
- Ravenscroft, 567.  
 Raynolds, 90, 91, 100, 136, 137.  
 Reasons, Dissenters', 256.  
 Reichel, 811 d.  
 Republics, Religious, 802.  
 Reuter, 848 a, 849.

- Reynolds, 809.  
 Richter, 837.  
 Riddle, 618.  
 Ripley, 796.  
 Ritschl, 835 a, 864.  
 Robinson, B., 441, 442; — J., 153, 154;  
   — S., 775 a.  
 Rogers, 470, 471, 472.  
 Rose, 570.  
 Roskovany, 591.  
 Rothe, 818.  
 Rothensee, 817.  
 Rovenius, 306.  
 Rückert, 853.  
 Rule, 339, 374, 375, 376, 396, 397, 398.  
 Russell, 726.  
 Rutherford, 231, 237, 238, 249, 253.  
 Rutherford, 508, 509-512.  
  
 Sage, 394, 395, 410.  
 Salmasius, 218, 239.  
 Salmeron, 158.  
 Sanders, 69, 71.  
 Sanderson, 293, 304, 651.  
 Saravia, 114, 114 a, 115, 116, 117.  
 Saybrook, 438.  
 Saywell, 349, 371.  
 Schaff, 718.  
 Scharpff, 845 a.  
 Schenkel, 854, 867.  
 Scherer, 698, 699.  
 Scholliner, 503.  
 Schuyler, 752.  
 Sclater, 461.  
 Scrivener, 184, 307.  
 Seaman, 250.  
 Selden, 220.  
 Sewell, 638, 639.  
 Sherlock, 344, 345.  
 Shimeall, 764.  
 Sinclair, 587.  
 Skinner, 530, 531.  
 Smectymnuus, 195, 196.  
 Smith, Rd., 167, 280, 811.  
 Smyth, J., 148; —, T., 662, 663, 678, 723.  
 Snodgrass, 710.  
 Some, 101, 102.  
 Spotswoode, 169.  
 Stahl, 827.  
 Stanihurst, 162.  
 Stanley, 735, 760 a, 811 b.  
 Stapleton, 72.  
 Stebbing, 697.  
 Stephanus, 155 a.  
 Stillingfleet, 288, 331, 340.  
 Stone, 728.  
 Sugenheim, 845 b.  
  
 Sumner, 800.  
 Süsskind, 840.  
 Sutcliffe, 118, 119, 138, 139.  
 Swedenborg, 504.  
  
 Taylor, J., 593; —, Bishop, 223, 247.  
 Theiner, 781.  
 Theoklesia, 799.  
 Thiele, 831.  
 Thomassin, 385.  
 Thomson, 736, 737.  
 Thorndike, 209, 222, 260, 264.  
 Tindal, 426, 428.  
 Tossanus, 183.  
 Tracts, 197-202; 619-637.  
 Travers, 83.  
 Trent, Canons, 62.  
 Turretine, 369.  
 Tydings, 711.  
  
 Uhden, 830.  
 Upham, 713.  
 Usher, 161, 203, 232, 284.  
  
 Vail, 666.  
 Van Espen, 410 a.  
 Vincentius Lerinensis, 12.  
 Vinton, 811 e.  
 Vitringa, 399, 400.  
 Voetius, 322.  
 Voice of the Church, 648.  
  
 Walcott, 757.  
 Walo Messalinus, 218.  
 Walther, 838 a.  
 Warburton, 494.  
 Ward, T., 469; —, W. G., 690, 691, 751.  
 Wardlaw, 656, 657, 745.  
 Waterland, 455.  
 Watts, 501.  
 Waylen, 709.  
 Way of Churches, 254.  
 Wendt, 863 b.  
 Wesel, 45, 46.  
 Wessel, 47, 48.  
 Whately, 661, 685.  
 White, J., 150; —, Bishop, 517, 549.  
 Whitgift, 76, 79.  
 Whytock, 522, 682.  
 Wier, 108.  
 Wilberforce, 769.  
 Wilks, 561.  
 Williams, 227, 229, 230.  
 Wilson, J., 563; —, J. P., 589; —, W.,  
   777; —, W. D., 729, 780.  
 Windsor, 701.  
 Wise, 458.

Wiseman, 602, 603, 604.  
Wisner, 702.  
Wood, 279.  
Woods, 712.  
Wordsworth, 687.  
Wotton, 427.

Wright, 110.  
Wycliffe, 28, 29, 665, 753.  
Zachariæ, 520 a.  
Ziegler, 324, 360, 524.  
Zimmermann, 346.

76

THE END.











Princeton Theological Seminary Speer Library



1 1012 01032 6892