

Durham E-Theses

Some Elizabethan controversies about the church and the ministry

J. M. Corley

How to cite:

Corley, J. M. (1959) Some Elizabethan controversies about the church and the ministry. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/10123/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

SOME ELIZABETHAN CONTROVERSIES

ABOUT

THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY

A Thesis submitted to the University of Durham (Durham Division)
for the degree of Master of Letters

by

J.M. Corley

(St John's College)

October 1959

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.



21. JUL. 1960

FOREWORD

The reign of Queen Elizabeth I saw the beginnings of some of the main divisions of English Christianity. The differences between papist and reformer were already there before Elizabeth's accession, but it was while she was on the throne that Puritan first came to be distinguished from Anglican and, within the Puritan party, Independent from Presbyterian.

Controversy between these parties circled around the doctrine of the Church and the Ministry. The arguments of a representative selection of Anglican and Puritan divines of this period on this subject are compared in these pages, and a doctrine is suggested which, although it would not have fully satisfied any of them, might have given some satisfaction to all of them. Had this doctrine been accepted, schism might well have been avoided.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

The author wishes to express his gratitude to the University Library, Cambridge, for supplying a microfilm copy of Bredwell's "Rasing of the Foundations of Brownisme", and for permission to quote from that work; and to Dr Williams's Library, London, for permission to consult and to quote from the manuscript of "The Second Parte of A Register." He is indebted to both Libraries, and to the British Museum Library and the Bodleian Library, Oxford, for permission to check the accuracy of quotations made by the Elizabethan controversialists from the works of their contemporaries, English and foreign. He is also indebted to the Rev. E.R. Evans and the Rev. Professor S.L.Greenslade for the information acknowledged in the footnotes to pages 330 and 643f.

ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCES

The following abbreviations are used in the footnotes:-

- B. Bredwell, "The Rasing of the Foundations of Brownisme"
- BPG. Bilson, "The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church"
edn 1593
- C. Peel and Carlson (ed), "Cartwrightiana"
- H. Hooker, "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity", Preface and
five Books.
- HK. Hooker, "Works", Keble's edition, vol iii.
- J. Parker Society, "The Works of Bishop Jewel", 4 vols.
- S.A. Strype, "Annals of the Reformation", 4 vols (the first three
in two parts each)
- S.G. .. "The Life and Acts of Edmund Grindal"
- S.P. .. "The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker" 3 vols
- S.W. .. "The Life and Acts of John Whitgift" 3 vols
- T. Travers, "A Full and Plain Declaration of Ecclesiastical
Discipline" (English translation by Cartwright)
- W. Parker Society, "The Works of Archbishop Whitgift", 3 vols.
- WHB. Peel (ed), "The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert
Browne"
- Z.L. Parker Society, "Zurich Letters", 1st and 2nd series.
- 2P.R. Peel (ed), "The Second Parte of A Register", 2 vols.

References are also made in the footnotes to the following works:-

- Arndt and Gingrich, "A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament."
- Bancroft, "Dangerous Positions and Proceedings"
- .. "A Survay of the Pretended Holy Discipline"
- Bullinger, "Adversus Anabaptistas, in Lat. con. per Jos. Simlerum."
- "A Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort in Germany
Anno Domini 1554."

Beza, "Responsio ad tractationem de gradibus ministrorum Evangelii ab Hadriano Saravia editam."

Bright, "Canons of the First Four General Councils."

Bromiley, "Thomas Cranmer, Theologian."

Brook, "Whitgift and the English Church."

Conyers Read, "Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth."

"Correspondence of Matthew Parker", Parker Society.

Cross (ed), "Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church."

Cooper, "Athenae Cantabrigiensis", vol 1.

Cullmann, "Peter, Apostle etc"

Calvin, "Commentaries", Calvin Translation Society

"Ioannis Calvini Opera", Brunswick 1868 vol 7

Cartwright, "The Second Reply" 1575

.. "The Rest of the Second Reply" 1577

Dawley, "John Whitgift and the Reformation."

Davies, "The Political Ideas of Richard Hooker."

.. "Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy."

Daube, "The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism."

"Dictionary of National Biography."

Dix, "The Apostolic Tradition of St Hippolytus."

Dixon, "History of the Church of England." 5 vols.

Dodd, "The Parables of the Kingdom."

"A Directory of Church Government", 1644

Easton, "Early Christianity".

.. "The Pastoral Epistles."

Ehrhardt, "The Apostolic Succession."

Flew (ed), "The Nature of the Church".

Frere and Douglas, "Puritan Manifestoes".

Gaster, "The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect."

Gesenius (tr Tregelles), "Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon."

Gee and Hardy, "Documents Illustrative of English Church History."

Gibson (ed), "The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI."
(Everyman)

Greenslade, "Schism in the Early Church."

.. "Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius."

Gualter, "In priorem D.Pauli Apostoli ad Corinthios Epistolam

Homiliae."

Hammond, "Definitions of Faith and Canons of Discipline."

Hebert, "The Form of the Church."

Hefele, "History of the Councils", Engl. trans. vol iv.

Heylyn, "Aerius Redivivus", edn 1672

Hughes, "The Reformation in England", vol iii.

Jalland, "The Origin and Evolution of the Christian Church."

Jones, "Constantine and the Conversion of Europe."

"The Journal of Ecclesiastical History" vol.iii, no 1.

.. .. vol.vi, no 2.

"The Journal of Theological Studies", new series, vol.iv, part 2.

Knappen, "Tudor Puritanism."

Kirk (ed), "The Apostolic Ministry."

a Lasco, "A briefe examination for the tyme."

Liddell and Scott, "Greek Lexicon", new edn.

Lightfoot, "The Epistle to the Philippians."

"Lutheri Opera", tom.ii. Witebergae, 1551.

Manson, "The Church's Ministry."

.. "The Teaching of Jesus."

Mascall, "Corpus Christi."

.. "Christ, the Christian, and the Church."

McNeill, "The History and Character of Calvinism."

Morris (ed) "Hooker's 'Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity'".
(Everyman)

Moulton and Milligan, "Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament."

Musculus, "Commonplaces". Engl. trans.

Neale, "Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1559 - 1581."

.. 1584 - 1601.

Nowell, "A Catechisme", Parker Society.

.. "A Confutation as well of M.Dorman's last Boke, etc"

Paget, "Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical
Polity."

Percival, "Seven Ecumenical Councils".

Porter, "Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge."

Reid (ed), "Calvin's Theological Treatises."

"Remains of Archbishop Grindal", Parker Society.

"Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches."

Redlich, "Form Criticism".

Richardson, A. "The Miracle Stories of the Gospels."

Richardson, C.C. "Early Christian Fathers".

Robinson, "The Body".

Sanders, "De Visibilia Monarchia Ecclesiae".

Schmidt et al., "Basileia", tr. Kingdon.

Schurer, "The Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ".

Engl.trans. vol.ii. pt.2.

Scott Pearson, "Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism."

.. .. "Church and State in the 16th Century."

"Scottish Journal of Theology", vol.ix, June 1956.

Sisson, "The Judicious Marriage of Mr Richard Hooker".

Skinner, "Prophecy and Religion".

Srawley, "The Epistles of St Ignatius."

Sykes, "Old Priest and New Presbyter."

Souter, "A Glossary of Later Latin."

.. "A Pocket Lexicon of the Greek New Testament."

Taylor, "The Formation of the Gospel Tradition".

Temple, "Citizen and Churchman".

Venn, "Alumni Cantabrigienses". Part I, vols i and iv.

References to the works of the early Fathers of the Church and to Calvin's "Institutes" are to the sections of those works and not to the pages of any particular edition of them. References to the New Testament "Annotations" of Beza and Erasmus are to the passages of Scripture upon which they commented.

In quotations from the English reformers the spelling has been modernized and the frenzied punctuation of the ^{16th Century} printers corrected. In the latter case care has been taken to avoid the danger of misinterpreting the authors' meaning.

1

SOME ELIZABETHAN CONTROVERSIES
ABOUT
THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY

Part I

JEWEL v. HARDING

Part I

Jewel v. Harding

.....

I

On 17th November 1558 Queen Elizabeth I acceded to the throne of England, inheriting from her half-sister a kingdom at war and almost bankrupt together with a Church divided in doctrine and distracted by persecution.

We are not concerned here with the means by which the kingdom was restored to peace and solvency, but only with the methods employed (not altogether successfully) to bring the Church to unity and tranquillity.

Some change in the religion of England was widely expected of Elizabeth. When Queen Mary died the joy of those who had fled to the continent to escape her terror was matched by the speed with which most of them packed their belongings and returned home, surely a rash proceeding unless it were common knowledge that the new Queen would support them rather than the dominant papist party.

Much the same expectation of change, and even desire for it, was also probably to be found among many of the common people of England. The increasing severity of Mary's persecution betrays a growing sense of failure to capture public opinion for her faith, no matter how much outward conformity there might be. In the south and east, including London, where Mary's burnings had been most numerous, there was never much serious opposition to Elizabeth's reforms. It was rather the case that the over-zealous reformer had to be re-

restrained, and not the reluctant urged on. In the northern counties the papist rising of 1569, it is true, revealed an abiding attachment to the old religion on the part of the commonalty. These counties had not felt the full weight of persecution, and Elizabeth's ~~changes~~ changes were not therefore so readily felt to be a part of a deliverance from a reign of terror. But the north was far less populous than the south, and opinion there cannot be taken as representative of the nation as a whole.

In an authoritarian society, however, the common people are willing and are expected to be willing, to accept what is handed out to them and to do as they are told. That, generally speaking, was the religious atmosphere of Elizabethan England. The great majority of Englishmen were not considered to be, and in fact were not, capable of forming a sound opinion upon the merits or demerits of any proposed reform. The opinion that carried weight and influenced the course of events was that of the nation's leaders, the Privy Council, Parliament, the Bishops and the clergy; it was to this opinion that the new Queen must look for effective support for any changes that she might wish to make, or for any opposition to her plans. As it turned out, Elizabeth's very first House of Commons was strongly favourable to

(1). reform. The Lords and the Council seem, as we shall see, to have been a little hesitant and uncertain of themselves. Judging by their

(1) Neale, Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 57f. The Commons represented only a minority of the people, but even so the interest shown by the House in proposals for the reformation of the Church suggests that there was a much wider popular desire for a change.

subsequent conformity, most of the clergy were willing to accept a change even if they did not particularly like it. The attitude of the Bishops was exemplified by that of White, of Winchester, who in his sermon at Queen Mary's funeral exhorted the congregation to go to all lengths to resist any alteration of religion, and who was promptly placed under house-arrest for his pains.⁽¹⁾ But the opposition of the Bishops was more than balanced by the emergence from the obscurity in which they had effaced themselves of such learned clergymen as Guest and Parker, and by the return from the continent of an equally learned and much more numerous contingent of reformers. It was between these two parties that, at the beginning of the reign, the future of the Church of England appeared to lie, with the Bishops/some clerical and lay support, and the reforming clergy along with a much larger and more influential body of the laity in support of the Queen.

At the outset the Queen could do nothing without Parliament, which must first of all repeal the Act of 1554 whereby Mary had restored the papal supremacy over the Church of England and enact another establishing her own supremacy.⁽²⁾ Without this key Elizabeth could not legally unlock the door to reform at all, for without it she could not legislate for the Church without the Pope's agreement.

At first, too, the Queen had to go cautiously about the work of reformation. Spain was her ally in the war with France and Scotland. But if King Philip were to make a separate peace, then it was

(1) SA i 1 48, 154. (2) Gee and Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History 385ff.

morally certain that England would be invaded and the Queen deposed. Then there would be no reformation at all, for the heir to the throne was Mary, Queen of Scots, a Catholic. Philip must not, therefore, be offended, which meant in effect that Elizabeth's Bishops must not be alienated, by drastic or hasty reform. On the other hand there was some reason to suppose that the Bishops might be led a little way along the path of change. Two of them, Heath and Tunstall, had been Bishops in Henry VIII's time; perhaps they would follow the daughter as far as they had followed her father; perhaps they might take the rest of the Bishops with them, in spite of White. It may have been with considerations such as these in her mind that Elizabeth told the Spanish Ambassador that she was

"resolved to restore religion as her father had left it."(1)

The same discreet approach is to be discerned in the Proclamation issued on 27th December 1558. After placing a temporary ban on preaching (in order ^{to} ~~the~~ stop incitement to unauthorized reform on the part of the over-zealous) the Queen allowed the Epistle and Gospel at Mass to be read in English, and the Litany, Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Decalogue to be recited in English at times other than at Mass. Otherwise, the worship of the Church was to remain unchanged until (2) the Lords, Commons, and Clergy could be consulted.

By 22nd March 1559 a Bill abolishing the Pope's supremacy and establishing the Queen's had passed both Houses of Parliament, and (3) the limits of Henry VIII's reformation had been reached. But on the

(1) Neale, op.cit. 54 (2) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 416 (3) This Bill, which named the Queen "Supreme Head" of the Church of England, never received the royal assent. It was soon replaced by another which gave her the title of "Supreme Governor". Neale, op.cit. 75.

same day the first step beyond those limits was taken when the Queen issued another Proclamation, this time requiring the clergy to administer the Communion in both kinds on the following Easter Day, 26th March.⁽¹⁾

How came it that the Queen should so soon abandon the intentions she had expressed to the Spanish ambassador? The answer seems to lie in the fact that by 19th March she was aware that terms of peace had been arranged with France. She was therefore no longer under the necessity of looking over her shoulder at Spain whenever she dealt with ecclesiastical matters; she was free now to carry out the reformation she desired.⁽²⁾

The same prospect of peace with France may have decided the Queen to agree to the holding of a Disputation between the Marians and the reformers. On 18th March the Bishops had finally and unanimously opposed the Supremacy Bill in the House of Lords, thus making it clear that they would not support any other change which had not the Pope's consent. By 20th March it was known that there was to be a Disputation on 31st March, that the papist side was to be upheld by five Bishops and four other of the Marian clergy, that eight Marian exiles and Guest were to put the reformers' case, and that the meeting place was to be Westminster Abbey. It was also known that the questions to be debated were the use of the vernacular in worship, the right of each provincial Church to decree its own rites and ceremonies, and the sacrifice of the Mass.⁽³⁾ All this suggests that there had been

(1) Neale, op.cit. 67 (2) Ibid. 70 (3) J.IV. 1200

a good deal of preliminary planning. But the Bishops were given "ten days, more or less,"⁽¹⁾ in which to ~~pre~~ prepare their case for delivery on 31st March, which means that the final decision to hold the Disputation must have been notified to them on or about 20th March, that is to say, as soon as they had refused to acknowledge the royal supremacy, and as soon as news had been received of the success of the negotiations with France.

John Jewel, who was to be one of the disputants on the reforming side, thought that the purpose of the Disputation was,

"that our Bishops may have no ground for complaint that they are put down only by power and authority of law."⁽²⁾

He clearly anticipated that the Bishops would refuse the oath of abjuration of the Pope's supremacy and of acknowledgment of the Queen's supremacy, and would suffer deprivation. But this would leave them with far too respectable an appearance. He wished them to be shown up as perverters of the Gospel and as deserving deprivation for that reason, even though the punishment might be inflicted, in fact, upon legal grounds. The aim of the Disputation was, in his opinion, to bring theological discredit upon the Bishops.

Neale agrees with Jewel about the purpose of the Disputation, but interprets him as though he meant that it

"was to serve as propaganda on which to launch the religious settlement: revolutionary technique with which in these days we also are familiar."⁽³⁾

This is something different from, and more reputable than, the mere

(1) J.IV.1203 (2) Ibid 1200 (3) Neale, op.cit. 71

humiliation of one's opponents. If we ask at whom the "propaganda" was to be directed it is possible to trace in Jewel a more worthy purpose for it. He complained that

"The Bishops are a great hindrance to us (reformers); for being... among the nobility and leading men in the upper house, and having none there on our side to expose their artifices and falsehoods by word of mouth, they reign as sole monarchs in the midst of simple and ignorant men, and easily overreach our weak senators, either by their numbers, or their reputation for learning."(1)

Jewel wrote this two days after the lay peers had defeated the Bishops in the Lords over the Supremacy Bill. But could the lay peers be trusted to agree to the doctrinal and liturgical changes that were to come? Jewel obviously doubted it and thought they needed to be instructed in the issues at stake between the Marians and the reformers, and taught to see the force of the reformers' case.

Neale notices that the Disputation was held before the Privy Council and peers. Jewel shows that, although a crowd of spectators was present, the affair was conducted under the direction of the Privy Council and many of the nobility attended. It was, in fact, held for the benefit of the Lords and Council, who wished to hear what each side had to say and who, in Jewel's opinion, needed to hear what the reformers had to say.

If the object of the Disputation was merely to discredit the Bishops, then their own conduct ensured its success. As Jewel wrote,

"It is almost incredible how much this conduct has lessened the opinion that the people entertained of the bishops; for they all begin to suspect that they refused to say anything because they had nothing to say."(4)

(1) J.IV. 1200 (2) op.cit. 71 (3) J.IV. 1203f (4) Ibid 1204

But Jewel was bitterly disappointed with the occasion. It was

"an useless conference, and one which indeed can hardly be described as such."(1)

It is not difficult to see why he was disappointed; there had been no opportunity to inform the Lords and Council of the nature and truth of reformed doctrine and practice.

Perhaps Queen Elizabeth may be credited with yet another worthy motive when she consented to the holding of the Disputation. If the Bishops found themselves worsted in public debate, might they not come to heel and agree to the reforms she intended to introduce? There are signs that she wished for their co-operation and she had yet to make another attempt to obtain it for the consecration of Matthew Parker, her first Archbishop of Canterbury. Although herself a reformer, she was not altogether happy with the returned exiles, some of whom she suspected of republicanism and all of whom she felt to be too extreme in doctrine. With the support of the Bishops she might have carried out a moderate reformation along Lutheran lines instead of the more radical changes she eventually had to accept. It must have been a disappointment to her that she failed ever to win the help of any single one of the Marian Bishops.

In the Westminster Disputation is to be found the germ of the controversies in which one of the disputants, John Jewel, later became involved. The reformers had obtained no statement of doctrine from the Marians which they, in their turn, could expose as false.

(1) J.IV.1204

But Jewel was not to be cheated. He was determined, as we shall see, to force the Marians to state their case so that he could demolish it. Before we examine his controversies (insofar as they deal with the doctrine of the Church and the Ministry) it will be worth while, however, to consider Jewel's own eye-witness account of the abortive Disputation, written only three days after its tame conclusion, for this account furnishes a good deal of the background of what was to follow.

"To remove all ground of contention and idle debate, the council ordained that everything, on either side, should be read from written papers, and that the time should be so marked out, that on the first day nothing should be proposed by either party beyond bare affirmations; and that at the next meeting we were to answer them, and they, in their turn, to reply to us. Accordingly, we assembled at Westminster on the 31st of March. Great were the expectations of the people, and the crowd, I believe, still greater. The bishops (such was their good faith) produced not a single line either in writing or in print, alleging that they had not had ~~time~~ sufficient time for the consideration of matters of such importance; notwithstanding that they had been allowed ten days, more or less, and had in the meantime assembled their auxiliary troops both from Oxford and Cambridge, and all corners. However, that so great a number might not seem to have come together to no purpose, Dr Cole, being instructed by the others, stepped forth in the midst, to harangue, in the name of them all, respecting the first point of discussion, namely, the use of a foreign language. After having assailed us most unworthily with all manner of contumely and invective, and stigmatized us as the authors and firebrands of every kind of sedition; and having turned himself towards all quarters, and into every possible attitude, stamping with his feet, throwing about his arms, bending his sides, snapping his fingers, alternately elevating and depressing his eyebrows (you know the look and modesty of the man), he came at last to this, that England had now for thirteen hundred years received the gospel. And by what literary remains, he asked, by what annals, what monuments can it be made to appear, that the public prayers then in use in England were in the English tongue? When he had sufficiently careered within that circle, he added seriously, and with a solemn countenance and admonitory tone, that all should especially attend to and mark this, as a most precious saying, that the apostles from the beginning so divided their labours among themselves, that some of them established the eastern, and others the western churches;

"and that therefore Peter and Paul in the church of Rome, which at that time comprehended nearly all Europe, gave all their instructions in the language of Rome, that is, in Latin; and that the rest of the apostles in the east never employed any other language but the Greek... When he had thus taken up a great part of the time allotted to us for disputation, in calumny, abuse, and falsehood, we at last recited our arguments from written papers, with so much moderation as only to treat upon the matter in dispute, without wounding our opponents... It was afterwards arranged, that we should speak in the same manner respecting the second question on the Monday following, and that on the Wednesday we should reply to their first day's arguments, and they in turn to ours. On the Monday... the bishops, I know not whether from shame at the preceding day, or from despair of victory, first began to shuffle, that they had yet much to say upon the first question, and that the matter must not go off in that way. The council replied that, if they had anything further to say, they might be heard on the third day following, as it had been originally agreed upon; but that they were now to confine themselves to the question before them, and not disturb the order of the disputation. Being driven from this position, they nevertheless still evaded the question by saying that, if they must needs speak at all, they would not speak first, that they were in possession of the ground, and that we, if we wished it, might try our strength in the first place; for that they would be doing great injury to their cause, if they should allow us to depart last, with the applause of the people, and leave the stings of our discourse fresh in the minds of the audience. The council replied on the other hand, that it was originally settled that they, as being first in dignity, should be first to speak; and that this arrangement could not now be altered: they were surprised, however, at there being all this mystery, since one party must of necessity begin the discussion, or else nothing could be said by either; and it was the more extraordinary, because on the first day's disputation Cole sprung forth to speak first, even without being called upon. At last, when a great deal of the time had been taken up in altercation, and the bishops would on no account consent to yield the second place, the assembly broke up without any disputation at all... On the day after your friend White, bishop of Winchester, and Watson, bishop of Lincoln, were committed to the Tower for open contempt and contumacy... The rest are bound in recognizances to appear in court from day to day, and await the determination of the council respecting them." (1)

II

At the time of the Westminster Disputation John Jewel was 36 years old. In Edward VI's reign he had been a Fellow of Corpus Christi, Oxford, but as a known reformer had been expelled from the college at the accession of Mary. For a while he had remained in Oxford, and had witnessed the disputation that preceded the trial of Archbishop Cranmer. Like Cranmer he had signed a retraction of his reforming views, but had soon realized, as Cranmer was to realize, that retraction would not save him from the stake. He therefore fled to Germany and later to Zurich where he joined Peter Martyr whom he had known in Oxford.

The Queen's cautious attitude towards a reformation during the opening months of her reign filled Jewel with impatience. On 14th April 1559 he wrote

"This woman, excellent as she is, and earnest in the cause of true religion, notwithstanding she desires a thorough change as early as possible, cannot however be induced to effect such a change without the sanction of law; lest the matter should seem to have been accomplished, not so much by the judgment of discreet men, as in compliance with the impulse of a furious multitude."(1)

During his exile, Jewel had spent some time at Frankfurt where he had sided with Cox in the ~~latter's~~ latter's famous quarrel with John Knox about the use of the Book of Common Prayer of 1552. He must therefore be classed as one of the more moderate reformers. But he was on the left wing of the moderate party and would nowadays be thought a very "low" churchman. Thus early in May 1559 he told Peter Martyr that

(1) J.IV.1210

"the scenic apparatus of divine worship is now under agitation, and those very things that you and I have so often laughed at are now seriously and solemnly entertained by certain persons... as if the christian religion could not exist without something tawdry... Others are seeking after a golden, or, as it rather seems to me, a leaden mediocrity; and are crying out, that the half is better than the whole."(1)

A "via media" had clearly little attraction for Jewel.

He was greatly troubled because the Queen retained a silver crucifix in her private chapel, and on 16th November 1559 he wrote,

"that little silver cross, of ill-omened origin, still maintains its place in the queen's chapel. Wretched me! this thing will soon be drawn into a precedent."(2)

Along with other reformers he seems to have been instrumental in removing the crucifixes from many Churches, and he and Grindal pleaded with the Queen that this example should be followed in the royal chapel, while Parker and Cox pleaded that the crucifix be retained there. At one time he feared that the position he had adopted over such ornaments would cost him the See of Salisbury, to which he had just been appointed, for on 4th February 1560 he wrote,

"Matters are come to that pass, that either the crosses of silver and tin, which we have everywhere broken in pieces, must be restored, or our bishopricks relinquished."(3)

The crisis passed, however, and Jewel kept his See. In process of time the responsibilities of office smoothed away the rough edges of his thinking. He did not change his opinions (he still disliked
(4)
surplices, for example), but he learned to tolerate the externals of worship for the sake of peace and order in the Church, and expected others to do likewise. Thus he wrote to Archbishop Parker about Lawrence Humphrey whom we are to meet later as another disliker of

(1) J.IV.1210. See p.71 (2) J.IV.1225 (3) Ibid 1229 (4) Ibid 1268.

the surplice, though less tolerant than Jewel, on 22nd December 1565,

"M. Doctor Humfrey, the President of Maudlin College, in Oxon, is presented unto me by my Lord of Winchester into a benefice in my diocese, whom notwithstanding I would gladly admit in respect of his learning, yet in respect of this vain contention about apparel I have thought it best to make a stay, until I might further understand your grace's pleasure. Unless your grace shall otherwise advise me by your letters, without good assurance of his conformity I mind not in any wise to receive him."(1)

Jewel's correspondence provides firsthand evidence of the existence of a problem which was to trouble the Church of England for many years, the poor quality of the ministry. In the old religion all the emphasis had been upon the sacraments, and it had mattered little that the parish priest was often an ignoramus providing he could read the services. Now, not only had reformed doctrine and practice to be commended to the people, but the regular and careful exposition of the word of God was seen to be just as much a part of the Church's work as the administration of the sacraments. A learned ministry was therefore an essential. But Jewel was constrained to write,

"We are only wanting in preachers; and of these there is a great and alarming scarcity. The schools also are entirely deserted; so that, unless God look favourably upon us, we cannot hope for any supply in the future."(2)

Various causes combined to hinder the ordination of educated men. The ministry had become a distasteful and hazardous occupation. A priest ordained before Henry VIII's quarrel with the Pope and living thirty years after that event into the reign of Elizabeth would either have had to play, several times over, the humiliating role of the Vicar of Bray, or else have suffered deprivation, followed perhaps by

(1) J.IV. 1265 (2) J.IV. 1241

by exile, or imprisonment, or even a painful death. Only the shameless or the very brave would be attracted by such a prospect. The ministry certainly did not seem to provide the quietness in which the scholarly mind might thrive. And nobody could tell how soon another bout of recantation as an alternative to deprivation might not be demanded of the clergy. Much depended upon the continuance of a single human life, and so Jewel exclaimed,

"O how wretched we are, who cannot tell under what sovereign we are to live! God will, I trust, long preserve Elizabeth to reign over us in life and safety; and that will satisfy us."(1)

Further, the repeated and contrary questioning of the Church's faith and worship by their elders, and even by their rulers, must have left many young men in such confusion as to inhibit whatever vocation to the ministry they might otherwise have felt. Jewel therefore complained that

"there is a dismal solitude in our universities. The young men are flying about in all directions, rather than come to an agreement in matters of religion."(2)

Again, the mismanagement of the nation's finances and the debasement of the currency had brought about an inflation. Faced with rising prices on an income fixed, to start with, at a miserably low level, many of the clergy found themselves utterly impoverished, and Jewel tells how many suitable young men were

"ashamed to be ministers in God's church."(3)

Instead, they became physicians, apothecaries, or lawyers.

Handicapped in this way, the Elizabethan Church had to do its best with what it could get. Puritan criticism about "dumb dogs"

(1) J.IV.1248 (2) Ibid 1215 (3) J.II.999

among the clergy was unhelpful, but it was justified, for to obtain a ministry at all a very low standard of ability had to be accepted.

III

After the Westminster Disputation Jewel remained in London for four months and then, early in August 1559, set out on a tour of the west country as one of her Majesty's commissioners for Laws Ecclesiastical.⁽¹⁾ By 1st November he was back in London and on 29th of that month delivered at Paul's Cross a discourse which quickly became famous as his "Challenge Sermon". Jewel was seizing the opportunity that had been denied to him at Westminster.

The challenge, issued to the Marians, consisted of the naming of fifteen points of their doctrine and practice, and a demand that they should show that any one of these things had been taught or practised in the Church during the first six hundred years after Christ.

"If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any sufficient sentence out of any old catholic doctor, or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the holy scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of six hundred years after Christ, or that... or that, etc.. I promise that I will give over and subscribe unto him."⁽²⁾

~~The first response to the challenge~~

The sermon was repeated at Court, and again at Paul's Cross, in the following March, by which time the original fifteen points had grown to twenty-seven.

(1) J.IV.1215 (2) J.I.20

The first response to the challenge was a private letter from Dr Cole, the Marian Dean of St Paul's.⁽¹⁾ In the courteous and humble tones of a scholar seeking information, he asked for the patristic authorities upon which Jewel rested his case. We have seen Cole in action at Westminster, but his behaviour on that occasion probably meant little to Jewel by comparison with the fact that he had been the preacher at Cranmer's execution. It was probably this, more than anything else, that prompted the frigidity of Jewel's reply, which was only barely polite and amounted to no more than a repetition of his challenge.⁽²⁾

In fact Jewel could not give the patristic authority demanded of him. His case was wholly negative and therefore notoriously impossible to prove. He could only point to the whole field of patristic literature in the first six centuries and invite his opponents to show that their doctrines and their practices were to be found in it. The Marian attitude was that the reformers were innovators; the challenge was designed to show up the Marians as the true innovators. So long as the Marians were allowed to assert without proof that their ways were the ways that the Church had always followed they were in a strong position, for even a man as young as Jewel could remember that these were the ways of his childhood. The Marian position could only be met by a flat denial of its truth and this was, in effect, how Jewel met it. Some years later he revealed his purpose in proceeding in this manner:-

(1) J.I.26 (2) Ibid 27f

"The ancient learned fathers, having to deal with impudent heretics, that in defence of their errors avouched the judgment of all the old bishops and doctors that had been before them, and the general councils... were oftentimes forced to use the negative, and so to drive the same heretics, as we do you, to prove their affirmatives."(1)

Jewel was confident that if he could get the Marians to try to prove their case from Scripture and the Fathers, he would be able to defeat their arguments in detail.

In a second letter Cole declared that he could not accept Jewel's challenge because he had been suspended from office and had given recognizances not to engage in public disputation. Again he asked for proof of Jewel's position.

"We are in the place of learners, and ye are in the place to teach. We are defendants, and ye are the plaintiffs. We continue in the faith we professed sith our baptism, ye pretend a change in the same. We have with us an apostolic church, ye have none yet approved... Ye say ye bring us again to the primitive church. It is a foul fall in reasoning to bring that for proof which lieth yet in question, or plainly denied. We are in possession; ye come to put us from it. Ye mean to draw us to you; we desire to know the cause why."(2)

Jewel now relented a little, at anyrate to the extent of giving a brief explanation of some of the points of his challenge. Cole again replied, but he did not send this third letter to Jewel. Instead he circulated copies of it among his friends, and in the Diocese of Salisbury to which Jewel was shortly to go as Bishop. This rejoinder of Cole's contained little substance, but the tone in which it was written was calculated to injure Jewel's reputation for learning. The correspondence had begun by being private, but since Cole had chosen to make it more public, Jewel felt justified in

(1) J.IV.886 (2) J.I.30

printing and publishing all that had passed, prefaced by the text of the "Challenge Sermon" and concluded with a final "Reply" from himself.⁽¹⁾

If their faith was not to seem merely a cold denial of other men's beliefs, it was essential to the reformers that their case be presented in positive rather than in negative terms to the people of England. In 1562 Jewel discharged this task with his ~~Apologia~~⁽²⁾ "Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae", a work skilfully turned into English in 1564 by Lady Bacon. The terms in which this Apology was written constituted a further challenge to the Marians, and it was not long before Jewel found that both of them had been taken up by the same person.

IV.

Thomas Harding was, in 1559, a Canon of Salisbury Cathedral and Treasurer to the Chapter, but he was deprived in the visitation of that year. He had been a contemporary of Jewel's at Oxford, and had been ordained according to the rite of 1549.⁽³⁾ During Edward VI's reign he had been an ardent reformer, but had submitted during Queen Mary's reign and had become an equally zealous papist. After his deprivation he had fled to Louvain, from which retreat there came in 1564 his "Answer to M. Juelle's Challenge".⁽⁴⁾

The following year Jewel brought out a "Replie to Hardinge's Answer", but only to be faced in the same year with Harding's "Confutation of a Booke intituled an Apologie", and while he was

(1) J.I. 38ff (2) J.III. 5ff (3) Ibid. 334 (4) J.IV. 1268

still struggling to complete a "Defence of the Apology" there appeared, in 1566, Harding's "Rejoinder to M.Jewel's Reply" and, in 1567, Harding's "Rejoinder to M.Jewel's Reply against the Sacrifice of the Mass".

Jewel's "Defence" was published in 1567, but he was already well behind in the race to obtain the ear of the English people, and he fell yet further behind when, in 1568, Harding produced his "Detection of Sundry Foul Errors uttered by M.Jewel in his Defence of the Apology". Harding had set a furious pace, bombarding his opponent with a book a year over a period of five years. He had probably little else to do but write, whereas Jewel had the administration of a Diocese upon his hands (and he was not a negligent Bishop). Further, Jewel's books were necessarily much longer than Harding's for, as he remarked himself,

"a little poison requireth oft-times a great deal of treacle." (1)

As it turned out, Jewel was unable to keep up the pace, and so he abandoned the "Challenge" controversy and devoted himself to the one he had provoked with his "Apology". Nothing was lost by doing this for the same ground was covered in both controversies. In his continuance of the "Apology" controversy Jewel wrote no new works after the "Defence", but contented himself with ~~answering~~ answering Harding in new and enlarged editions of that work in 1570 and 1571.

The papal Bull of 1569 which purported to excommunicate Elizabeth and to release her subjects from their allegiance served also to protect Jewel from further attack. Thereafter, the dissemination of

papist literature in England became too dangerous to be worth while. Jewel's ~~death~~ death in 1572 delivered him from involvement in any further controversy.

V.

Jewel's method in controversy was to allow his opponent to speak first by means of extensive quotations from his writings. Then Jewel drenched his opponent's case with a torrent of quotations, some from Scripture but most from the Fathers in whose works he was very widely read. After expounding his authorities as required, Jewel would then expose his opponent's faulty reasoning by reducing it to a set of absurd syllogisms.

Cole, and in the "Challenge" controversy Harding, had their work reproduced in full by Jewel. In the "Defence" Jewel quoted his original "Apology" section by section, each followed by the corresponding part of Harding's "Confutation", though not the latter in full. Then he added, section by section, his defence of his case. Into these last portions he later inserted those parts of Harding's "Detection" which seemed to call for an answer. Nothing material was omitted in these quotations of Harding's works and so, in its final form, the "Defence" affords, for all practical purposes, a complete record of the "Apology" controversy.

In England Jewel's work was so well approved by his fellow-reformers that Archbishop Parker, and later Archbishop Bancroft, ordered copies of the "Defence" to be placed in all parish churches. It was widely read on the continent and the Council of Trent paid it

the compliment of appointing two Spanish scholars to refute it. They do not seem to have completed their task, even if they ever began it.

All the time that Jewel was involved in controversy Mary Queen of Scots was heir-presumptive to the crown of England. If she had come to the throne the restoration of papalism would have been much more than an academic question. The matters with which Jewel dealt, such as the papal supremacy and the doctrine of the Mass, must therefore have seemed to him to be things from which it was important to win the people of England, not merely because they were things erroneous in themselves but also because a conviction that they were erroneous might be needed in order to resist their re-introduction into the Church of England. In the event, Jewel's fear turned out to be groundless. There was no attempt to re-impose papal doctrine and supremacy, and many of the matters which Jewel handled became dead issues until they were revived in the nineteenth century by the Oxford Movement. Even towards the end of Jewel's life these questions were losing their relevance to the ecclesiastical problems of the time. The controversial battlefields of the larger part of Elizabeth's reign were fought over by Anglicans and Puritans, both of whom agreed with Jewel's arguments against Harding. For this reason alone, Jewel's value for this present study of Elizabethan controversy would be limited, but it is the more limited because the subjects he dealt with were very largely connected with the Eucharist, and not so much with the Church and the Ministry. Further, Jewel's negative case led him into a great deal of "ad hominem" argument. When he quotes the Fathers it cannot be assumed that he quotes them

with approval. He frequently quoted them with no other object than to show that Harding had either misquoted or misinterpreted them, his purpose throughout being to show that Harding's teaching was not the teaching of the early Church, even though the early teaching might itself be false.

In spite of all this, Jewel's work has a value for present purposes. It affords glimpses into the mind of a typical Marian exile, of ~~an~~ a reformer, that is to say, whose position lay somewhere between the extreme of John Knox and the moderation of Queen Elizabeth. What he has to say about the Church and the Ministry, although not lengthy, provides a useful introduction to the subjects which were, in Jewel's last years and after his death, so acutely matters of controversy in the Church of England.

VI.

For Jewel, Holy Scripture was the paramount and over-riding authority in the Church.

"We receive and embrace all the Canonical Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament... These be the heavenly voices whereby God hath opened unto us his will... In them be abundantly and fully comprehended all things whatsoever be needful for our health... They be the very sure and infallible rule whereby may be tried whether the Church doth swerve or err, and whereunto all ecclesiastical doctrine ought to be called to account... Against these Scriptures neither law, nor ordinance, nor any custom, ought to be heard." (1)

In the Scriptures the Church had not only its supreme authority, but also its inerrant authority, viz:-

(1) J.III.429

"It is possible the Church may err; but it is not possible the Scriptures may err. And the Scriptures of God have authority to reform the Church; but I never heard that the Church had authority to reform the Scriptures. Thus Christ reformed the errors of the Church in his time, brought in by the Scribes and Pharisees, and said unto them, Scriptum est."(1)

The books of the Old Testament were authoritative for Jewel because they were

"the Holy Scriptures which our Saviour Jesus Christ did not only use for authority in all his speech, but did also at last seal up the same with his own blood."(2)

On this matter of the authority of Scripture, Harding had two pertinent questions to ask. Upon what authority did Jewel disallow the books of the Maccabees as canonical, and upon what authority did he determine which books were canonical? Scripture could give no answer to the second of these questions, Harding declared. Therefore,

"what authority have you to stay yourself by concerning these, but only that of the Church?"(3)

For the books of the Maccabees, Jewel depended upon the authority
 (4) (5) (6)
 of SS Jerome, Augustine, and Cyprian, all of whom had denied
 (6)
 canonicity. Cyprian had called these books "ecclesiastical", because they might be read in Church. Augustine had used the term "canonical" of them in two senses, so that he seemed at one moment to say that they were canonical, and at the next to say that they were not. But

(1) J.I.79 (2) J.IV.748 (3) J.III.430 (4) In his Preface to the Vulgate version of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon. (5) De Civ. Dei, xviii.36 (6) i.e. Rufinus, Commentary on the Apostles' Creed, c.38, wrongly attributed to Cyprian.

he was not self-contradictory, for

"to be alleged in proof of faith they are not canonical; but to be read unto the people in church for example of life, in this sense, saith St Augustine, they are canonical."(1)

On Harding's second question Jewel again had recourse to the
 Fathers, this time to ~~xxx~~ Eusebius, Augustine, and Ambrose as re-
 presenting the mind of the early Church. He agreed with Harding
 that the Church must play an authoritative role in determining the
 canonicity of Scripture:-

"Thus had the Church of God the Spirit of wisdom, whereby to discern the true Scriptures from the false."(5)

But he added immediately,

"yet we may not gather hereof that the authority of the Church is over and above Scripture."(6)

Jewel does not seem to have distinguished very clearly between the authority of the Old Testament and that of the New. When Harding pleaded that the practice of Infant Baptism showed that the Church might over-ride Christ's command to "teach and baptize" (since an infant has not the capacity to be taught), Jewel might have justified the practice, as the Book of Common Prayer does, by reference to Jesus' command,

"suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God."

Instead he preferred to rely upon the Old Testament notion of the

(1) J.III.432 (2) Hist.Eccles.iii.25 (3) c.Faust. xxi.79,xxxii.21
 (4) Expos.Evang.sec.Luc,i.1. (5) J.III.442 (6) Ibid. Harding seems to be hinting that because the Church determined which scriptures were canonical and which not, the Church is the primary authority and Scripture secondary and minor. But the early Church, having decided which books comprised Holy Scripture, placed itself under the authority of those books, and not above it, as Jewel shows later. See p. 29

solidarity of the family, viz:-

"Touching Baptism, first we teach the fathers, and afterwards we baptize them and their children; and this is no breach of Christ's commandment. For after we be once become God's people, God hath promised, that he will be our God, and the God of our children; and by the prophet Ezekiel he saith, Your children be my children."(1)

Again, when Harding instanced the case of the Maccabees fighting the armies of Antiochus on the Sabbath as an example of a blameless breaking of a law of God, Jewel replied that the Maccabees

"might lawfully defend themselves upon the Sabbath-day. For, as Christ expoundeth the law, Man is not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath is made for man."(2)

Quite apart from the curious retrospective effect which Jewel attributes to Jesus's saying, he minimizes our Lord's authority in the matter of the Sabbath by describing him only as an expounder of the Law. The primitive Gentile Church kept her Sabbath, so far as is known, neither in the Jewish way, nor on the Jewish day, nor for the Jewish reason. Jesus must therefore have been regarded by Gentile Christians not so much as an expounder of the Law in the saying quoted by Jewel, but as a reviser of the Law almost to the point of abolishing the fourth commandment altogether. To Jewel this commandment retained more force under Christ than the early Church seemed to think it had.

(1) J.I.224 (2) Ibid

VII.

It is not difficult to detect in Jewel a certain suspicion of the authority of the Church. In the course of his argument Harding brought up the case of Martin Luther. Luther had believed that it was wrong to administer the Communion in one kind when Christ had commanded it to be administered in both kinds. Yet Luther had declared that if a Council of the Church commanded him to administer in both kinds, and did so upon its own authority rather than upon the authority of Christ, he would disobey the Council and administer in one kind, or not at all. Harding pointed out how Luther had later regretted these words, and had admitted that he had been over-hasty in making a decision to do wrong for the right reason rather than to do right for the wrong reason. But up to a point Jewel defended Luther's first position:-

"Luther wrote this not in despite of any godly council... But he could not suffer to see God's glory so defaced, that a company of men should presume to allow or disallow his truth, as if it were not true in itself, but must fall or stand only at their pleasure."(1)

Jewel had good reason to fear that the Church might use its authority to overthrow the commandments of Christ. Indeed, a great deal of his argument was that the Church into which he had been baptized had done that very thing. But he also traced the Church's disobedience to Christ much further back than his own childhood.

"The sacrament of the breaking of Christ's body and the shedding of his blood is an heavenly mystery, and an holy thing; yet it hath oftentimes been abused, and that in the primitive church, when the religion of Christ seemed to be in the highest perfection."(2)

(1) J.I.215f. Formula Missae Communis: Pro Ecclesia Wittembergensi. De Communioni Populi. Lutheri Opera Tomus II, Witebergae 1551. fol.385.2. (2) J.I.6.

As examples of what he considered to be abuses of the Eucharist
 (1) (2)
 in the early Church Jewel cited Tertullian and Cyprian to witness to
 the practice of carrying the elements home for a private partaking,
 (3) (4)
 and Augustine and Jerome to testify to the administering of the
 Communion to infants. He might have gone back further still and
 have mentioned those corruptions of the Lord's Supper which St Paul
 denounced in I Cor.xi. Instead, he preferred to find corruption in
 the Corinthian Church over a matter in which it is not necessary to
 suppose that there was any.

"The sacrament of Baptism is an holy thing, yet it hath been
 abused, and that in the Church of God, yea, even at the
 beginning of the Church, even when the Apostles of Christ
 were still alive."(5)

The practice Jewel had in mind was that mentioned by St Paul in
 I Cor.xv.29, where living Christians were baptized as proxies for
 their dead friends. Jewel assumed that St Paul disapproved of the
 custom and had only mentioned it "ad hominem" as evidence of a
 belief in the resurrection of the dead. But, in fact, St Paul
 expressed neither approval nor disapproval, and in the absence of
 anything to the contrary it must be assumed that he approved of the
 custom. The ground upon which Jewel based his idea that the practice
 was corrupt seems to have been the later variation of it, the bap-
 tizing of actual corpses as though they were still alive, a thing
 (6)
 which the Church condemned. But Baptism of the dead is one thing,

(1) Ad Uxor.ii.5 (2) De Laps.25 (3) Ep.xcviii.4.ad Bonif.
 (4) Ep.xlviii.15.adv. Jovin. Apol. (5) J.I.5 (6) Cod. Can. Eccles.
 Afric. can.xviii.

and Baptism for the dead is quite another. Jewel did not distinguish carefully enough between the two, and was rather too ready to find fault with any development of Baptism beyond its original use.

Notwithstanding all this, Jewel had a healthy and balanced respect for the early Church, and for its Fathers and Councils:-

"What say we of the Fathers, Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, Cyprian, etc?... They be interpreters of the word of God. They were learned men and learned Fathers; the instruments of the mercy of God, and vessels full of grace. We despise them not, we read them, we reverence them, and give thanks unto God for them. They were witnesses unto the truth. They were worthy pillars and ornaments in the Church of God."

(1)

But he was careful to add without delay,

"Yet may they not be compared with the word of God. We may not build upon them; we may not think them the foundation and warrant of our conscience; we may not put our trust in them... Some things I believe, and some things which they write I cannot believe: I weigh them not as the holy and canonical Scriptures."(2)

That authority which the Fathers had claimed for themselves, Jewel was prepared to allow them, for they had placed the Scriptures above all human authority whatsoever. He was ready to accept their interpretations of doubtful places of Scripture, although he had reservations to make about this, viz:-

"We deny not the learned Fathers' expositions and judgments in doubtful cases of the Scriptures. We read them ourselves... But thus we say; The same Fathers' opinions and judgments, forasmuch as they are sometimes disagreeable one from another, and sometimes imply contrarieties and contradictions, therefore alone and of themselves, without farther authority and guiding of God's word, are not always sufficient warrants to charge our faith. And thus the learned catholic Fathers themselves have evermore taught us to esteem and weigh the Fathers."(4)

(1) J.IV.1173 (2) Ibid (3) J.III.176 (4) J.I.239

Jewel's chief complaint against the Church of Rome was that it lacked conformity in doctrine and practice with the apostolic and primitive Church. He wrote to Cole,

"Ye have ecclesiam apostolicam, ye say, and we have none. Howbeit, in all these matters that we now entreat of, we have, as you know and must needs confess, the old doctors' church, the ancient Council's church, the primitive church, St Peter's church, St Paul's church, and Christ's church, and this, I believe, ought of good right to be called the apostles' church. And I marvel much that you, knowing that ye have none of all these, yet should say ye have ecclesiam apostolicam."(1)

Just as the Fathers could and did err, so Jewel believed that the General Councils of the Church could err, and had erred. (2) He had little enthusiasm for the idea that a Council might be called to compose the differences between papists and reformers. The most that such a Council could achieve would be to witness to already existing truth:-

"Truth will be truth notwithstanding; for the Council cannot make the falsehood truth, but the thing that is taken to be true, it certifieth only to be ~~trve~~ true."(3)

The idea that there could be infallibility in the Church, or in a general Council of the Church, or in anything but Scripture, Jewel rejected absolutely.

"Like as the errors of the clock be revealed by the constant course of the sun, even so the errors of the Church are revealed by the everlasting and infallible word of God. But to say, as some of you have said, the Church is the only rule of our faith, and, whatsoever God saith in his word, she can never err, is as much as if a man would say, Howsoever the sun goeth, yet the clock must needs go true."(4)

(1) J.I.34 (2) Ibid 35f (3) Ibid 34 (4) Ibid 80.

VIII

The one and only constructive idea that Cole brought forward in his correspondence with Jewel was expressed as follows:-

"Shew me your opinion, whether we are bound to do all things which we find by sufficient authority were in use in the primitive church... I think it an error, I am bound to do as the primitive church did. Where the Church customably useth the contrary, I reckon an example, and no bond. I deny not but these examples were to be followed, and not to be broken at every man's will and pleasure, until by common assent other order were taken. But if ye seek old writers, and find me that the church this six hundred years observed not many things which were practised, and accounted for good, wholesome, and holy, in the primitive church, and thereby deem us in error, this were a wrong judgment. For the church of Christ hath his childhood, his manhood, and his hoar-hairs; and as to one man that is meet to him in one age is not meet for him in another; so were many things requisite and necessary in the primitive church, which in our days were like to do more harm than good. This is no new devised fantasy, but uttered 1100 years ago by St Ambrose, without reproach... St Augustine saith... it is a marvellous insolent kind of madness to mislike that which is received in the church, where the custom is not against any commandment in scripture."(1)

This idea of the Church as a living organism keeping the customs of the past but not afraid to change those customs in accordance with the circumstances of each age through which it lives, is attractive. However, in the final sentence of the above quotation, Cole handed over to Jewel all that was required to establish the reformers' case. Among all the changes that the passage of time might require of the Church, the unvarying element must be the will of God as expressed in Scripture. It was precisely Jewel's case that Rome observed customs which were against the commandments of God in Scripture, and therefore he replied,

(1) J.I.74 Ambrose (i.e. Ambrosiaster) Comm.in Ep. ad Ephes. iv.11,12. Augustine Ep.liv.v.6

"There were some orders in the primitive church commanded by God; and some others were devised by men, for the better training of the people. Such orders as were commanded by God may not be changed in any case, only because God commanded them: for, as God is everlasting, so is his word and commandment everlasting. Of the other side, such orders as have been devised by men may be broken upon some good consideration, only because they were men that devised them."(1)

From this principle it must be understood that

"as it is not in the power of men to appoint sacraments, so it is not in the power of men to alter or change sacraments. God will not be worshipped after our fantasies, and therefore so oftentimes he chargeth us in the scriptures, Non facietis quod bonum videtur in oculis vestris."(2)

Where Cole pleaded for the liberty of the Church upon the authority of St Ambrose (or Ambrosiaster) and St Augustine, Harding pleaded for it upon the authority of St Paul, referring his opponent to Gal.iv,9-11, in which place the Apostle had said,

"Now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known of God, how turn ye back again unto the weak and beggarly rudiments whereunto ye desire to be in bondage over again? Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years. I am afraid of you, lest by any means I have bestowed labour upon you in vain."~~1~~

Applying this passage to the case of the celebrant at Mass communicating alone to the exclusion of the rest of the worshippers, Harding argued,

"If either the priest or every other Christian man or woman might at no time receive this blessed sacrament but with more together in one place, then, for the enjoying of this great and necessary benefit, we were bound to condition of a place. And so the church, delivered from all bondage by Christ, and set at liberty, should yet for all that be in servitude and subjection under those outward things which St Paul calleth infirma et egena elementa... Then, when St Paul, blaming the Galatians, saith, Ye observe days and months and times, for this bondage he might blame us and say, Ye observe places."(3)

(1) J.I. 75 ~~(2) Ibid 24 (3) Ibid 137~~ Hooker was later to modify this rule. See p. 534 (2) J.I. 24 (3) Ibid 137

Harding did not mean, however, that the Church was simply free to do as she pleased. For the right use of her liberty the Church must be directed by the Holy Spirit, and so

"the Catholic Church, taught by the Holy Ghost all truth... in distributing of the blessed sacrament to Christian people hath used liberty (which Christ never imbarred by any ~~commandment~~ commandment to the contrary) so as it hath ever been ~~most~~ most for the behoof and commodity of the receivers."(1)

Jewel disposed of Harding's argument by placing Gal.iv,9-11 in its context. Our deliverance, he said, was

"from the curse of the Law, wherein we reated under sin, and from the ceremonies and ordinances given by Moses... From this servitude, saith St Paul, God hath delivered you... From this liberty the Galatians were fallen away to the servile observation of circumcision, washings, and other ceremonies of the Law. Therefore of this liberty and of this bondage St Paul speaketh, and of none other."(2)

He was willing to allow that the Church was free to arrange certain matters connected with the Eucharist as she thought fit, but not to make the celebrant the sole communicant.

"I grant certain circumstances, as fasting, sitting, standing, kneeling, and other like ceremonies about the holy ministration, are left to the discretion of the church. But this is a very simple argument: Certain circumstances may be altered; ergo the priest may receive alone. Christ himself hath already determined the case. For albeit he hath appointed no certain number of communicants, yet he hath by special words appointed a number. For these very words, Take ye, eat ye; Drink ye all; Divide ye among yourselves; Do ye this in my remembrance; Ye shall set forth the Lord's death; these very words, I say, cannot be taken of one singular man, but necessarily import a number."(3)

Not only must the necessary implications of Christ's commands be observed by the Church, but also his unexpressed intentions.

These intentions were to be learned from the actions of the Apostles

(1) J.I.208 (2) Ibid 138 (3) Ibid 124

or from the practice of the primitive Church. Jewel used this argument against Harding's theory that Jesus had commanded only the Apostles and their successors in the ministry to repeat the Eucharist and that it was only by a decision of the ~~any~~ Church that this repetition was extended to the laity. It must therefore, Harding maintained, be within the competence of the Church to decide how far the laity should be permitted to join in the Eucharist, i.e. (1) whether they might communicate in both kinds or in one only or, as (2) Jewel pointed out, not at all.

By inviting Harding to compare Christ's command regarding the Eucharist with St Paul's words in I Cor.xi.26, and with the custom of the primitive Church, Jewel exposed the error of his opponent's reasoning.

"Whereas Christ saith, Drink ye all of this, if (Harding) will follow the letter, the words be plain that all should drink. If he will leave the letter and take the meaning, St Paul hath opened it. For writing unto the whole congregation at Corinth, he saith thus, As often as ye shall eat this bread and drink this cup, ye shall declare the Lord's death until he come. If (Harding) doubt St Paul, yet the very practice and continual order of the primitive church fully declareth what Christ meant." (3)

It was not, that is to say, by a decision of St Paul's that partaking of the cup, or participation in the Eucharist at all, was permitted to the laity. St Paul merely acted upon Christ's meaning and intention. And if St Paul's guidance in this matter had been lacking, the custom of the primitive Church would have shown what Christ meant when he commanded the Eucharist to be repeated.

Jewel would not, however, have accepted the practice of the prim-

itive Church as a guide to Christ's intentions in any way that might seem to conflict with Christ's commands. His presupposition was that the apostolic and primitive Church had an insight into Christ's mind, not that it had liberty to alter his ordinances. Writing of the difference between himself and Harding on this point, he said,

"The question that lieth between us standeth not in this point, whether we ought to do everything that Christ did; but whether we ought to do that thing that Christ both did himself, and also commanded us to do, and was afterwards practised by the Apostles and holy Fathers, that had the Spirit of understanding, and knew Christ's meaning."(1)

To establish his proposition that the Church had liberty, in certain cases, to repeal the commandments of God, Harding put forward as an example the decree of the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.28f). The Church observed this decree only for a time, but the account of its enactment showed no sign that it was meant to be other than permanent. It could be taken as a commandment of God, for "it seemed good to the Holy Ghost". It was apostolic, and it was recorded in Scripture. Harding's words were,

"Many... commandments of God concerning outward things might be rehearsed here which, notwithstanding, by little and little in the church have been omitted; as the forbearing of strangled things and blood, which was commanded by God in the Old Testament and, according to the pleasure and advice of the Holy Ghost, decreed by the Apostles in the New Testament."(2)

Jewel replied as follows:-

"The forbearing of blood and strangled meats began among the faithful in the time of the Apostles, not as of God's commandment, or to continue for ever, but only of charity, to bear with the weakness of the Jews... But after that the Jews were thoroughly persuaded that all creatures of God were clean, this forbearing, which began only for their sakes, had an end."

(3)

(1) J.I.127 (2) Ibid 222f (3) Ibid 228

This amounts to no more than a flat denial of Harding's flat assertion that a decree which "seemed good to the Holy Ghost" was a decree of God. But Jewel complicated the question by saying that when the Church allowed the decree to lapse, she was merely returning to the liberty which Christ had allowed in such matters as idol-meat by saying,

"The thing that entereth into the mouth defileth not the man."⁽¹⁾
 He merely put the problem one stage further back. If the decree was not a commandment of God, was the Council of Jerusalem justified in making it, even for reasons of charity, against the liberty which Jesus had conferred upon his people? It was left to Hooker to find a more acceptable solution to the problem raised by this decree.⁽²⁾

IX.

Throughout the period of Jewel's controversies with Harding the Church of England was torn by controversy about the apparel of the clergy, and especially about the use of the surplice. Surprisingly little of this controversy was reflected in the writings of either Jewel or Harding, but the question received some slight attention when Jewel accused the religious orders of putting "a great holiness"⁽³⁾ in their diet, their habit, their tonsure, and so on. Harding denied that the orders did any such thing:-

"They be not so ignorant as to put holiness in such outward things, though their obedience performed in the humble observation of these outward things according to their rule be an holy thing."⁽⁴⁾

(1) J.I.228 Matt.xv.11 (2) See p.559 (3) J.III.611 (4) Ibid

In reply Jewel asked,

"wherefore do your doctors keep such hot schools amongst themselves whether, if the sexton happen to mend his hallowed vestiment with a thread unhallowed, the whole vestiment be not thereby become unhallowed? How could those so doubtful matters ever have fallen in question amongst your fellows, if ye had been fully and thoroughly persuaded that there is no holiness in your apparel?"(1)

Harding noticed that among the English reformers there were some who seemed to put a great unholiness in the apparel prescribed for the clergy.

"The thing is indifferent and may be yielded unto, saith the one sect. They be the pope's rags and may not be worn, saith the other sect."(2)

At heart Jewel sympathized with the "other sect". On 8th February 1567 he wrote to Bullinger,

"The contest regarding the linen surplice... is not yet at rest. That matter still somewhat disturbs weak minds. I wish that all, even the slightest vestiges of popery, might be removed from our churches, and above all from our minds. But the Queen at this time is unable to endure the least alteration in matters of religion."(3)

But as we have already seen in his attitude over the case of Dr
(4)

Humphrey, Jewel was not an extremist in practice, and he could even bring himself to declare that

"We keep still and esteem, not only those ceremonies which we are sure were delivered us from the Apostles, but some others too, which we thought might be suffered without hurt to the church of God, for that we had a desire that all things in the holy congregation, as St Paul commandeth, be done with comeliness and in good order."(5)

(1) J.III.614f (2) Ibid 612 (3) J.IV.1268 (4) See p.14 (5) J.III.

X.

Of the conveners of the Council of Trent, which was in session at the time, Jewel asked Harding,

"Wherefore do they shut out Christian kings and good princes from their convocation? Why do they so uncourteously, or with such spite leave them out, and, as though either they were not Christian men, or else could not judge, will not have them acquainted with the causes of Christian religion, nor understand the state of their own churches?"(1)

Harding thought that the presence of kings in the Council would have amounted to a confusion of the offices of spiritual governor
(2)
and temporal magistrate. Jewel agreed that he would have seen such a confusion of offices if Queen Elizabeth had claimed the right to exercise the ministry of the word and sacraments, or to excommunicate and absolve. But she claimed none of these things.

"She doeth nothing but which she may lawfully do, nothing but whereunto the Lord God hath given her especial warrant. Her Majesty is supreme governor over her subjects. The bishops within her realm are subjects to her. She governeth; they yield obedience. When occasion is offered to dispose of anything specially appertaining to the service of God, or to judge of any controversy arising in spiritual causes, she commendeth and giveth to her learned divines the due consideration thereof... God hath given her charge of both tables. In the first she hath charge of religion, in the other of civil causes."(3)

The authority of a national ruler in ecclesiastical affairs, Jewel believed, was based upon Scripture. But it was only a Christian ruler, a "godly prince", who had this authority. A heathen king could have no legitimate authority over a Christian Church in his realm, and so, in the nature of the case, Jewel was unable to show any example from the New Testament, just as he was unable to show

(1) J.IV. 957 (2) Ibid. 958 (3) Ibid 1145

any precept from the same place, in support of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of a Christian king. All Jewel's Scripture for his proposition had therefore, of necessity, to come from the Old Testament, re-inforced by the practice of the Church in the Roman Empire from the time of ~~Constantine~~ Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, onwards.

God, said Jewel, often exhorted the kings of Israel by his prophets to lay waste the heathen temples, and through Isaiah had pronounced kings to be the patrons and the nurses of the Church. Moses, a civil magistrate, had rebuked Aaron, a priest, for making a golden calf. King David brought home the Ark, and appointed hymns and psalms for the worship of God. King Solomon built the Temple, made an oration on religion, and deposed Abiathar the priest in favour of Zadok. The kings Hezekiah, Jehoshaphat and Josiah
(1)
cleansed the Temple of idolatry, and reformed the priests.

As examples of Christian Emperors who had exercised jurisdiction in the Church, Jewel instanced among others, Constantine who called the Council of Nicea, Theodosius who called the Council of Constantinople, Mar^tian who called the Council of Chalcedon. According to Theodore^t, Constantine actually sat in the Council of Nicea and advised the Bishops in their deliberations. According to Socrates, Theodosius I presided over the Council of Constantinople and having at its conclusion allowed the ~~Catholic~~ Catholic case, tore up the writings of the heretics. At the third Council of Constantinople

(1) J.IV.977ff

(1)

the civil magistrate subscribed to the Council's canons. Since these rulers did these things, Jewel concluded,

"not by any other man's commission, but in their own name, and that both uprightly and godly, shall we say it pertaineth not to such men to have to do with religion? Or shall we say, a Christian magistrate which dealeth amongst others in these matters doeth either naughtily, or presumptuously, or wickedly? The most ancient and Christian Emperors and kings that ever were did occupy themselves in these matters, and yet were they never for this cause noted either of wickedness or presumption... Wherefore, if it were lawful for them to do thus, being but civil magistrates, and having the chief rule of commonweals, what offence have our princes at this day committed that they, being in the like degree, may not have leave to do the like?" (2)

XI.

Jewel defined the Church in the following terms:-

"We believe that there is one Church of God, and that the same is... catholic and universal, and dispersed throughout the whole world, so that there is now no nation which may 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; 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." (3)

Regarding the catholicity of the Church, Harding noted a three-
(4)
fold universality based on the rule of St Vincent of Lerins. There

(1) J.IV.992, 1014, 1018, 1024. Jewel referred to Eusebius, Hist. Eccles.x.5 (where, however, Councils at Rome and Arles are mentioned, but not Nicea); Leo, Ep.lix; Socrates, Hist Eccles.v.10; Theodoret, Hist.Eccles.i.7; the Imperial Edict on the 3rd Council of Constantinople (see Percival, Seven Ecumenical Councils, 353); the Prefatory Epistle of the 1st Council of Constantinople to Theodosius (see Percival, op.cit. 170, also 172. (2) J.IV. 1035, 1037f
(3) J.III.265. It is to be noticed that Jewel identified the Church with the Kingdom of Christ. See further on this p.52f
(4) Commonitoria, 11.

must be a universality

"of places, which (Jewel) here toucheth; of times, and of men, which he toucheth not. In the catholic church we must have a great care, saith (St Vincent), that we hold that which hath everywhere, evermore, and of all persons been believed. If these (reformers) prove not the church they profess themselves to be of to have this threefold universality, then is their congregation not this one church, nor of this one church of God, but the synagogue of antichrist." (1)

Jewel thought little of St Vincent's rule. It could only be used for a ^{5/}consensus of Churches which had not been corrupted, for otherwise the true doctrine of Christ would not pass its test nor would the Gospel be Catholic. ~~But~~ Instead, he declared that

"the catholic church of God standeth not in multitude of persons, but in weight of truth." (2)

In common with all the reformers of his time, Jewel held that there was an invisible as well as a visible Church, and that the two were not necessarily co-terminous. The Church might admit a man to its membership, but only God could judge whether that man's faith was genuine or feigned. Therefore within the visible Church, and perhaps even overlapping its boundaries, there must be a company of true believers forming an invisible Church known only to God. In accordance with this position Jewel said

"The general or outward church of God is visible, and may be seen; but the very true church of God's elect is invisible, and cannot be seen or discerned by man, but is only known to God alone." (3)

Anyone holding the view that Baptism was, ex opere operato, a guarantee of admission into the true Church of God could do without the idea of an invisible Church parallel with the visible. But

(1) J.III.265 (2) Ibid 268 (3) J.IV.668 The idea of an invisible Church arises, of course, out of the doctrine of justification by faith alone

Harding, who held that view of Baptism, still found it necessary to postulate something like an invisible Church, viz:-

"According to the inward influence of grace, Christ properly and only is Head of his mystical body the Church; but as touching the outward government, the being of a head is common to Christ with others... According to inward influence of grace into every faithful member, Christ only is head of the Church; according to outward governing the Pope under Christ and instead of Christ is head of the same."(1)

(2)
Jewel identified the universal Church with the visible Church, as is shown by his view of how the universal Church might be kept in unity. To Harding this was done by obedience to the universal supremacy of the Pope, but to Jewel it ought to be done by the universal consenting together of the Bishops under Christ as their (3)
Head, a conception which he learned from St Cyprian and other of the early Fathers.

Jewel was willing to agree that

"dissension and quarrelling be the sooner ended when all things be put over to one man."

But he added the important proviso

"so that the same one man may live for ever, and still continue in one mind, and never alter."(4)

This proviso expressed Jewel's difficulty about accepting the idea of a Universal Bishop. The Popes had differed from each other and had sometimes even contradicted themselves. That was a situation which St Cyprian had foreseen when he said,

"There are many Bishops in the Church, that, if one fall into heresy, the rest may help."(5)

But Jewel's main reason for rejecting a unity based upon the

(1) J.III.266 (2) Jewel did not, that is to say, identify the Catholic Church with the invisible Church, as Bredwell later did, see p. 437 (3) Ep.lxvi.8 (4) J.III.276 (5) Ep.lxviii.3

supremacy of a single Bishop was its lack of scriptural warrant.

St Paul had provided for unity and peace under many, not under one.

"For the unity and quiet government of the Church of God, St Paul saith, Christ ascending above all the heavens hath given (not one universal Pope to rule the whole, but) some apostles, some prophets, some pastors, some doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ, that we may all come into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God. By these means God thought it sufficient to preserve his Church in unity, and never made mention of one universal Pope."(1)

XII.

Jewel would not agree that Holy Orders should be classed as a sacrament, his objection being the lack of scriptural authority for such a classification.

"No doubt the ministry of the Gospel is highly to be esteemed, seeing our Saviour was not ashamed to publish the will of his Father in his own person; yet it appeareth not where ever he did ordain it to be a sacrament."(2)

He recognized three degrees of ministers, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, but not the ~~xxx~~ minor Orders (although he allowed that they had at one time played useful parts in the Church).⁽³⁾

All Bishops were, to Jewel, of equal authority, just as the Apostles had been of equal authority. A Bishop ~~xxx~~ differed from a Priest only in having authority to order ministers.⁽⁴⁾⁽⁵⁾

On the difference between the ministry and the laity Jewel told Harding,

"Thus saith St Peter, You are a kingly priesthood. And this he saith not only unto priests and bishops, but also unto the

(1) J.III.283f (2) J.IV.1129 (3) J.III.271 (4) Ibid 286, 290.

(5) Ibid. 292.

"whole Christian people... But ye tell us, There is a priesthood internal, and a priesthood external; and there is a difference between laymen and priests. What needed this talk, M.Harding? There is not one of us that ever taught otherwise. We know that the priest or minister of the Church of God is divided from the rest of his brethren as was the tribe of Levi from the children of Israel, and hath a special office over the people. Neither may any man force himself into that office without lawful calling. But, as touching the inward priesthood... every faithful Christian man is a priest, and offereth unto God spiritual sacrifices: in this only sense, I say, and no other."(1)

On the authority of SS Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, and Chrysostom, Jewel declared that

"whosoever is a member of Christ's body, whosoever is a child of the church, whosoever is baptized in Christ and beareth his name, is fully invested with this priesthood, and therefore may justly be called a priest. And wheresoever there be three such together, as Tertullian saith, Yea, though they be only laymen, yet have they a church."(3)

In Jewel's opinion the special work of the ministry was not to offer sacrifice, but to preach the Word of God and administer the Sacraments:-

"This ministry of the church was not ordained to offer sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins. Whosoever taketh that office upon him, he doeth injury to the death and passion of Christ... The holy ministry... standeth in the setting forth of the mystery of our salvation, both by the preaching of the word of God, and by the due and reverend ministration of the sacraments. The principalest part of this office is to preach repentance."(4)

In the ministry there was an authority given by Christ:-

 (1) J.III.335f. (2) Augustine, De Civ. Dei, xx.10. Quaest. Evang. II.xl. Ambrose, Expos.Evang.sec.Luc.v.33. Jerome, Comm. in Malach. i.7. Chrysostom, in Ep. II ad Cor. Rom. III.4.
 (3) J.III.336. Tertullian, De Exhort. Cast. 7. (4) J.II.1141.

"to bind, to loose, to open, to shut."(1)

In connection with the exercise of this authority Jewel allowed a place for private confession of sin, but always provided that the practice should not be abused.

"The abuses and errors set apart, we do no more dislike a private confession than a private sermon. Thus much only we say, that private confession to be made unto a minister is neither commanded by Christ, nor necessary to salvation."(2)

Jewel put great emphasis upon preaching as a declaration of God's forgiveness of sin, and it may be inferred that, to him, the general declarations of absolution in the Book of Common Prayer constituted a form of preaching. It was always the word of God which made a declaration of forgiveness, or the sacraments, effective.

"That duly receiving the holy sacraments ordained by Christ we receive also the remission of sins, it is not anyway denied. For the substance of all sacraments is the word of God... This word is the instrument of remission of sin. The sacraments are the seals affixed to the same; the priest is the mean."(3)

"Loosing" consisted of preaching pardon to the contrite, or of reconciling offenders and bringing them home to the company of the faithful. (4) "Binding" consisted of denouncing God's judgment upon the impenitent, or of excommunicating them.

"Out of doubt, what sentence soever the minister of God shall give in this sort, God himself doth so well allow it, that whatsoever here in earth by their means is loosed and bound, God himself will loose and bind, and confirm the same in heaven."(5)

(1) J.III.351 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 353 (4) Ibid 354 (5) Ibid 361.

"The keys of the Kingdom of Heaven" were identified by Jewel in the following manner:-

"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."(1)

These keys were two in number.

"Our doctrine is plain, that there be two keys in the Church of God; the one is of instruction, the other of correction: whereof the one worketh inwardly, the other outwardly. The one before God, the other before the congregation. And yet either of these standeth wholly in the word of God."(2)

In the Church of England "the power of the keys" was given only into the charge of priests,

"yet... hath not every priest the use of these keys."(3)

Jewel rejected Harding's criticism that if the expounding of the Gospel constituted absolution, then laymen, or even children, might forgive sins just as well as a priest. But he immediately qualified his rejection by adding,

"And yet God's word may be mighty, be the pronouncer of it never so simple."(4)

The power of the priest lay in his commission to open the will of God to the people, but it was the Word of God that effected forgiveness.

"Seeing then the key... is the word of the Gospel... we say plainly, where the same word is not, there is not the key."(5)

(1) J.III.363. Chrysostom, Op.imperf.in Matt. Hom.xliv ex cap. xxiii. This work is spurious, probably written by a 5th or 6th cent. Latin Arian. Tertullian, adv.Marc. iv.27. Neither Jewel nor the Parker Society editor of his works provided a reference for the saying attributed to Eusebius, and the present writer has failed to trace its origin. (2) J.III.369 (3) Ibid 356. Jewel was referring no doubt to priests too ignorant to be allowed to preach, and to the fact that the power to excommunicate was not exercised by the inferior clergy, but was reserved to the Bishops. (4) J.III.356. (5) Ibid. 380f.

XIII.

Jewel placed little, if any, value upon the idea that as Bishop of Salisbury he was the successor of a line of Bishops stretching back to the Apostles. He claimed that he had been canonically consecrated by three who were already themselves Bishops, but any succession of consecration, like any succession of place, was of no importance to him. He said,

"If it were certain that the religion and truth of God passeth evermore orderly by succession, then were succession... a very good substantial argument of the truth... Of succession St Paul saith to the faithful at Ephesus, I know that after my departure hence ravening wolves shall enter, and succeed me. And out of yourselves there shall (by succession) spring up men speaking perversely. Therefore St Jerome saith, They be not always the children of holy men that (by succession) have the places of holy men." (2)

The matter of succession to the places of the Apostles was, in any case, Jewel thought, a matter of doubt. Even at Rome the first three successors of St Peter were given in varying order by Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Optatus, and Clement. Whereby

"it is clear, that of the first four Bishops of Rome, M. Harding cannot certainly tell us who in order succeeded the other. And, thus talking so much of succession, (the papists) are not well able to blase their own succession." (4)

All Jewel's interest was centred upon a succession of sound doctrine, and it troubled him not at all that he had to leap a gap of at least a millenium in order to obtain a succession of this sort with the Church of the Fathers and the Apostles.

(1) J.III.330 (2) Ibid 322f, and footnote 6 p.323. The saying attributed to Jerome is not to be found in his works. (3) J.III.326. Irenaeus, adv.Haeres.III.iii.3. Epiphanius, Haeres.I. haer. xxvii. 6. Optatus, De Schism. Donat. ii.3. Clement, i.e. the pseudo-Clementine Epistle to James, ii. (4) J.III.326.

"It is not sufficient to claim succession of place; it behoveth us rather to have regard to the succession of doctrine... Compare the use and order of our churches, M. Harding, with the primitive church of God, and ye shall easily see the right ~~aff~~ of our succession."(1)

As for himself and his fellow-Bishops in the Church of England, Jewel said,

"we succeed the bishops that were before our days. We are elected, consecrate, confirmed, and admitted, as they were. If they were deceived in anything, we succeed them in place, but not in error. They were our predecessors, but not the rulers and standards of our faith. Or rather, to set aside all comparison of persons, the doctrine of Christ this day, M. Harding, succeedeth your doctrine, as the day succeedeth the night; as the light succeedeth darkness; and as the truth succeedeth error."(2)

It was along the line of this idea of succession in doctrine that Jewel found himself able to defend the Church of England against the charge of schism, viz:-

"We have not cut ourselves off from the catholic church of God. We have forsaken the dangerous company of them that have turned the church of God into a cave of thieves."(3)

"Thus we have reason sufficient to open the error of M. Harding's church, and godly charity to join with the old catholic church of the Apostles and holy Fathers, which we doubt not, was the church of God."(4)

XIV.

The foregoing review of the work's of Jewel has served to introduce us to a number of the characteristic features of the thinking of the Marian exiles and other English reformers, and also to many of the topics which were to become matters of contention and controversy between the various shades of opinion among those men. First

(1) J.III.349f (2) Ibid 339 (3) J.II.780 (4) J.I. 230

and foremost was the absolute supremacy of the Word of God, not only over individual men, but also over the Church. This was an axiom to all the reformers. But was there any part of the Church's life for which Holy Scripture supplied no rules, and in which the Church's discretion must therefore necessarily operate? Jewel agreed, a little reluctantly, that there was. He recognized the value of the evidence provided by the primitive Church in determining the meaning of doubtful passages of Scripture, and in revealing the intentions of Christ where they had not been openly expressed in the Scriptures. But he did not clearly define the point at which the authority of the Word of God ceased to have effect, and at which the discretionary power of the Church must take charge. Thus he left many questions unanswered.

Within the authority of Scripture, was example to be taken as though it were precept? Must the Church necessarily do whatever the Apostles had done, in the absence of any definite commandment to imitate them? Were even the commandments of God, in every case, to be taken as having permanent application, or could some of them be regarded as having only a temporary force? To what extent might a rite or ceremony that had previously been abused be continued in a reformed Church? Was Holy Scripture a guide in this matter, or was the Church free to put such things to a right use if it seemed expedient to do so? Jewel provided no solution to these problems.

What authority ought a Christian King to have in the Church within his realm? Jewel obviously thought that such a King should exercise an ecclesiastical authority which it would not be proper to allow

to a heathen ruler. He thought that in the exercise of this authority affecting the Church the Christian King would always consult the learned divines of his kingdom before making a decision. But Jewel did not say whether the Christian King must necessarily follow the advice offered by his divines; he did not, that is to say, define whether the "godly prince" was to use his ecclesiastical powers absolutely or constitutionally. Jewel would certainly not have ~~agreed~~ agreed that a Christian King could lawfully require the Church to do anything that would be against the Word of God, but he clearly contemplated that such a ruler, whether acting absolutely or constitutionally, would, by virtue of his ecclesiastical authority, in his own person exercise the discretionary power of the Church in matters not determined by the Scriptures. But how far could this royal prerogative be justified by Scripture? Did it not take away from the Church an authority which Christ had left to the whole Church, or to the ministry of the Church, and not to one individual, however exalted, in the Church?

Jewel assumed that there ought to be, within the ministry, a superior degree of ministers having as its distinguishing feature the power to order other ministers, i.e. that there ought to be Bishops as well as priests. Was this a right assumption, or ought all the powers of the ministry to reside equally in each minister? Again, was Jewel right in thinking that the unity of the Church should lie in the agreement of the Bishops, or should it be based more widely upon a consensus of the whole Church, including the laity?

To the laity Jewel allotted a rather less passive role in the Church than seemed right to Harding, but he did it more by minimizing the authority of the clergy relative to the Word of God than by increasing the powers of the laity relative to the powers of the clergy. The outstanding exception to this rule was the power that he placed in the hands of one lay person, the "godly prince". But a King was, to begin with, an exceptional person among the laity. Did he hold his ecclesiastical powers as the Chief Laymen of his realm, that is, as the representative of his lay subjects, or did he hold those powers as the representative of God, i.e. independently of the laity? If the former, could the laity rightfully delegate its powers in ecclesiastical matters to a civil ruler? If the latter, were there any powers remaining for the laity to exercise in a body of which the laity is a constituent part?

If, as Jewel thought, no reliance is to be placed upon a tactual succession in the consecration of Bishops by those who are already Bishops, whence does the ministry derive its authority? Apart from the Bishops of each generation, is there some other successor to the Apostles that can give to each generation of the ministry its authorization? Is the succession of true doctrine the only worthwhile succession the Church can have?

Most of these questions which arise out of Jewel's teaching received no answers from him, but they were destined to receive extensive treatment when the English reformers became divided into two parties which can be described as "Anglican" and "Puritan", and when within the latter party there arose mutually hostile sub-

divisions.

It has been noticed that Jewel identified the Church with the
 (1)
 Kingdom of Christ. In this he was of one ~~same~~ mind with most of the theologians of his time, and especially with the Puritans, who built a great deal of their case upon this identification. They were accustomed to argue that since Christ was King it could not be thought that he had failed to perform that most important function of a King, the providing of his Kingdom with the government that best suited its needs. Since the Church was Christ's Kingdom it was to be assumed that he had furnished it with all the forms of government, including the kinds of governing officials, that he wished it to have. It was also to be presumed that, since the Bible was the Word of God, whatever Christ had had to say about the government of the Church could be found in the New Testament.

Starting from these preconceptions, the Puritans searched the Scriptures for what they believed must necessarily be there, and they thought they had discovered the type of government and the kinds of officers which Christ had appointed for his Church. These differed materially from the government and officers which they saw in the Church of England as settled in 1559, and they agitated for the reformation of that year to be extended so as to bring the Church into conformity with what they believed to have been the kind of government prescribed by Christ.

The extent to which this Puritan process of reasoning could go can be illustrated by an anecdote which Bancroft related in 1593:-

 (1) p.40

"Having occasion to talk upon a time with an artizan of Kingston, about his refusal (after the purest fashion) to be examined upon his oath: because I saw how pert he was, and rapped out text upon text (full ignorantly God knoweth): I was so bold as to examine him in the second petition of the Lord's Prayer, demanding of him, what he thought was meant by this word 'kingdom', there mentioned. Whereunto he made in effect this answer, without any staggering: 'We pray, (saith he), that our heavenly father would at the last grant unto us, that we might have pastors, doctors, elders, and deacons, in every parish, and so be governed by such elderships, as Christ's holy discipline doth require.'"(1)

It was only by using their ingenuity that the Puritans were able to discover in the New Testament the forms of Church government they favoured, and only by a further use of it that they were able to attribute the establishment of those forms to Jesus Christ. Their preconceptions prevented them from facing the fact that Christ did not prescribe any particular manner of governing his Church. At the root of their erroneous reasoning lay their false identification of the Church with the Kingdom of Christ. The New Testament does not make this identification, and it is therefore useless to look to the New Testament for the results which might be supposed to flow from the identification if it were made there.

In the New Testament ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ (or alternatively τοῦ Χριστοῦ) (2) refers to the activity of God, and not to the sphere in which that activity takes place, to the rule, sovereignty, or reign of God, and not to the realm over which that rule is exercised.

Βασιλεία should be translated as "Kingship" and not as "Kingdom". (3)

(1) Bancroft, A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline, 399.

(2) Basileia (by Schmidt et al. Translated from Kittel's Theologisches Worterbuch Zum Neuen Testament by H.P. Kingdon), 37.

(3) Ibid. 34, footnote 1.

"The essential meaning is not realm, but sway."(1)

The identification of the Church with the Kingdom was derived, not
(2)
from the New Testament, but from St Augustine.

"The N.T... stops short of identifying the basileia tou theou with the believers in Christ. Only one single passage can be found to suggest this: Christ epoiesen hemas basileian (Rev. 1.6). It is unnecessary to explain, or prove, that Christians can only be spoken of as being the basileia in a derivative sense - albeit derived from Christ."(3)

(1) Basileia, 38 (2) Ibid 59 (3) Ibid 55.

SOME ELIZABETHAN CONTROVERSIES

ABOUT

THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY

Part II

Sampson and Humphrey v. The Queen and Bishops

(Bullinger and others intervening)

Part II

Sampson and Humphrey v. The Queen and Bishops

(Bullinger and others intervening)

.....

I

(1)

The 18th century historian John Strype, closely followed by such later writers as Dixon, gave a picture of the settlement of religion at the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign which has been taken as authentic until quite recently. The Queen, it was thought, appointed a committee of clergymen to meet in Sir Thomas Smith's house and there to draw up a revised Book of Common Prayer. The leader in this work was Guest, who was later to become Bishop of Rochester, and his advisers were drawn from the rest of those who had been appointed to dispute with the Marian Bishops at Westminster.

In due course, Strype thought, this committee sent a draft of a new Prayer Book to Sir William Cecil, the Queen's Secretary. The revision was based upon Edward VI's second Prayer Book (that of 1552) but was even more protestant than that Book had been. For example, instead of requiring worshippers to kneel when receiving the Holy Communion, it allowed each communicant to kneel or stand as he pleased.

Again according to Strype, when the draft came before Parliament it was altered. The protestant deviations from the standard of 1552 were removed, and in two respects (which we shall notice later) it was brought nearer to King Edward's first Prayer Book (of 1549)

(1) S.A.1.1.119ff (2) History of the Church of England, v. 97ff.

instead of further away from it. In this form the Elizabethan Book of Common Prayer passed through Parliament, received the Royal Assent, and was put into use.

There is, however, no evidence that a committee of reforming divines worked on the revision of the Prayer Book. Such a committee was certainly recommended in "The Device for alteration of religion in the first year of Queen Elizabeth", ⁽¹⁾ but Strype's idea that this recommendation had been followed was based upon a conjecture of ⁽²⁾ Camden, and the hesitating manner in which Strype accepted the conjecture suggests that he felt some doubt about it. viz;}

"There was about the beginning of December such a device drawn up by some notable hand, and offered to secretary Cecil; and which, by the steps that were afterward taken, appeared to have been followed." (3)

Even "the steps that were afterward taken" are in their turn no inference more than an ~~inference~~ which Strype drew from a letter which he ⁽⁴⁾ supposed had been written by Guest to Cecil. This letter refers to a draft revision of the Prayer Book, but it is written throughout in the first person singular and contains not the slightest hint that its author was writing as the chairman of a committee, nor even as a single reviser who had been assisted by a panel of advisers. Taken by itself, and apart from the "Device", the only

(1) S.A. 1.11.392 (2) "William Camden, the first and easily the most significant of contemporary historians in the reign of Elizabeth, has given the only account which survives of the preparations of the Queen for the change in religion... It so happens that this procedure was the same as that recommended in the Device... Probably Camden had the Device before him as he wrote. The question at once arises as to whether he knew what we do not know, whether the Device was, in fact, the guide to royal ~~xxxxx~~ action. Did Elizabeth in fact proceed as Camden said she did? Certainly there is no supporting evidence." Conyers Read, Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth, p.128 (3) S.A.1.1.74 (4) S.A.1.11.459. Neale (op.cit. 77 footnote) gives reasons for doubting Guest's authorship.

conclusion that can reasonably be drawn from the letter is that the writer was explaining the reasons behind his own personal ideas of how the Prayer Book should be revised.

Within recent years Professor Neale has shown that Strype's view of the origins of the Prayer Book of 1559 ought to be modified,⁽¹⁾ When Elizabeth failed to win the support of the Marian Bishops she had perforce to look for the future leadership of the Church to the clergy who had recently returned from exile and who, with the addition of Parker and Guest, comprised all the most able of the remaining English divines. Lacking support from the right, that is to say, the Queen had now to do what she could with the left.

⁽²⁾
In spite of her declaration to the Spanish ambassador it was never Elizabeth's intention, Neale thinks, to halt her reformation of religion at the point which had earlier been reached in the year that her father died. Left to herself she would have preferred

"the first Edwardian Prayer Book, where both theological and political reasoning would probably have stayed her; political reasoning, because the 1549 book, which Stephen Gardiner had once said 'he could with his conscience keep', offered, with its implication of the real presence in the Communion, the prospect of compromise with conservatives at home and alliance with Lutherans abroad... Now, however... it was a question whether pressure from the left could drive the Queen on another stage or more."⁽³⁾

The unsigned letter, mentioned above, which was supposedly written by Guest to Cecil, fits readily into this background. It answered some anxious enquiries from Cecil about a draft revision of the Prayer Book which had been sent to him. The ~~new~~ nature of the answers shows that the draft differed widely from the book of

(1) op.cit. pp 51-84 (2) see p.5 (3) Neale, op.cit. 78

1549, and Cecil had wanted to know why. His anxiety was understandable if he had been acting as intermediary between the returned exiles and the Queen and if, being in sympathy with the exiles, he was pressing the Queen to meet their demands.

Assuming that this letter was written by Guest, Neale is prepared to agree with Strype that there may have been a revising committee in the sense that Guest was given the task of revision and was, in fact, assisted by a panel of advisers drawn from the Marian exiles. But he does not agree that Guest was commissioned to revise the book of 1552. Rather,

"those instructions had been to base the revision on the conservative first Edwardian Prayer Book of 1549." (1)

What Cecil had received

"had been based on the more radical of the two former books; the 1552 or last Edwardian Prayer Book. But it had advanced further, like the revised book of Frankfort in Mary's days. It was the type of revision to be expected from the divines who had been at Frankfort or Strassburg or elsewhere, but not at Geneva." (2)

Alternatively, Neale allows that the draft revision may have been prepared by the reformers and submitted to Cecil on their own initiative, and without any commission to do so. Its drastic departures from the standard of 1549 would worry him because they would reveal how far apart the Queen and the revisers were. (3) Which-ever of these alternatives we accept, some initiative must be granted to the revisers, if only that of departing from their instructions.

No doubt there was much determined negotiation behind the scenes.

(1) Neale, op.cit. 77 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid

and out of this there came, in the end, a compromise. The exiles gave up their revision and the Queen gave up the book of 1549. The Elizabethan Prayer Book was a re-issue of the book of 1552, with two significant changes which we shall examine presently. But even this compromise seems to have been reached only after an ultimatum to the exiles to "take it or leave it". Writing six years after the event Grindal said, with reference to the Act of Uniformity, 1559,

"It was enjoined us, (who had not then any authority either to make laws or repeal them) either to wear the caps and surplices, or to give place to others."(1)

And a year later still he wrote,

"We... contended long and earnestly for the removal of those things that have occasioned the present dispute; but... we were unable to prevail, either with the queen or the parliament."(2)

To much the same effect is a passage in "A General Supplication made to the Parliament in Anno 1586 November":-

"In the beginning of her Majesty's reign, a number of worthy men... desired such a book and such an order for the discipline of the Church, as they had seen in the best reformed Churches abroad. But any change from that was used concerning religion in Queen Mary's days being then thought by such as ruled the state so dangerous, that either that which was then used must be retained still, or the former order of King Edward received, a number were wrought diversely to yield thereunto, as bearing with it and tolerating it for a time, which yet some of the sounder and sincerer could never be brought unto."(3)

(1) Z.L.1.142 (2) Ibid 169 (3) 2P.R. 11.84 This Supplication was a Puritan document, and so the 'sounder and sincerer' are to be identified with those who did not conform to the ornaments appointed by the Act of Uniformity. The pressure put upon the exiles to accept the Prayer Book is clearly indicated, as also the reluctance of those who did yield.

But if the exiles had been under pressure, so had the Queen. In doctrine she was a Lutheran,⁽¹⁾ which explains why in two respects the Prayer Book of 1559 is nearer to that of 1549 than to that of 1552. It explains also why she retained the silver crucifix in her chapel in spite of the protests of some of her Bishops. Indeed, in some ways she was more conservative than most Lutherans, as her well-known dislike of a married clergy suggests. In her second declaration on religion to the Spanish ambassador she told him that she would like the Confession of Augsburg, or something similar, to be maintained in her realm, adding that she differed little from him because she believed that God was in the sacrament of the Eucharist,⁽²⁾ and she only dissented from three or four things in the Mass. The exiles had therefore wrung concessions out of her, and the Act of Uniformity represented the limit to which she would go. That was why she was later to insist so strongly that it should be obeyed.

II

One of the two departures from the book of 1552 which are features of the Elizabethan Prayer Book is a mere papering-over of a crack in the compromise between the contending parties. The words of administration at the Communion in the 1549 book implied a belief in a real presence in the Eucharist; those in the 1552 book contemplate the Eucharist only as a commemorative act. In the 1559 the two sets of phrases were combined to give the lengthy form of administration which still remains in the Prayer Book.⁽³⁾

(1) Neale, op.cit. 71 (2) Ibid 79 (3) The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI, ed Gibson, Everyman. 225, 389.

The second change was also a move back towards 1549. In that book the attire of the clergy in Church was regulated as follows:-

"In the saying or singing of Matins and Evensong, Baptizing and Burying, the minister, in parish churches and chapels annexed to the same, shall use a surplice. And in all Cathedral churches and Colleges, the Archdeacons, Deans, Provosts, Masters, Prebendaries, and Fellows, being Graduates, may use in the Choir, beside their Surplices, such hoods as pertain to their several degrees, which they have taken in any university within this realm. But in all other places, every minister shall be at liberty to use any Surplice or no...

"And whensoever the Bishop shall celebrate the holy communion in the church, or execute any other public ministration, he shall have upon him, beside his rochet, a Surplice or alb, and a cope or vestment, and also his pastoral staff in his hand, or holden by his chaplain."(1)

At the Eucharist

"the Priest that shall execute the holy ministry, shall put upon him... a white Alb plain, with a vestment or cope. And where there be many priests or Deacons, there so many shall be ready to help the Priest in the administration as shall be requisite: And shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is to say, Albs with tunicles."(2)

At the ordering of Deacons and Priests each ordinand was to have

"upon him a plain Alb."(3)

At the consecration of a Bishop

"the elected Bishop having upon him a Surplice and Cope shall be presented by two Bishops (being also in surplices and copes, and having their pastoral staves in their hands)."(4)

In the 1552 book it was provided

"that the minister at the time of the Communion and all other times in his ministration, shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope: but being an archbishop or bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."(5)

The section of the Act of Uniformity, 1559, which authorized

(1) Gibson, op.cit.288 (2) Ibid 212 (3) Ibid 293, 307 (4) Ibid 313
(5) Ibid 347

the ornaments of the minister in the Elizabethan Church read:-

"Such ornaments of the church, and of the ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use, as was in the Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI, until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the queen's majesty, with the advice of her commissioners appointed and authorized, under the great seal of England, for causes ecclesiastical, or of the metropolitan of this realm. And also, that if there shall happen any contempt or irreverence to be used in the ceremonies or rights of the Church, by the misuse of the orders appointed in this book, the queen's majesty may, by the like advice of the said commissioners or metropolitan, ordain and publish such further ceremonies or rites, as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, the edifying of his Church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments."(1)

This was the clause that caused a division in the ranks of the reformers and brought about the Vestiarian controversy, the first round in the battle between Anglicans and Puritans.

On 30th April 1559 Edwin Sandys, one of the returned exiles, soon to be appointed to the See of Worcester and later to be translated to London and York, wrote to Matthew Parker, who was soon to become Archbishop of Canterbury,

"The last book of service is gone through with a proviso to retain the ornaments which were used in the first and second year of King Edward, until it please the Queen to take order for them. Our gloss upon this text is, that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the mean time shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen."(2)

This piece of wishful thinking shows that the reformers had no notion of what was in the Queen's mind, as they must have done if they had been engaged in direct negotiations with her. If we are

(1) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 466 (2) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, Parker Society, p.65

to think of the Prayer Book of 1559, then, as a settlement between contending parties, we ought probably to think of those parties as Cecil and the Queen, each no doubt supported by a section of the Court and the Council. Neale notices how easily the Act of Uniformity⁽¹⁾ passed through the Commons, and it must be supposed that Cecil did some lobbying to obtain the support of those members who were in sympathy with the former exiles. Needless to say, the book of 1559 was never presented to Convocation. If it had been it would have been rejected out of hand, if not by the lower house then certainly by the upper, which was composed of the Marian Bishops.

Cecil's part in the settlement of 1559, from what he said later when he was once reproached for a lack of interest in religion, must have been considerable. He claimed to have been active above others in propagating religion at the beginning of the Queen's reign; he had undergone many and great labours in anxieties and disquiets of mind; he had fought hand to hand to establish it, enduring great⁽²⁾ contestation in it.

Thus the Act of Uniformity, 1559, was primarily a compromise and agreement between laymen. It must have been presented, as Grindal suggested, to those of the clergy who were designated as future Bishops either for acceptance or rejection. They accepted it, as Sandys suggested, with mental reservations, and with no clear idea of what was in the mind of the opposite party, the Queen.

(1) op.cit. 79 (2) S.A.1.1.120

III

If John Knox had been more discreet with his pen it is possible that the Puritan revolt against Queen Elizabeth's settlement of religion would have been less severe than it turned out to be, and it is just possible that it might not then have become a permanent feature of English life.

During his exile in Geneva, in the latter part of Queen Mary's reign, Knox wrote and published his "First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment and Empire of Women" in which he proved from Scripture, to his own satisfaction, that it was against the Law of God for a woman to occupy a throne and rule a kingdom. All Queens, regnant and regent, must therefore be deposed without delay by their Christian subjects.

To some of his fellow-exiles, no doubt, these were pleasing conclusions to be able to draw from Scripture for, when Knox's book was published, not only was Mary still upon the throne of England but Mary of Lorraine was Queen Regent in Scotland. Both were supporters of the Papacy, and both were persecutors of Protestants. One who must certainly have agreed with Knox was Christopher Goodman, another English exile in Geneva, who matched Knox's book with his own "How Superior Powers ought to be obeyed of their Subjects." In this book the author taught that a private subject might lawfully assassinate his ruler if, in his conscience, he believed him to be a tyrant.⁽¹⁾

(1) S.A.1.1.178ff

The "First Blast" was not Knox's first indiscretion. Before going to Geneva he had been minister of a Church of English exiles in Frankfort and had set up a form of worship and Church government there so unlike that of the Church of England in Edward VI's time that it was greatly disliked by a later contingent of exiles who arrived in the city. To get rid of Knox the new arrivals were in a position to point out/nine instances of sedition in his writings, (1) including comparisons between the Emperor and Nero, and between Mary of England and Jezebel. Fearing that their Emperor's wrath would fall upon them if he discovered that they were harbouring such a man, the magistrates expelled Knox from their city.

Knox's "First Blast" and Goodman's "Superior Powers" were well known in England. Matthew Parker saw them in the London bookshops when he was there in the early part of 1559, and learned that they were being widely read. (2) It is therefore hardly surprising that when, a little later, Knox wanted to visit England on his way to Scotland, he was refused permission to land, and had to make the whole journey north by sea. Nor is it surprising that William Fuller, when he reached London from Geneva on 27th February 1559, found

"that your Majesty (as was also then bruited) counted ~~him~~ but as curious and precise both John Calvin, one of the most singular men of God that hath been since the Apostles' time, yea also and Geneva itself, the best reformed and most blessed Church and City of God that then was." (3)

Elizabeth had good reason for suspecting Geneva and all who were associated with it, although "curious and precise" hardly seem to

(1) Troubles at Frankfort, 1642 edn, p.37 (2) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, p.60 (3) 2P.R. ii.60

be terms adequate to express what must have been her feelings.

When Calvin sent the Queen a copy of his "Commentaries on Isaiah" she refused it, and the bearer of the gift was severely handled in a conversation with Cecil. On hearing of this incident, Calvin wrote to Cecil to say that he disagreed with Knox's views, that he had not learned until too late that Knox's book was to be published, and that he had forbidden its sale in Geneva. If Calvin had said no more than this, all might have been mended. But he completely ruined his attempt at a reconciliation by revealing that he had told Knox

"that as (government by women) was a deviation from the original and proper order of nature, it was to be ranked, no less than slavery, among the punishments consequent upon the fall of man."(1)

By this time it had dawned upon Knox that a Queen need not inevitably be either a papist or a persecutor of reformers, and he too, in his own way, tried to effect a reconciliation. He did not retract his opinions, for to him they had the value of Holy Scripture.

"He did no more doubt of the truth of the proposition, than he doubted this was the voice of God, which first did pronounce this penalty against women, In dolour shalt thou bear thy children."(2)

But if

"Queen Elizabeth would confess, that the extraordinary dispensation of God's great mercy made that lawful unto her, which both nature and God's laws did deny unto all other women besides, then should none in England be more willing to maintain her authority than he."(3)

(1) Z.L.11.34 (2) S.A.1.1.178 (3) Ibid 179

But in order to obtain this favour the Queen must not

"Plead her

~~Right~~ right by descent or law (nor begin) to brag of her birth, and to build her authority and regiment upon her own law."(1)

The combination of Calvin's blundering and Knox's impertinence served only to confirm the Queen in her dislike of the Church of Geneva and its ways, and in September 1566 we find Theodore Beza, Calvin's successor, complaining that

"as to our own church (i.e. Geneva), I would have you know that it is so hateful to that Queen, that on this account she has never said a single word in acknowledgment of the gift of my Annotations."(2)

The papists used Knox's and Goodman's books to sow doubts in the Queen's mind about the loyalty of all the returned exiles. (3)
Some colour could be imparted to these doubts because, apart from the two books, most of the exiles had been in contact with the self-governing cities of Switzerland, and might be supposed to have become infected with republican ideas. Elizabeth's rule was to be very much personal; democracy was a dangerous thing to her, menacing her authority and threatening her throne; it was not a thing to be tolerated. The reforming clergy therefore, led by Sandys, drew up a statement of their position in which, under the heading of "The Civil Magistrate", they said,

"The word of God doth not condemn the governance or regiment of women, but that such women as by succession, inheritance, or other just title... are placed in such esteem, are lawful magistrates, and are no less in any respect to be obeyed... than if they were men."(4)

(1) S.A.1.1.179 (2) Z.L.ii.131 (3) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, p.66 (4) S.A.1.1. 173

"It is not lawful for any private person or persons to kill, or by any means to procure the death of a tyrant or evil person, being their ordinary magistrate."

"All conspiracies, seditions, and rebellions of private men against their magistrates, men or women, good governors or evil, are unlawful, and against the will and word of God." (1)

This declaration appears to have allayed any doubts which the Queen may have entertained of the men from places such as Frankfort, Strasbourg and Zurich, but she never trusted those from Geneva, and excluded them from the highest offices in the Church. True, William Whittingham, who had written a preface to Goodman's book, became
(2)
Dean of Durham. Goodman himself, after a period in Scotland with Knox and a longer period in hiding in England, signed a recantation
(3)
and eventually became Archdeacon of Richmond. But these were not key positions in the Church. Miles Coverdale, who had been Bishop of Exeter in Edward VI's reign, and then an exile in Geneva, might have been restored to his See if he had been willing to conform to the ornaments laid down by the Act of Uniformity. Instead, he was
(4)
left in poverty for several years, with no preferment at all.

The chief offices of governance and responsibility were the Bishoprics; the result of the policy of excluding the Genevans from them was to create opposition to the settlement of 1559. Able men who might have been mellowed by the responsibilities of high office and have grown to be more careful for the unity of the Church, found themselves with time and energy to spare for attacking the settlement. Feeling themselves to be out of favour anyway, it

(1) S.A.1.1.173 (2) Ibid 182 (3) Ibid 185 (4) S.A.1.11.43.
Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, was an exception to the general rule that the Genevans were not raised to the episcopate.

must have mattered little to them if they gave additional cause of offence. Where their influence might have been used in support of the Queen, it was directed against her. The Queen is scarcely to be blamed for this state of affairs; it ~~is~~ was one of the consequences of Knox. There would certainly have been an opposition anyway, for not all the returned exiles were reconcileable upon the basis of the Act of Uniformity, not even some who had never seen Geneva. But the opposition, without Knox, need not have been either so numerous or so influential as it turned out to be.

IV.

The Act of Supremacy, 1559, authorized Queen Elizabeth, her heirs and successors,

"by letters patent under the great seal of England, to assign, name and authorize, when and as often as your highness... shall think meet and convenient, and for such and so long time as shall please your highness... such person or persons being natural born subjects to your highness... as your majesty... shall think meet, to exercise, use, occupy, and execute under your highness... all manner of jurisdictions, privileges, and pre-eminences, in any wise touching or concerning any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction... and to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all such errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities whatsoever, which by any manner spiritual or ecclesiastical power, authority, or jurisdiction, can or may lawfully be reformed."(1)

Under this clause the Queen appointed a series of commissions to visit the various parts of the country and enforce the changes in religion. John Jewel, who was a member of one of these bodies, set out upon his task on 1st August 1559.⁽²⁾

The Act of Uniformity had been in force since 24th June, so

(1) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 447f (2) Z.L.i.38

that everywhere the commissioners should find the revised Book of Common Prayer in use, but there were many other matters not covered by the Act of Supremacy which had to be settled. To this end the commissioners were supplied with a set of Royal Injunctions.

These Injunctions appear to have been imposed upon the clergy without consultation. In the preamble it is stated that they had been prepared by

"The queen's most royal majesty, by the advice of her most honourable council."(1)

Again, referring to the Injunctions Jewel remarked

"The scenic apparatus of divine worship is now under agitation; and those very things which you and I have so often laughed at, are now seriously and solemnly entertained by certain persons, (for we are not consulted)..."(2)

(1) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 418 (2) Z.L.1.23. Whether or not Jewel's remark is to be taken as a reference to the Injunctions must depend on the date on which it was written. It occurs in the fifth letter, unfortunately undated, which Jewel wrote to Peter Martyr after leaving Zurich. The fourth letter is dated 28th April, while the next extant letter, which unfortunately was not numbered, is dated 1st August. The fifth letter must therefore have been written in May, June or July. It is possible to narrow this gap a little. In this fifth letter Jewel mentions that it had been effected that religion should be as Martyr would remember it when he had been in England in Edward VI's reign. This appears to mean that the Act of Supremacy had received the royal assent, and this was given on 8th May. In the letter of 1st August Jewel mentions that he had written to Martyr twelve days earlier, i.e. on 20th July. Thus it may be said with some probability that the fifth letter was penned between 8th May and 20th July. But in the fifth letter Jewel was already aware that he had been appointed a commissioner to visit the west country, which suggests that the letter ought to be placed nearer to the end of the period than to the beginning, for when he wrote on 1st August he was just about to leave for Devon and Cornwall. Indeed, it seems probable that this fifth letter was the letter written on 20th July, but it is impossible to be certain of this, for several of the letters which Jewel wrote to Zurich never reached that city, and so have not come down to us. For the letters of 28th April and 1st August see Z.L.1.19,38.

Cecil seems to have been the chief author of the Injunctions. Parker, at the end of his ~~ix~~ life, was assailed with doubts about their validity, and wrote to the Secretary

"Whatsoever the ecclesiastical prerogative is, I fear it is not so great as your pen hath given it her in the Injunction."
(1)

The legal defect in the Injunctions is clear. The Act of Supremacy authorized Elizabeth to appoint commissioners under the great seal, and the Act of Uniformity authorized her to take further order for the Church either by the advice of such commissioners or by the advice of the Metropolitan. At the time the Injunctions were issued there was no Metropolitan and, as Jewel shows, the commissioners were not called upon to advise. Instead, the Queen acted "by the advice" of the Privy Council. But the expressions "by the advice" and "with the advice" are ambiguous. Did the Privy Council advise the Queen about the content of the Injunctions, or did they merely advise her to authorize the Injunctions without consulting the commissioners? Either way, in issuing them the Queen went beyond the powers given to her in the Act of Uniformity, ~~thence~~ thus extending her prerogative beyond its strict limits, as Parker observed.

V.

Elizabeth's Injunctions empowered her commissioners to require such things as the dismantling of altars and their replacement by tables, the use of wafer-bread different from that previously used at the Communion, the keeping of register books, the removal of

(1) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, p.479

~~Pictures~~

(1)

~~Whether~~ pictures (whether on walls or in windows), and so on. But the following item was the one which was destined to cause the most trouble in the future:-

"Her majesty being desirous to have the prelacy and clergy of this realm to be had as well in outward reverence, as otherwise regarded for the worthiness of their ministries, and thinking it necessary to have them known to the people in all places and assemblies, both in the church and without ... wills and commands that all archbishops and bishops, and all other that be called or admitted to preaching or ministry of the sacraments... shall use and wear such seemly habits, garments, and such square caps, as were most commonly and orderly received in the latter year of the reign of King Edward VI; not thereby meaning to attribute any holiness or special worthiness to the said garments, but as St Paul writeth: Omnia decenter et secundum ordinem fiant."(2)

Thus the attire of the clergy, whether inside the Church or outside it, was laid down either by the Act of Uniformity or by Injunction. But from the outset neither the Act nor the Injunction appears to have been enforced so far as this matter of attire was concerned.

(3)

We have seen that Sandys believed that the ornaments clause in the Act of Uniformity would not be enforced. He had reasons for his belief. George Withers, writing in 1567 to the Prince Elector Palatine and describing the reformation carried out in the reign of Edward VI, said,

"The theatrical dresses of the papists, and other things of the like kind were retained under the name of ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof. Afterwards this godly king, perceiving how far he still was from the mark, took in hand the matter afresh, set forth a new form of prayers, removed and prohibited all the monuments of superstition which he had before left, excepting the surplice... What he retained, however, was left so free, that no one who objected to them was compelled to observe them."(4)

(1) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 417ff (2) Ibid 432 (3) see p. 63
(4) Z.L.ii.159

The case of Bishop Hooper is evidence that conformity to the ornaments rubric was not enforced in Edward VI's reign, and that Withers did not overstate the case. Hooper refused the See of Gloucester rather than wear a rochet. In the end his scruples were overcome to the extent that he wore it for his consecration, but not afterwards except on special occasions.⁽¹⁾ Similarly, Peter Martyr declined to wear a surplice when he was in Oxford, and was not in any way attacked for his refusal.⁽²⁾

The same toleration of nonconformity was practised in the early days of Queen Elizabeth's reign. Miles Coverdale officiated at the consecration of Matthew Parker clad in a plain black gown. Some of the Bishops were extremely tolerant of disobedience. In 1561 Cecil complained to Parker that⁽³⁾

"the Bishop of Norwich is blamed even of the best sort for his remissness in ordering his clergy. He winketh at schismatics and anabaptists, as I am informed. Surely I see great variety in ministration. A surplice may not be borne here. And the ministers follow the folly of the people, calling it charity to feed their fond humour."⁽⁴⁾

In 1566 Parker complained to Cecil that

"now my Lord of London by experience feeleth and seeth the marks and bounds of these good sprights, which, but for his toleration &c, had been suppressed four 5 or 6 years ago."⁽⁵⁾

As late as about 1582 the Vicar of Moreton Corbett in Shropshire, having been hailed before the Consistory Court of Lichfield to answer for his nonconformity, was addressed thus by his Bishop:-

"Mr Axton, you shall yield somewhat unto me, and I will likewise yield unto you what I can... For the surplice, if you will wear it but sometimes, or but twice or thrice, or if you will wear it but once, I will urge you no further."⁽⁶⁾

(1) Dixon, op.cit. iii.256 (2) See p. 88 (3) S.A.1.11.43
 (4) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, 149 (5) Ibid 284
 (6) 2P.R.1.72. See p. 325 ff

From the nonconformist side the tolerance of the Bishops was acknowledged by Withers when he asked that the Bishops of Norwich, Worcester and Durham should be thanked for their "kind forbearance", and again when he told the Elector Palatine that (1)

"on the expulsion of the popish bishops new ones were to be appointed in their room; and most of these were of the number of those who had been exiles. These at first began to oppose the ceremonies; but afterwards, when there was no hope otherwise of obtaining a bishoprick, they yielded, and, as one of them openly acknowledged, undertook the office against their conscience. In the mean while they comforted their brethren, whom they perceived to be still struggling against these things, by promising them free liberty in the government of their churches; and for some years they kept this promise. On the obtaining of which liberty, they diligently purified their churches from all the blemishes and defilements of popery. Others, who had at first yielded, incited by their example, began to reform their churches in like manner." (2)

In January 1563 a new Parliament assembled, and with it a new Convocation. In the lower house of Convocation thirty-three members, among whom was Sampson, the Dean of Christ Church, put forward seven articles designed to bring about changes in the settlement of 1559. These articles included,

(iv)

~~for~~ That the use of copes and surplices may be taken away; so that all ministers in their ministry use a grave, comely, and side-garment, as commonly they do in preaching.

(v) That the ministers of the word and sacraments be not compelled to wear such gowns and caps, as the enemies of Christ's gospel have chosen to be the special array of their priesthood.

(vi) That in the 33rd article, Of doctrine concerning ceremonies, these words may be mitigated; Is, ut qui peccat in publicum ordinem ecclesiae, quique laedit auctoritatem magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias vulnerat, publice, ut caeteri timeant, arguendus est." (3)

These articles were not adopted, but a more moderate set of propos-

(1) Z.L.11.151 (2) Ibid 161 (3) S.A.1.1.501 The 33rd article here referred to is now, in substance, no 34 of the 39 Articles of Religion.

als, six in number, was rejected by the narrow margin of 59 votes to 58. The fifth of these fresh proposals read:-

"That it be sufficient for the minister, in time of saying divine service, and ministering of the sacraments, to use a surplice; and that no minister say service, or minister the sacraments, but in a comely garment or habit."(1)

The minister, that is to say, was to be allowed to wear a surplice in Church, or not, as he pleased. But what of the Eucharistic vestments prescribed by the Act of Uniformity? They were not even mentioned in either of these sets of proposals, and they were not mentioned because no-one was enforcing their use and no-one was using them, except perhaps in the Queen's private chapel.⁽²⁾ Sandys' gloss upon the ornaments clause in the Act had been accepted; the clause was virtually a dead letter in spite of the Queen's insistence upon its inclusion in the Act.

VI.

The nonconformity in her Church could not altogether have escaped the Queen's notice; the marvel is that she remained patient of it for so long. She had already accused Parker, over another matter, of being too "soft and easy" with his suffragans,⁽³⁾ wherein, no doubt, she judged him rightly. He was not the man to impose his will on others. In King Edward's days he had been a Cambridge don and Dean of Lincoln, a scholar rather than an administrator. He had been chosen for the Primacy, it would appear, because he had been chaplain to the Queen's mother and to her father, and was therefore known to her. He had not been an exile, and was therefore

(1) S.A.1.1.503 (2) Z.L.1.63 (3) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, 173.

more acceptable to her than most of the reformers. But he turned out to be a bad choice, for what the Church of England needed at that time was a disciplinarian without regard for his own popularity and with little concern for the feelings of others, not a leader whose delight it was to retire to his study to write "British Antiquities."

At length, on 25th January 1565, Elizabeth addressed a stinging letter to the Primate, and through him to the Bishops. Whereas, she said, she desired unity, quietness and concord among her people, because diversity, variety, contention, and vain love of singularity, either in clergy or people, must provoke the displeasure of Almighty God, must be discomfortable, heavy, and troublesome to the government, and must bring danger of ruin to her people and country; and whereas the ecclesiastical administration should set a good example to the civil;

"yet in sundry places of our realm of late, for lack of regard given there in due time, by such superior and principal officers as you are, being the primate and other bishops of your province, with sufferance of sundry varieties and novelties... there is crept into the church... an open and manifest disorder and offence... by diversity of opinions and specially in the external, decent, and lawful rites and ceremonies to be used in the churches... And although we have now a good while heard to our grief sundry reports hereof... yet we thought, until this present, that by the regard which you, being the primate and metropolitan would have had hereto according to your office, with the assistance of the bishops your brethren... these errors, tending to breed some schism or deformity in the church, should have been stayed and appeased. But perceiving very lately, and also certainly, that the same doth rather begin to increase than to stay or diminish, We mean not to endure or suffer any longer these evils... but have certainly determined to have all such diversities, varieties, and novelties amongst them of the clergy and

"our people... reformed and repressed and brought to one manner of uniformity.

And therefore, We... require, enjoin, and straitly charge you, being the metropolitan... to confer with the bishops your brethren... And thereupon... so to proceed by order, injunction, or censure, according to the order and appointment of such laws as are provided by act of Parliament... so as uniformity of order may be kept in every church, and without variety and contention. And in the execution hereof we require you to use all expedition... that hereafter we be not occasioned, for lack of your diligence, to provide such further remedy, by some other sharp proceedings, as shall percase not be easy to be borne by such as shall be disordered; and therewith also we shall impute to you the cause thereof."(1)

Parker obeyed the Queen's command. He summoned the Bishops of London, Winchester, Ely, and Lincoln, and had, with their help, by 3rd March, drawn up a series of Articles which he proposed to put before six of the leading nonconformists on that day. Grindal, the Bishop of London, was reluctant to act unless directly ordered by the Queen to do so, and therefore Parker begged Cecil

"to obtain a private letter from the Queen's majesty to my Lord of London, to execute laws and injunctions; which, he saith, if he be so charged, he will out of hand see reformation in all London; and ye know there is the most disorder, and then is the matter almost won through the realm."(3)

(4)

On 8th March Parker again wrote to Cecil and enclosed a fair copy of the Bishops' Articles, which he hoped the Queen would authorize since he doubted his ability to enforce obedience on the authority of the Bishops alone. Cecil must already have warned him that the Queen would not grant the authority he wanted, for he wrote,

"If this ball be tossed unto us, and then have no authority by the Queen's Majesty's hand, we will set still. I marvel that not six words were spoken from the Queen's Majesty to

(1) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, 223ff. (2) Ibid 233

(3) Ibid ~~221~~ (4) Ibid 234

"my Lord of London, for the uniformity of his London, as himself told me; if the remedy is not by letter, I will no more strive against the stream, fume or chide who will." (1)

But Parker could not "set still" altogether. He had already begun proceedings against six nonconformists and two of them, Sampson, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, and Humphrey, President of Magdalen College, Oxford, had been before him that same day, and as they proved to be obdurate, had been ordered to remain in London.

The Queen not only withheld her authority from the Bishops' Articles, but she also seemed to tolerate nonconformity herself; a certain Mr Cole appeared at Court uncanonically dressed in a hat (2) and short cloak without receiving even a word of rebuke. Others were equally unhelpful. Either the Bishop of London or the Lord (3) Mayor invited Sampson and Humphrey to preach at Paul's Cross. The Dean of Wells ridiculed the Archbishop's efforts to obtain conformity by ordering a common adulterer to do public penance in a priest's (4) square cap. Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, wrote to the Earl of Leicester, begging him to protect the nonconformists from further (5) discipline.

On 20th April Parker called Sampson and Humphrey before him for the last time, and told Cecil the next day,

"I did peremptorily will them to agree, or else to depart their places. I showed them these were the orders which they must observe; to wear the cap appointed by Injunction, to wear no hats in their long gowns, to wear a surplice with a non-regent hood in the quires at their Colleges, according to the ancient manner there, to communicate kneeling in wafer bread. In fine, they said their consciences could not agree to these orders... Resign I think they mean not; judicially

(1) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, 235 (2) Ibid 237 (3) Ibid 239
(4) Ibid ~~2241~~ 241 (5) S.P. iii.69

"to be deprived, against Mr Sampson my jurisdiction (after long pleading) might serve, yet so it cannot upon Dr Humphrey, but it is to be expended by the bishop of Winchester their visitor." (1)

As a warning to others Sampson was indeed deprived, but was furnished with an income by appointment to the wardenship of a hospital, with other preferment later. (3) Against Humphrey the Bishop of Winchester either could not or would not act, and the Queen did not intervene. He remained at his College until 1576 when, upon hearing that his obduracy was hindering his preferment, he conformed, and was appointed Dean of Winchester. (4)

After the depriving of Sampson, Parker fell into inactivity again for nearly a year. He seems, indeed, to have been told to go no further. Knappen thinks that he was halted in the enforcement of conformity because negotiations were in progress with the Scottish reformers, whom the Privy Council would not wish to offend by the harassing of their sympathizers in England. (5) It is more likely that the stay of discipline was the first sign of the long-continued policy of the Council of appeasing and placating the Puritans. For many years the Council was obsessed with the danger which might arise from a revolt of the English papists, and they regarded the Puritans as a valuable counter-weight against this danger.

In March, 1566, the Queen called Parker and Grindal before her and bade them make a further attempt to secure conformity. (6) Again Parker submitted the Bishop's Articles in the hope that at least those which dealt with the apparel of the clergy might receive the

(1) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, 240f. (2) Ibid 244. (3) Dixon, op.cit. vi.64 footnote. (4) S.A.l.ii.145 (5) Knappen, op.cit. 195. (6) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, 273.

(1)

Queen's authority, but again he was refused and told to act upon his own authority. This time he had the articles printed under the title of "Advertisements", and distributed them throughout the realm for the Bishops to enforce. On 28th April 1566 he wrote to Cecil,

"I have weeded out of these articles all such of doctrine &c which peradventure stayed the book from the Queen's Majesty's approbation, and have put in but things advouchable, and, as I take them, against no law of the realm. And where the Queen's Highness will needs have me assay with mine own authority what I can do for order, I trust I shall not be stayed hereafter." (2)

Knaappen thinks that the Queen withheld her authority from the Advertisements because she shirked the responsibility of taking
(3)
unpopular action. But the preamble to the Advertisements makes no
(4)
secret of the royal urging which had led to their compilation, and Strype pointed out that as soon as they were published the Queen issued a Proclamation demanding uniformity, and sharpening the penalties of suspension and sequestration threatened by the Bishops
(5)
for nonconformity into deprivation and inhibition from preaching. The true reason for her refusal seems to lie in the "other order"
(6)
which might be taken under the Act of Uniformity, 1559. If the Queen, on the advice of the Metropolitan, had authorized the Advertisements, they would have constituted that "other order" and would then have superseded the ornaments clause in the Act, the very clause which she had fought for so ardently. She was willing to support the Advertisements as far as they went, but she was willing

(1) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, 263 (2) Ibid 272 (3) op.cit. 193, 198. (4) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 467f (5) S.P.1.427
(6) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 466

to support them only to the extent that they were a step in the process of restoring full legal conformity. The Advertisements fell far below her real requirements. What those requirements were she expressed in a letter to Parker written on 20th August 1571.

"We understanding that... ye have well entered into some convenient reformation of things disordered... minding earnestly to have a perfect reformation of all abuses attempted to deform the uniformity prescribed by our laws and Injunctions, and that none should be suffered to decline either on the left hand or on the right hand from the direct line limited by authority of our said laws and Injunctions, do earnestly by our authority royal will and charge you, by all means lawful, to proceed herein as you have begun."(1)

VII.

The Preface to the Advertisements declares them to be, like the original articles,

"not as laws equivalent with the eternal word of God, and as of necessity to bind the consciences of (the Queen's) subjects, in the nature of them considered in themselves, (nor things which could) add any efficacy or more holiness to the virtue of public prayer and to the sacraments. (They were) as temporal orders mere ecclesiastical, without any vain superstition, and as rules in some part of discipline concerning decency, distinction and order for the time."(2)

As between the original articles and the Advertisements, there are slight verbal differences in those sections which deal with the attire of the clergy, but the substance of both is the same, viz:-

"In the ministration of the Holy Communion in cathedral and collegiate churches, the principal minister shall use a cope with gospeller and epistoler agreeably; and at all other prayers to be said at that Communion Table, to use no copes but surplices.

"That the dean and prebendaries wear a surplice with a silk ~~hood~~ hood in the choir; and when they preach in the cathedral or

(1)Correspondence of Matthew Parker, 386 (2) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 468, cf S.P.iii.85.

"collegiate church, to wear their hood.

"That every minister saying any public prayers, or ministering ~~the~~ the sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charges of the parish.

"That all archbishops and bishops do use and continue their accustomed apparel.

"That all deans of cathedral churches, masters of colleges, all archdeacons, and other dignities in cathedral churches, doctors, bachelors of divinity and law, having any ecclesiastical living, shall wear in their common apparel abroad a side gown with sleeves straight at the hand, without any cuts in the same; and that also without any falling cape; and to wear tippets of sarcenet, as is lawful for them by the Act of Parliament 24 Henry VIII.

"That all ecclesiastical persons or other, having any ecclesiastical living, do wear the cap appointed by the Injunctions. And to wear no hats but in their journeying.

"That they in their journeying do wear their cloaks with sleeves put on and in like fashion to their gowns, without guards, welts, or cuts.

"That in their private houses and studies they use their own liberty of comely apparel.

"That all inferior ecclesiastical persons shall wear long gowns of the fashion aforesaid, and caps as before is prescribed."(1)

The Advertisements were applied first to the city of London, where thirty-seven of the clergy,

"of which number were the best, and some preachers?"(2) were deprived. They formed about one-third of all the clergy of the city, but some of them later conformed. Thereafter, discipline was enforced throughout the country, creating a body of deprived malcontents among whom the controversy was broadened into something of far greater consequence to the Church than caps and surplices.

Parker had little taste for his task. He saw the importance of enforcing the law, but attached none to the law he was required to enforce, and he asked Cecil,

(1) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 470f, 473f (2) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, 269f

"Does your lordship think that I care for cap, tippet, surplice, or wafer-bread, or any such? But for the laws so established I esteem them... nor for any other respect."(1)

VIII.

Thomas Sampson had been ordained in the reign of Edward VI by Ridley, and had been dispensed by Ridley and Cranmer from wearing the vestments appointed in the Prayer Book of 1549. He became Dean of Chichester and then, during Queen Mary's reign, an exile in Strasbourg, Frankfort, Zurich, and Geneva. Along with his Deanery he had held, in plurality, the benefice of All Hallows, Bread Street. To his London parishioners he once wrote,

"As for traditions, customs, and (by and for the order of the Church) ceremonies received and used, which be not matters of faith, they may be admitted and altered at the discretion of them that have the rule of the Church under Christ, according to the necessity of the time and the disposition of the people: so that in them be nothing else but true edifying to unfeigned godliness."(4)

We are to see how far he changed this opinion during his exile.

Exactly one month after Elizabeth's accession Sampson wrote from Strasbourg to Peter Martyr in Zurich to ask for advice about the answer he was to give if offered a Bishopric upon his return home. His anticipation of such an offer was well founded, for his name appeared on a short-list for preferment drawn up a little later by Cecil. He does not seem, however, really to have wanted Martyr's advice, for he told him how he intended to answer if an

(1) Correspondence of Matthew Parker, 478. (2) S.A.1.1.147

(3) Porter, Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge, 94.

(4) S.A.1.11.133f (5) S.A.1.1.229.

offer were made. He seems rather to have wanted to justify his future actions in Martyr's eyes, and to claim approval for the reasons behind those actions.⁽¹⁾

In his letter Sampson asked whether the new Queen ought to be allowed the title borne by her father and step-brother, "Supreme Head, after Christ, of the Church of England"? Since "discipline" was lacking in the Church of England, and since a Bishop was expected to live in such style that he could not help in the support of the poor and the learned, he asked whether he could conscientiously become a Bishop? Again, since in England Bishops were not appointed by popular election, and had to wear vain, unseemly, and superstitious dress, ought he to become a Bishop, if invited? He⁽²⁾

(1) A similar lack of confidence in their own ideas and a hunger for Swiss approval is typical of the returned exiles, both of those who supported the Queen's settlement of religion and of those who opposed it. For some years after Elizabeth's accession a stream of letters crossed from England to the continent, in which the affairs of the Church of England were unfolded to the Swiss pastors, and their support solicited for the writers' standpoint. This is especially true of the Puritan party. One of the favourite puritan cliches during Elizabeth's reign was "the best reformed churches" or, as we should print it, "the best-reformed churches", meaning those most thoroughly reformed, i.e. the Swiss churches, and above all that of Geneva, but not the Lutheran churches of Germany. At its most favourable the phrase denotes those churches which had arranged their affairs most nearly to what was believed to be a Biblical pattern, but sometimes it comes dangerously near to meaning those churches which were most unlike the church of Rome. After all, if one believes that the Pope is Antichrist, there is virtue in being as unlike him as possible. (2) It should be noted that the Queen refused the title "Supreme Head" and took instead that of "Supreme Governor". It should also be noted that Sampson used the term "discipline" in a technical sense which will be explained later. His reference here to this matter and to the election of Bishops shows that the questions which were to become controversial at a later date were there from the beginning. The Vestiarian controversy was not a separate matter from those of later years, but only one aspect of a single and many-sided controversy.

intended to undertake the office of preaching, but would play no part in the governing of the Church

"until, after having made an entire reformation in all ecclesiastical functions, (the Queen) will concede to the clergy the right of ordering all things according to the word of God, both as regards doctrine and discipline, and the property of the Church. And if it be demanded what kind of reformation I wish for, you can easily conjecture, from the three articles above stated, what, in my opinion, ought to be required."(1)

In those days the delivery of letters was an uncertain matter, and Sampson did not receive Martyr's reply. He therefore wrote a second letter. This is no longer extant, but Martyr's reply to it is, and from the reply the inference is to be drawn that Sampson had added to his list of objections the silver crucifix in the Queen's chapel (which he probably thought would be repeated in every Church in the realm), and the Eucharistic vestments appointed in the Act of Uniformity, which he supposed he would have to wear if he celebrated the Holy Communion (for evidently he had not yet heard of Sandys' gloss).

On 15th July 1559 Martyr gave Sampson two pieces of advice with which Bullinger (Martyr's alter ego at Zurich) agreed:-

"First, that you still retain the function of preaching, and cease not, both in public and private, to defend the truth of doctrine, and to declaim against rites which are full of offences and occasions of falling. The other is, that you abstain from the administration of the sacraments, until these intolerable blemishes be removed."(2)

About the "intolerable blemishes", Martyr said:-

(1) Z.L.i.2 (2) Z.L.ii.26f

"Although they may seem to have but little weight and importance in the eyes of men who are but faintly disposed towards the gospel, for they count all such things as matters of indifference... will anyone who is somewhat better instructed in religion, when he sees you, a messenger of Christ and zealous trumpeter of the gospel, arrayed in these vestments, praying at the altar before the image of the crucifix, repeating holy words, and distributing the sacraments, will anyone, I say, not think that these rites are not only tolerated, but also approved by you? Whereby no credit will be given you hereafter, when you teach otherwise... Neither can the example of the apostle be alleged in excuse for such conduct, who for a time retained the Jewish ceremonies with a safe conscience; since the Mosaic institutions were brought in of old by the authority and law of God, and neither devised by man's understanding, nor condemned in regard to worship. But the things of which we now speak were both instituted by men without any divine sanction, and have splendidly subserved that worship which all godly persons do now abominate."(1)

In this letter Martyr said that he had mislaid Sampson's original questions, but if Sampson would repeat them, he in turn would repeat his answers. The agitated Sampson, however, was not allowing enough time for Martyr's replies to reach him; their letters were crossing each other en route; Sampson's third letter, no longer extant, was written before he received Martyr's second; in it he complained that the Queen had impropriated some of the parochial and episcopal endowments, and he raised objections to the habit to be worn by the clergy outside their churches.

In his reply Martyr said,

"You have nothing to do with the question, whence or how the Queen may choose to afford a maintenance or stipend either to the bishop or to the parochial clergy... With respect also to wearing the round (sic) cap or habit at other times besides that of divine service, I think you ought not to contend more than is necessary; for superstition does not properly seem to have anything to do therein."(2)

(1) Z.L.ii.25 (2) Ibid 32.

Now Martyr returned to the question of the vestments and the crucifix. He was still of the opinion that Sampson must not celebrate at an altar having a crucifix upon it. But as to

"the use of garments as holy in the ministry itself", (1) although he had a dislike of them and had fallen easily into agreement with Bullinger that Sampson should not use them, he had nevertheless been slower to advise Sampson to refuse a bishopric on this ground than he had been on the ground of the altar and the crucifix. He had heard that altars and images had been abolished in England. In a bishopric might not Sampson be able to bring about the abolition of the vestments as well? Another man in the same bishopric might defend and retain them. Finally,

"questions of this kind are also full of difficulty to us here... As to myself, when I was at Oxford, I would never wear the surplice in the choir, although I was a canon, and I had my own reasons for doing so. Wherefore I recommend you also to take advice upon the spot... but that which then influenced me, influences me still, and perhaps may also influence you, namely, to do nothing which might give any sanction to what my conscience disapproves." (2)

This letter was written on 4th November 1559, and Sampson answered it on 6th January 1560, by which date he was wringing his hands over the Church of England. What hope was there when the ministry of the Word was banished from the Court, while candles and a crucifix were retained there? What hope was there when three of the new Bishops were to celebrate in the royal chapel as priest, deacon, and subdeacon, arrayed in vestments, and before the crucifix, or at least not very far from it? But to get down to business,

(1) Z.L.ii.32 (2) Ibid 33 (3) Presumably a reference to celebrating the Holy Communion without an accompanying sermon.

Sampson had only one question to raise this time. Was a crucifix placed on the Lord's table, with lighted candles, a thing indifferent⁽¹⁾? If not indifferent, but unlawful and wicked, what must Sampson do if the Queen should order these things to be placed in all Churches in her realm? Ought he to abandon the ministry? Would Martyr ^{or} Bullinger please write to the Queen about these matters? She would be able to read anything they wrote in Italian, Latin, or Greek. But if they wrote they must not let the Queen know that anyone had urged them to do so.⁽²⁾

Before Martyr received this letter, two earlier ones, written in October and December, were delivered to him on 24th January 1560. Martyr replied a week later. After exhorting Sampson not to refuse a bishopric, because there was a shortage of clergy in England and because someone less suitable might take it,

"but if you sit at the helm of the church, there is a hope that many things may be corrected, though not all,"⁽³⁾

he continued,

"You say that they have taken away the church lands; but consider that you have not alienated them... There is no blame in this respect to be laid upon you... As to the square cap and external episcopal habit, I do not think there is much need of dispute, seeing it is unattended by superstition... There may be a political reason for its use... Touching the garments which they call holy... I confess the case is somewhat more difficult... If peace could obtain between the churches of Saxony and our own with respect to doctrine, this sort of garments would never make a separation; for though we should by no means approve of them, we would nevertheless bear with them, congratulating ourselves upon our having got rid of them. You may therefore use those habits either in preaching, or in the administration of the Lord's Supper, provided however you persist in speaking and teaching against the use of them.

(1) Sampson is here using the term "indifferent" in its technical sense of a matter which is within the discretion of the Church to decide. (2) Z.L.i.64 (3) Z.L.ii.39

"But I can never recommend anyone, either when about to preach or to administer the Lord's supper, to have the image of the crucifix upon the table."(1)

In these letters of October and December 1559, neither of which are extant, Sampson must have propounded a further list of questions which may be reconstructed, along with Peter Martyr's answers, as follows:-

Sampson: Ought not former papists to be punished for their past wrong-doing?

Martyr: "You must remember that punishments have been more than once discontinued for the sake of peace... Care must, however, be taken by you that in future they do nothing in opposition to the religion now received."

Sampson: If I become a Bishop, what ought I to do if a patron presents a former papist for institution to a benefice?

Martyr: "Such persons ought not to be instituted by you without subscribing to the religion which is now established."

Sampson: In the Injunctions the Queen has laid down that wafer-bread must be used at the Communion. Is this lawful?

Martyr: "None of our churches, as you are well aware, have any contention about it, nay, indeed, they all everywhere make use of it."

Sampson: The Injunctions provide for processions in Rogation week. Are they allowable?

Martyr: As they "seem to have been derived from the Ambarvalia of the heathen, I scarcely know what I can rightly advise you ... Superstition is altogether to be avoided. But if in these processions only prayer is made to God, that he will graciously supply us with new fruits... and thanks be given... for the sustenance of the year preceding, superstitions perhaps will seem to have been sufficiently avoided." (2)

The three letters^{ok} of Martyr to Sampson which we have now considered are described by Knappen as containing Martyr's

"usual timid and uncertain answers to such inquiries."(3)

This is a shallow judgment. The answers are rather those of a statesman who, if he could have won unity of doctrine between the

Zwinglians and the Lutherans would not have ~~quarrelled~~ quarrelled with the latter for wearing vestments, although he would still have congratulated himself that they were not ~~worn~~ worn in Zurich. True, he shifted his ground a little on this question of vestments, but without Bullinger at his elbow his position might, as he suggested, have been consistent throughout. Moreover, he knew the person he was advising and doubtless worded his answers to suit his correspondent. To Sampson Martyr was

"one... into whose bosom I could pour out all my cares."(1)

But if Bullinger is to be believed, Martyr was not so ardent an admirer of Sampson. In 1567 Bullinger wrote to Theodore Beza:-

"I have always looked with suspicion upon the statements made by master Sampson. He is not amiss in other respects, but of an exceedingly restless disposition. While he resided amongst us at Zurich, and after he returned to England, he never ceased to be troublesome to master Peter Martyr of blessed memory. He often used to complain to me, that Sampson never wrote a letter without filling it with grievances: the man is never satisfied; he has always some doubt or other to busy himself with. As often as he began, when he was here, to lay his plans before me, I used to get rid of him in a friendly way, as well knowing him to be a man of a captious and unquiet disposition. England has many characters of this sort, who cannot be at rest, who can never be satisfied, and who have always something or other to complain about. I have certainly a natural dislike to men of this stamp."(2)

On 20th March 1560 Martyr replied to Sampson's letter of 6th January.⁽³⁾ A crucifix on the Table at the time of Communion was not, he pronounced, to be counted among things indifferent. The worshipping of images must in no wise be tolerated.⁽⁴⁾ He flatly

(1) Z.L.i.130 (2) Z.L.ii.152 (3) see p.88 (4) Martyr did not seem to contemplate the possibility that the crucifix might be on the Table without being worshipped.

refused to write to Queen Elizabeth about the affairs of the Church of England, although he thought that Bullinger and Bernardine would do so. But he judged that the Queen would hold letters from Zurich in little esteem since there were rumours of an alliance
(1)
between England and Lutheran Germany.

Sampson's last extant letter to Peter Martyr shows that he had been considered for the See of Norwich, but the matter had not been taken to the point where he would have had to make a decision. He seems to have been aggrieved about this, and complained vaguely of some injury done to him. He warned Martyr not to believe what men who were Martyr's friends, and had been Sampson's, might say about him. He had made up his mind, if offered a bishopric, to take
(2)
Martyr's advice and conform.

So far as we know nothing further was heard from Sampson in Zurich for several years, with the exception of a brief letter to Bullinger in 1563 lamenting the death of Peter Martyr and bemoaning
(3)
the unhappy state of the Church of England.

IX.

Laurence Humphrey, Sampson's partner in nonconformity at Oxford, had also spent a part of his exile in Zurich. All that remains of what may possibly have been a lengthy correspondence with that city during the first seven years of Queen Elizabeth's
(4)
reign, is contained in two letters to Bullinger. The first,

(1) Z.L.11.47f (2) Z.L.1.75f. The Deanery of Christ Church was not, it seems, high enough an office to secure Sampson's conformity.
(3) Z.L.1.130 (4) Z.L.11.20

written at Basle in June 1559, dealt with nothing but trivia. The second, from Oxford in August 1563, may have been prompted by the Convocation of that year in which the nonconformists so narrowly failed to gain the day. Referring to an earlier letter no longer extant, Humphrey asked Bullinger to repeat his opinions on the following matters:-

"First, whether that appears to you as indifferent which has been so long established with so much superstition, and both fascinated the minds of the simple with its splendour, and imbued them with an opinion of its religion and sanctity; secondly, whether at the command of the sovereign, the jurisdiction of the pope having been abolished, and for the sake of order, and not of ornament, habits of this kind may be worn in church by pious men, lawfully and with a safe conscience. I am speaking of that round cap and popish surplice, which are now enjoined us, not by the unlawful tyranny of the pope, but by the just and legitimate authority of the queen. To the pure, then, can all these things be pure, and matters of indifference?"(1)

It will be noticed that Humphrey did not in any way challenge the Queen's right to take order for the Church in matters "indifferent", i.e. in matters not already regulated by God in Holy Scripture. Her authority, so far as it went, was "just and legitimate". But did it cover things which had at one time been put to a superstitious use, since superstition was certainly condemned in God's Word?

Bullinger's reply to this letter has not come down to us, but the substance of his probable reply will be seen in his later answers to similar questions in letters soon to be considered.

Humphrey's question above was put, many times over, by Sampson

to Peter Martyr, as we have seen. But in his first letter Sampson questioned the Queen's right to command the Church in any way at all, once she had carried out the initial reformation. Martyr's reply was lost, but he must have recognized the Queen's authority in things indifferent, otherwise there would have been no point in Sampson's further questions.

X.

In December 1563 Cecil wrote to Sampson telling him that his disobedience was causing offence and urging him to conform. Strype⁽¹⁾ supplies the gist of Sampson's reply. In the Law God prohibited both idols and the ceremonies and fashions which accompanied their worship. In the Gospel Christ did not take part in any of the traditions devised by the Pharisees, but condemned them and warned the Apostles against them. Some of the primitive Fathers of the Church had forbidden ceremonies devised and used by idolaters and heretics. Therefore all ceremonies and fashions devised and used by the papists ought to be forbidden. If those in authority thought otherwise, Sampson preferred to obey God. Some of the primitive Christians, upon their conversion, had changed their attire at the same time as they had changed their mind; at any rate they certainly did not impose upon their fellow-Christians the attire of the heathen whose religion they had abandoned. It arose out of the corrupt state of the Church ever since Christ that a distinctive dress was prescribed for the ministry. All

(1) S.A.1.11.149ff

reformation ought to go back to the beginnings of things; if other reformers would not admit this, their decision could not bind Sampson, any more than he would wish to bind the consciences of his fellow-men. These opinions had always been his, and they had been confirmed by recent study and by his contacts in exile with other Churches reformed.

This is a fuller statement than we have so far had from Sampson about the authority of Holy Scripture in matters of ceremonial. He also introduced the notion of the corruption of the Church ever since the days of Christ, but he did not go to the length of denying any value at all to the force of examples drawn from the life of the supposedly corrupt primitive Church. Instead, when it suited his purpose, he made use of primitive practice as an example to be followed. But the only proper rule for the Church was Holy Scripture, which contained the first principles to which all reformation must be adjusted.

XI.

The next applicant for Swiss advice in the Vestiarian controversy was, so far as we are able to judge from the available information, Horne, the Bishop of Winchester, who wrote to Rodolph Gualter on 17th July 1565. ⁽¹⁾ The English papists, he complained, were using the quarrel about "square caps and surplices" to assert that there was no unanimity within the reforming party. The caps and surplices were appointed in an Act of Parliament in which the

(1) Z.L.i.141ff

possibility of a superstitious regard for them was expressly

(1)
 guarded against. The Bishops had complied with the Act rather than surrender their places and allow crypto-papists to gain control of the Church. At the next session of Parliament they hoped to get the Act repealed, but if it was not repealed Horne was of the opinion that the Bishops should still remain in office. The controversy had split the "little flock" of Marian exiles, one party

"thinking that on account of this law the ministry ought to be abandoned, and the other, that it ought not."(2)

This letter was written shortly after Sampson had suffered deprivation, and had therefore in a sense abandoned the ministry, rather than conform.

At about the same date Horne must have written to Bullinger on the same topic. Bullinger's reply is extant, although Gualter's is not. Bullinger may be allowed to speak for himself, viz:-

"I approve the zeal of those persons who would have the church purged from all the dregs of popery... On the other hand, I also commend your prudence, who do not think that churches are to be forsaken because of the vestments. For since the great end of the ministry is the edification and preservation of the church, we have need of great ~~circumspection~~ circumspection, lest we depart from this, even while we are defending a cause, which in itself is good and holy. Nor are we only to consider now what is the state of that church which we think of forsaking, but also what it will be when we have left it... Your common adversaries are aiming only at this, that on your removal they may put in your places either papists, or else Lutheran doctors and presidents, who are not very much unlike them. Should this come to pass, not only will all ecclesiastical order be disturbed, and the number of most absurd ceremonies be increased, but even images (which we know are defended by the Lutherans) will be restored; the artolatry in the Lord's supper will be re-introduced;

(1) The phrases which guard against superstition are not in the Act of Uniformity, but in the Injunctions. (2) Z.L.1.142

"private absolution, and after this, auricular confession will creep in by degrees... But if anyone ask me whether I approve of those who first enacted, or are now zealous maintainers of, those laws by which the dregs of popery are retained, I candidly and freely answer that I do not... But although they have obtruded upon you these dregs, as if they were necessary for the worship of God... I should think that everything ought rather to be submitted to, than that you should suffer a godly people to be led away by them from a pure profession of faith. And since it is expressly provided, as you write me word, in that proclamation, that the square caps and surplices are to be retained without any superstitious conceit, I think that sufficient consideration has, at the same time, been shown to your consciences... I am aware that many questions are raised by some parties respecting the authority of kings and magistrates, whether they ought to make any laws for the church, and whether the clergy are bound to obey such laws. But I do not consider these inquiries of so much consequence in the present case, since, as I have above stated, all conceit of superstition is removed by the words of the proclamation itself. And we must take care, lest, by raising questions before the people respecting the extent of magisterial authority, we should give occasion to some disorders... We ought to beware, lest, while we are consulting our own feelings and reputation as individuals, we should bring the church at large into some grievous peril. And I do not think this opinion of mine is at variance with the mind of Paul, who was wont to become all things to all men, that he might gain some; and who thought good to circumcise Timothy, lest he should alienate the Jews of that place from the christian religion; and that he might exercise his ministry with greater advantage; but who, on other occasions, thought it not fit to yield in the least to those who placed any merit in circumcision itself."(1)

It will be noticed that Bullinger had changed his attitude towards the prescribed attire of the English clergy since the days when he influenced Peter Martyr's reply to Sampson. There are two reasons for this. First the Eucharistic vestments were no longer under discussion, but only the surplice and the outdoor attire; secondly, he was now aware of the verbal safeguards against superstition contained in the Injunctions. In general, there is a

much more responsible approach to the questions posed to him than his earlier attitude might lead one to expect. He is at least willing to allow that a thing may not be jet black even though it is not quite white.

In February 1566 Humphrey and Sampson wrote separately, though obviously in concert, to Bullinger. Each had written earlier, but had received no reply. ⁽¹⁾ Humphrey now put seven questions to Bullinger, and Sampson, characteristically, twelve. They requested that Gualter and other Zurich Pastors should take part in drafting the answers. As we have Bullinger's single reply to both letters, it will be convenient to treat all three letters together, setting out the questions and answers in dialogue form.

After stating the nature of the controversy as he had learned it from others, that it was not a matter of altars and crucifixes, nor yet of albs and copes, but of a round cap or a square cap and of

"a white garment which they call a surplice,"⁽²⁾

and after protesting against the tying up of a simple matter in so many and such complicated knots, Bullinger dealt first with Humphrey, viz:-

Humphrey: "May laws respecting habits properly be prescribed to churchmen so as to distinguish them from the laity."

Bullinger: "There is ambiguity in the word 'ought'... If it is taken as implying what is necessary and appertaining to salvation, I do not think that even the authors of the

(1) The earlier letters had evidently been lost. In Sampson's case he had written six months earlier, i.e. shortly after his deprivation, and about the time of Horne's letter. (2) Z.L.1.345.

"laws themselves intend such an interpretation. But if... for the sake of decency and comeliness... or dignity and order, some such regulation be made, or... that which the apostle requires, namely, that a bishop or minister of the church should be *κεκαλιος* ... I do not see how he is to blame, who either adopts a habit of this sort himself, or commands it to be worn by others."

- H. "Is the ceremonial ~~worship~~ worship of the Levitical priesthood to be re-introduced into the church of Christ?"
- B. "If a cap and habit not unbecoming a minister, and free from superstition, are commanded... no-one can reasonably assert that Judaism is revived."
- H. "In respect of habits and external rites, is it allowable to have anything in common with the papists?"
- B. "It is not yet proved that the pope introduced a distinction of habits into the church... It is clear that such distinction is long anterior to popery... If it were not allowable to have anything in common with them, it would be necessary to desert all the churches, to decline the receipt of a stipend, to abstain from baptism, and the reciting of the apostles' and Nicene creed, and even to reject the Lord's prayer... You do not borrow any ceremonies from them; for the use of the habits was never set aside from the beginning of the reformation; and it is still retained, not by any popish enactment, but by virtue of the royal edict."
- H. "Is the distinguishing apparel of the priesthood to be worn like a common dress? Does this not savour of monkery, popery, and Judaism?"
- B. "A distinctive cap or habit in civil matters savours neither of Judaism nor monachism; for they affect to appear separated from civil life, and make a merit of their peculiar dress. Thus Eustathius, bishop of Sebastia, was condemned, not merely on account of his peculiar dress, but because he made religion to consist in that dress."
- H. "Can those persons who till now have ~~enjoyed~~ enjoyed their liberty, with a safe conscience, by the authority of a royal edict, involve in this bondage both themselves and the church? Is the habit to be worn rather than the office deserted?"
- B. "Great caution is to be observed lest... a handle should be afforded to the queen's majesty to leave that no longer a matter of choice to those who have abused their liberty... It appears indeed most extraordinary to me... that you can persuade yourselves that you cannot, with a safe conscience, subject yourselves and churches to vestiarian bondage; and that you do not rather consider, to what kind of bondage you will subject yourselves and churches, if you refuse to comply with a civil ordinance, which is a matter of indifference."
- H. "May the clerical dress of the papists be regarded as a matter of indifference?"
- B. "It certainly seems such, when it is a matter of civil ordin-

"ance, and has respect only to decency and order, in which things religious worship does not consist."(1)

Several of Sampson's twelve questions overlapped some of Humphrey's, but it is worth while, in a few of these cases, to read Bullinger's answers for the sake of the additional reasons he gave for his opinions. But it should be noticed that in three cases Bullinger grouped two of Sampson's questions together, thus reducing his own answers to nine, viz:-

Sampson: "Was a peculiar habit, distinct from that of the laity, ever assigned to the ministers of the gospel in better times, and ought it now to be assigned to them in the reformed church?"

Bullinger: "That there was in the primitive church a habit peculiar to the priests, is manifest from the ecclesiastical history of Theodoret... and of Socrates... Ministers always wore the pallium on sacred occasions... Eusebius truly bears witness from the most ancient writers that the apostle John at Ephesus wore on his forehead a petalum, or pontifical plate... Pontius the Deacon relates of the martyr Cyprian, that when he was about to present his neck to the executioner, he first gave his birrus and his dalmatic to the deacon... Chrysostom makes mention of the white garment of the clergy... When Christians were converted from heathenism to the gospel and the church, they exchanged the toga for the pallium, on which account they were ridiculed by unbelievers. Tertullian composed his most learned treatise "de pallio"... I should prefer, indeed, that no difficulties had been thrown in the way of the clergy, and that they might have been at liberty to follow the practice of the apostles. But since the Queen's majesty only enjoins the wearing of a cap and surplice... and since the same things were in use among the ancients... and this too without superstition or anything to find fault with; I could wish that pious ministers would not make the whole advancement of religion to depend upon this matter."

S. "Is prescribing habits of this kind consistent with ecclesiastical

(1) Z.L.i.151f, 345ff. For Eustathius of Sebaste see Council of Gangra, canon xii (Percival, op.cit.97) "If anyone, under pretence of asceticism, should wear a periboloeum and, as if this gave him righteousness, shall despise those who, with piety, wear the berus and use other common and customary dress, let him be anathema."

"and christian liberty? Does the nature of things indifferent admit of co-ercion? ~~Should~~ Should any violence be offered to the consciences of the many who are not yet persuaded."

- B. "Matters of indifference admit sometimes of prescription, and therefore of being imposed by force, as far as their use, so to speak, but not their moral effect is concerned... The times and places of religious assemblies are assuredly regarded among things indifferent; and yet, if there is no prescription in such cases, consider, I pray, what confusion and disorder would ensue."
- S. "May new ceremonies be instituted, or superadded to what is expressly commanded in the word?"
- B. "I by no means approve the addition of new ceremonies, but yet I am not prepared to deny that some may lawfully be instituted... Christ himself observed the feast or ceremony of the dedication, though we do not read that this feast was prescribed ~~in~~ in the law. On the whole, the greater part of the propositions or questions touching the vestiarian controversy turn upon this, whether laws concerning habits may or ought to be framed in the church? And it recalls the general question, namely, what regulations is it lawful to make concerning ceremonies?.. Though I would rather no ceremonies, excepting such as are necessary, should be obtruded upon the church, yet I must confess... that regulations respecting them, though possibly not altogether necessary, and, sometimes, it may be, useless, ought not forthwith to be condemned as impious, and to excite disorder and schism in the church."
- S. "Is it expedient to borrow rites from idolaters or heretics, and to transfer such as are especially dedicated to their sect and religion to the use of the reformed church?"
- B. "I should be loth that any idolatrous rites should be transferred to the reformed churches, without being purified... But it might be demanded on the other hand, whether established ceremonies, void of superstition, may not be retained in the church, without any impropriety, for the sake of discipline and order."
- S. "Must conformity and general agreement of necessity be required in ceremonies of this kind?"
- B. "Conformity in ceremonies is perhaps not necessary in every church... There was not conformity in rites in all the more ancient churches; those, however, which adopted rites in conformity with each other, did not censure those who wanted such conformity... I can easily believe that wise and politic men are urgent for a conformity of rites, because they think it will tend to concord, and that there may be one and the same church throughout all England... I do not see why you should oppose yourselves with hostility to harmless regulations of that kind."
- S. "May those ceremonies be retained which occasion evident offence?"
- B. "We ought to avoid offence... But we must take care... lest we cloke our own feelings under the pretext of offence."

- S. "May any ecclesiastical constitutions be tolerated, which, though from their nature they are free from anything impious, do not, nevertheless, tend to edification?"
- B. "Where there is no impiety, and the conscience is not wounded, it is proper to submit, even if some degree of bondage be imposed... It might be demanded, on the other hand, whether the imposition of the habits, as far as it tends to decency and order, may justly come under the denomination of bondage."
- S. "May anything of a ceremonial nature be prescribed to the church by the sovereign, without the assent and free concurrence of churchmen?"
- B. "If the consent of the clergy is always to be waited for by the sovereign, it is probable that those most wise and pious kings, Asa, Hezekiah, Jehoshaphat, and Josiah, and other godly princes, would never have brought into proper order the Levites and ministers of the churches, though I would not altogether have the bishops excluded from the consultations of churchmen. But on the other hand I would not have them assume to themselves that power, which they heretofore usurped over kings and magistrates in the time of popery. Nor again, would I have the bishops sanction by silence the unjust ordinances of princes."
- S. "Ought a man thus to obey the decrees of the church; or on account of non-compliance, supposing there is no alternative, to be cast out of the ministry? May good pastors, of unblemished life and doctrine, rightfully be removed from the ministry on account of their non-compliance with such ceremonies?"
- B. "I will certainly allow, and that most fully, that a burden and bondage is imposed... But I will not allow... that their station and ministry is on that account to be deserted." (1)

XII

In his own and Gualter's names, Bullinger sent a copy of the above correspondence with Sampson and Humphrey to Bishop Horne, with a request that Bishops Parkhurst, Grindal, Jewel, Sandys, and

(1) Z.L.i.153f, 345ff. Theodoret.Hist.Eccles.ii.27. Socrates, Hist. Eccles.vi.22. Euseb.Hist.Eccles.III.xxxi.3, V.xxiv.3. The true text of Pontius Diaconus does not contain the incident attributed to Cyprian. Even if it did, it would be an anachronism to regard the dalmatic as a specifically ecclesiastical garment in Cyprian's time (see Cross, Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, and Souter, Glossary of Later Latin, under 'dalmatica'). Chrysostom, Hom.lxxxii.6 in Matt.

Pilkington, be allowed to see it, and that the Queen's leniency
 (1)
 be sought for Humphrey and Sampson. Grindal was so pleased with
 the letter that he had it printed in Latin and English, without
 (2)
 its authors' consent, and much to their annoyance. He was even
 slow to inform the Zurich pastors of what he had done, but when he
 did write he claimed that their letter had prevented many of the
 learned clergy from forsaking their ministry, and many of the
 people from withdrawing from the Church and setting up private
 (3)
 meetings.

The dismay of the nonconformists may be imagined. Dr Turner,
 the Dean of Wells (he who arrayed the penitent in the priest's
 cap), wrote to tell Bullinger what people in England were saying
 about him. Some thought he had been misled by the Bishops, others
 that he was merely wavering and would later return to a better way
 of thinking. Still others pointed out that he had contradicted
 (4)
 his own earlier writings, while the most charitable view was that
 the letter had never been intended as anything more than an acad-
 emic exercise between scholars. Finally, in a passage in which
 Turner begged almost every question which the Zurich pastors had
 already been at such pains to answer, Turner begged Bullinger to
 publish a tract on whether

"princes or ecclesiastical prelates, whom you call principal
 ministers, have authority to obtrude upon the pastors of
 churches against their will, under pain of deprivation and

(1) Z.L. i.356 (2) Ibid 357 (3) Ibid 168 (4) There was substance
 in this charge that Bullinger had changed his ideas. cf Z.L.ii.357

"imprisonment, certain prescribed habits, and corresponding ceremonies, whether borrowed from the heathen, or transferred from the Levitical law, or invented or approved by the ~~xxx~~ pope, and destined and employed for the furtherance of idolatry, without offence to christian liberty and manifest injury to the church."(1)

Not unnaturally Sampson and Humphrey were dissatisfied with Zurich's verdict and they appealed, as we shall see, to Geneva. But they also wrote to Bullinger and Gualter to express their dissatisfaction. Much of their letter is no more than a flat denial of the Zurich pastors' arguments, but in the course of it they stated that

"these things are our principal object, the authority of the scriptures, the simplicity of the ministry of Christ, the purity of the earliest and best churches... On the other side it has not previously been our lot to hear or read of any law or general decree, either of Almighty God, or of any reformed church, or general council, (which is the rule of Augustine)."(2)

They were of the opinion

"Not that whatever may be in any way lawful, should be obtruded, but what in every way tends to the edification of the church should be introduced; and that what may be lawful to some, is not forthwith lawful to all."(3)

They also defined the kind of uniformity they would wish to have:-

"Why should we look for precedents from our enemies, the papists, and not from you, our brethren of the reformation? We have the same confession in our churches, the same rule of doctrine and faith; why should ~~there~~ there be so great a dissimilarity and discrepancy in rites and ceremonies? The thing signified is the same; why do the signs differ so as to be unlike yours, and to resemble those of the papists?"(4)

So that Zurich should not think the controversy to be a trifling matter about a cap or a surplice, Sampson and Humphrey continued,

(1) Z.L.ii.124ff (2) Z.L.i.161f (3) Ibid 162 (4) Ibid

"we send you some straws and chips of the popish religion from which with your wonted prudence you may imagine the rest."
(1)

These "straws and chips" still remaining in the Church of England included such things as wedding rings, the sign of the cross at Baptisms, the playing of organs and part-singing by choirs, the wearing of a veil at Churchings, kneeling and the use of wafer-bread at the Communion, the removal from No 28 of the Thirty-nine Articles of the section which denied the real presence in the Eucharist, the sale of dispensations in the Archbishop's Court of Faculties, and the absence of "Discipline".
(2)

On 10th September 1566 Bullinger and Gualter replied. Their previous letter, they said, had been about caps and surplices, and must not be applied, either in Convocation or elsewhere, to the additional matters now raised. As to the caps and surplices, they had said all they intended to say; as to the additional matters now raised, they would not discuss them with Sampson and Humphrey.
(3)

On the very day that they wrote to the two Oxford nonconformists the Zurich divines were engaged in discussions about the "straws and chips" along with some other matters of a similar kind. Sampson and Humphrey had been so dismayed by the Zurich verdict on the Vestiarian question that they had extended the front on which they were attacking the Queen's settlement of religion. Some of their fellow nonconformists were trying to extend it still further and, because they thought that Zurich was insufficiently informed about the Church of England, they were trying to make good the deficiency.

(1) Z.L.i.163ff (2) Ibid 157ff (3) Ibid 360ff.

XIII.

Humphrey, if not Sampson, had already been in correspondence with Theodore Beza, since Calvin's death the leading minister at Geneva.⁽¹⁾ Now, taking Miles Coverdale into partnership, perhaps as a guarantor of their good faith because he was very well known in Geneva, the two men addressed a letter, in July 1566, to Beza and his fellow pastors.

After repeating in brief the questions and arguments they had put to Zurich, they asked three things. First, that a book might be written about their problems and the solution of them for the instruction of all the reformed Churches; secondly, that letters be sent privately to the Bishops asking them

"not to persecute Joseph on account of a garment."⁽²⁾ thirdly, that similar letters be written to any of the Privy Council who might be known personally to the Genevan ministers.⁽³⁾

The courier who took this letter to Geneva seems to have been Percival Wiburn, a clergyman deprived for nonconformity. He probably carried with him at the same time the "straws and chips" letter for Zurich, since this too was written in July. Wiburn would no doubt be instructed to give verbal support to this appeal to Geneva.

Wiburn must have reached Beza about the end of August, and was sympathetically received. It was felt, however, that if the Genevan ministers intervened they might make matters worse, since

(1) Z.L.i.152 (2) Z.L.ii.123 (3) Ibid 121ff

the Queen disapproved of them as they were well aware. Wiburn was therefore sent on to Zurich bearing a lengthy commendatory letter from Beza to Bullinger.

In this letter, dated 3rd September, after stating that

"the papacy was never abolished in that country (England), but transferred to the sovereign,"(1)

Beza continued,

"Since an outward call... not by any single individual, but at least by a congregation of the brethren, is as it were the basis and foundation of an ecclesiastical ministry, what can be more abominable... than that assumed power of the bishops, by which they admit at their pleasure parties not so called... and without assigning them any cure, approve of them as qualified either to serve... or to teach; and at length, on the vacancy of any preferment, after the delivery of a written form for a certain sum of money, and the administration of an oath respecting two things (the one that they will acknowledge the royal majesty as, next to Christ, the supreme head of the Church of England; the other, that they will so comply with the laws of the realm, and especially that famous book of reformation and all the ceremonies, as not in any way to impugn any) they appoint this or that individual to whatever churches they please." (2)

As regards the "Discipline", Beza said,

"Just the same as under the papacy, they have in the place of a lawfully appointed presbytery their deans, chancellors, and archdeacons, who at their pleasure... pronounce excommunication... which sentence afterwards the lord bishop or his official sends to the minister... to be read in church, namely, to be in force so long only as until the matter is made up with the judge... There is for the most part the same mode of absolution as of excommunication."(3)

About the marriage of the clergy, he exclaimed

"How little are they removed from the law of celibacy, who are forbidden to marry wives without the express permission of the queen, and the assent of the lord bishop and some two justices of the peace." (4)

(1) Z.L.ii.128 (2) Ibid 129 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid

As for the Marian clergy who had remained in office under Elizabeth, Beza said,

"The ~~papist~~ papists are left in possession of the revenues of their benefices... (and of) their ecclesiastical offices, upon merely taking an oath to maintain the reformation."(1)

After mentioning several of Sampson's and Humphrey's "straws and chips", Beza went on,

"Nor is this the end of their miseries... Whatever it may please the queen's majesty, with the sole concurrence of the archbishop of Canterbury, to establish, alter, or to take away, with respect to the rites of the church, it shall forthwith be considered as having the force of law."(2)

Beza did not agree that the nonconformists should yield to this state of affairs rather than resign or be deprived.

"It is one thing to endure what you cannot alter, and another thing to resume, to the certain offence of many persons, what has already been laid down... They certainly do not desert their churches, who are either ejected, or who, when commanded to ruin themselves and their flocks, refuse to comply."(3)

The remedy Beza suggested was that Gualter should lead a deputation from Zurich to the Queen and Bishops; this he was willing to support with an official letter from Geneva. Alternatively, Zurich might send a "grave and copious statement" on the subject to London.

When Wiburn arrived in Zurich with Beza's letter, he must have found the two zealous pastors there in some consternation. They had been listening to a sensational, and in parts inaccurate, tale of the condition of the Church of England, and were composing, or were about to compose, a letter to Bishops Grindal and Horne.

This letter was written on 6th September, three days after the date

(1) Z.L.11.130 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 133

of Beza's letter to Zurich.

After complaining that the publication of their letter to Sampson and Humphrey on the ~~vestiarian~~ vestiarian question had led to its perverted application in another context, Bullinger and Gualter continued,

"We have now heard... that it is required of ministers, either to subscribe to some new articles, or to relinquish their office. And the articles are said to be of this kind... The measured chanting in churches is to be retained, and in a foreign language, together with the sound of organs; women... may baptize infants in private houses; the minister ought to ask the infant presented for baptism the questions that were formerly proposed to the catechumens... Ministers who perform the office of baptism, must use breathings, exorcisms, the sign of the cross, oil, spittle, clay, lighted tapers and other things of this kind... Ministers are to teach that in the receiving of the Lord's supper kneeling is necessary, (which has an appearance of adoration) and that the bread is not to be broken in common, but that a small morsel is to be placed in the mouth of every communicant... The mode of spiritual feeding, and of the presence of the body of Christ in the holy supper, is not to be ~~explained~~ explained, but left undetermined... As formerly all things were to be had at Rome for money, so now are the same things for sale in the court of the metropolitan... The wives too of the clergy are removed apart from their husbands... Ministers, if they wish to continue the exercise of their ministry in the churches, are under the necessity of remaining silent under these grievances: so that all the power of church government or authority rests solely with the bishops, and ~~no~~ no pastor is allowed to deliver his opinion in ecclesiastical affairs of this kind."(1)

September 10th and 11th must have been busy days for the two Zurich ministers. On 10th, in addition to their joint letter to
(2)
Sampson and Humphrey already noticed, Bullinger wrote to Miles Coverdale and promised to communicate with "some godly and prudent persons" asking them to prevent the improper use of the letter Grindal had published.⁽³⁾ On 11th a joint letter was written to the

(1) Z.L.i.358f (2) see p. 105 (3) Z.L.ii.136f

(1)
Earl of Bedford in fulfilment of this promise, and on the same day Gualter wrote to Beza and Bishop Parkhurst.

The letter to Beza re-stated the Zurich position as we have already seen it, and declined the suggestion of a deputation to England on the ground that the Queen might resent the interference of foreigners. (2) The letter to Parkhurst was another that was to become famous by publication without its author's consent. Obviously influenced by the sensational reports he had heard only a few days earlier about the Church of England, and expressing his distaste for

"the superstition or folly of those parties who... sweep together from the pope's school, or rather kitchen, such filthiness,"(3)

Gualter indicated his amazement that

"any one could have been found among the bishops, who would allow himself either to participate in this wickedness by his instrumentality, or at least to encourage it by his cowardly connivance."(4)

In a postscript Gualter added,

"I have written this letter from the statement of the Englishman, Percival Wiburn."(5)

and all the letters to England were given into Wiburn's possession for him to deliver on his return home.

XIV.

On 25th February 1567 Wiburn wrote to Bullinger a piteous appeal for help. He had delivered the letters from Zurich, but because of

(1) Z.L.ii.137ff (2) Ibid 142ff (3) Ibid 141 (4) Ibid (5) Ibid 142

Gualter's postscript to Parkhurst he had been called before the Bishop of Winchester, Horne, and accused of detraction and calumny. The Bishop had allowed him a brief glance at one or two sentences in a letter from Zurich in which clay, spittle, candles, and a foreign language were mentioned. Would Bullinger write him a letter exonerating him from spreading these false reports about the Church of England? Bullinger would remember that their interview had been brief, and no word had been spoken about any given point of religion. Wiburn had made his report about the Church of England in written form, and this writing did not contain the false reports of which he was now accused.⁽¹⁾

Wiburn could hardly have written to Bullinger in this strain if he had previously lied to him about the state of affairs in the Church of England. Moreover, his written report is extant, and as a statement of facts about the Church of England it is by no means untrue.⁽²⁾ Either Bullinger and Gualter read a great deal ~~more~~ more into Wiburn's statement than it contained, or else Horne read more into Gualter's postscript than it was intended to convey.

On 6th February Horne and Grindal had already written an indignant denial that new articles of the kind alleged were being imposed on the clergy. They declared that they disapproved of organs and chanting, although they were allowed in England. Prayers in a foreign language, breathings, exorcisms, oil, clay, spittle, tapers etc, had been given up in the Church of England. The bread at the

(1) Z.L.i.187 (2) Z.L.ii.258

Communion was put into the worshipper's hand. The wives of the clergy were not separated from their husbands. (1) The whole management of the Church was not in the hands of the Bishops; the inferior clergy were represented in Convocation, and the consent of a majority of them was heeded before anything could be determined there. The court of faculties was a royal court, not a court of the metropolitan; it was tolerated, along with the sign of the cross and the interrogation of infants at Baptism, until it could be abolished. As to kneeling at the Communion, its use as an act of adoration to the bread and wine, or to any real and essential presence, was guarded against. (2)

In ~~August~~ ^{July} 1567 Beza wrote another commendatory letter to Bullinger, this time in support of George Withers and John Barthelot, whom he had found to be

"endued with a spirit of gentleness"(3)

Bullinger replied that he had found

"their minds... entirely set against the bishops; for they scarcely say anything respecting them but what is painted in the blackest colours, and savours of the most perfect hatred."(4)

He had confronted them with the letter he had recently received

from Horne and Grindal, but as they had stated that the matter had

(1) The two Bishops omitted to say that wives were not, by the Queen's order, permitted to live in Cathedral closes. (2) Z.L.i.175ff On the matter of adoration the two Bishops gave a free quotation of the 'black rubric' of 1552. Knappen (op.cit.207) regards this as a half-truth, since the rubric was not included in the 1559 book. But the Bishops say, "The same explanation... that the very authors of the kneeling, most holy and constant martyrs of Jesus Christ, adopted, is most diligently declared, published, and impressed upon the people." This obviously refers to preaching, not to the inclusion of the rubric in the Prayer Book. There is no need to accuse the Bishops of evasion. (3) Z.L.ii.154 (4) Ibid 155

not been fairly put by the Bishops, Bullinger declined any further discussion on the matter, for

"We could not withdraw our entire confidence in the bishops, who have acted in all other respects as men of piety and integrity."(1)

Already sickened of the controversy by the behaviour of the nonconformists, or by what they supposed was their behaviour, Bullinger and Gualter now, in face of the attitude of Withers and Barthelot towards the Bishops, came to a decision:-

"We had determined to have nothing more to do with anyone in this controversy, whether in conversation or by letter; and this is now our decided resolution."(2)

Withers and Barthelot, however, presented a written rejoinder to the Bishops' letter with which they had been confronted, and this concluded with an appeal to Bullinger to

"soften down the exasperated minds of the bishops of London, Winchester, and the archbishop of Canterbury."(3)

This appeal was met, to some extent, by a letter written from Zurich some days later to Grindal, Sandys, and Parkhurst, asking them to intercede with the Queen on behalf of the nonconformists.⁽⁴⁾

Perhaps about the same time Withers himself petitioned the Elector Palatine to intercede with the Queen in the same way.⁽⁵⁾ So far as is known, nothing came of this petition.

Thus the nonconforming party was left with the support only of Geneva, to which city henceforth it looked for guidance and inspiration, but not for intervention with the Queen.

(1) Z.L.11.154 (2) Ibid 155 (3) Ibid 151 (4) Ibid 167 (5) Ibid 156
Withers' letter is not dated, nor is the place of writing mentioned in it.

XV.

During the course of the Vestiarian controversy a steady movement can be noticed on the part of Zurich away from the non-conforming party and towards the Bishops. The "clay and spittle" legend brought this movement to a sudden but temporary halt. As soon as the legend was found to be a legend it had the reverse effect, and became the cause of a breach between the Zurich pastors and the nonconformists. Indeed, it became the occasion of a difference of opinion and policy between Zurich and Geneva. Who was the author of this foolish and harmful story?

(1)

Strype suspected Withers, but gave no reasons for his suspicion. The fact that Withers and Barthelot were confronted with Grindal's and Horne's letter suggests that one or both of them invented the legend. On the other hand the fact that they needed a commendatory letter from Beza to introduce them to Zurich suggests that neither of them had been there before, and that they could not therefore have concocted the legend.

Writing six years after the event, in 1572, Gualter explained how he had come to accuse the Bishops of cowardice in conniving at superstitious practices, viz:-

"Two Englishmen arrive at (sic; from?) Geneva, bringing with them a letter from master Beza, whose ears they had filled with calumnies and false accusations, in which he entreated us to do our endeavour to help the most afflicted state of England, and further exhorted me to make a journey to you for that purpose. To this was added the account of those two men, who told us the same story that they had done at Geneva, and... set down in writing a great many errors and superstitious abuses, which, as they asserted, were now maintained in England... Their most grievous cause of complaint was

"this, namely, that most of the bishops had become the willing executors of those things that were daily coined at court by superstitious and ambitious courtiers. Who would suspect that any persons could be so barefaced as to dare to lie with such assurance on matters of such notoriety?"(1)

Here Gualter was clearly referring to Wiburn's visit, bearing Beza's letter with the suggestion that Gualter should go to England. But Wiburn was alone on that visit to Zurich. In his letter Beza introduces "this our brother", and in his letter to Bullinger Wiburn writes throughout as though he had been alone and therefore had no witness other than Bullinger who could testify to what had passed between him and the Zurich pastors, e.g.

"You cannot easily forget, reverend sir, what were the heads I complained of in the articles; so that there was not the slightest occasion to scrape together the strange language, clay, spittle, candles, and other superfluities, to increase this mischief."(3)

Thus in at least one respect Gualter's memory was at fault, for he speaks of a visit by two men.

Further, in the letter which commended Wiburn to Zurich Beza had some hard things to say about the Church of England, but he shows no sign that he had heard the "clay and spittle" legend. He dealt solely with matters which can be found in Wiburn's written report.

Like Withers, then, Wiburn must be found not guilty on a charge of deliberate lying. Indeed, it is a matter of doubt whether there was any lying at all by anyone. As Gualter said, who would dare to lie in matters such as those in which the truth could so

(1) Z.L.1.363 (2) Z.L.11.128 (3) Z.L.1.189

easily be discovered.

But if there was no lying, there was certainly misunderstanding, and a clue to the source of this misunderstanding may perhaps be found in Gualter's reference to superstitious and ambitious courtiers.⁽¹⁾ Perhaps from someone else in Zurich, at or about the time of Wiburn's visit, Bullinger and Gualter heard complaints of old papist practices still carried out in secret, especially in the homes of noblemen. There would be some substance in such complaints, and also in complaints that the Bishops were often powerless to discipline the nobility, papist or puritan, for their illegal practices. That there was a papist party, as well as a Lutheran party and a puritan party, in opposition to the Bishops and the reformation was no secret; that it had supporters among the nobility was evident in the revolt of 1569. If then, complaints of this kind became confused with Wiburn's report on the Church of England, and with the knowledge that the clergy of England were required to subscribe to the Advertisements, it is not difficult to see how the "clay and spittle" legend arose. Nor would confusion be unlikely in conversations between Englishmen and Swiss, probably with Latin as the common language.

However the legend arose, it was believed in Zurich to be a deliberate and malicious falsehood, and the effect was most unhappy. It removed the nonconformists from the moderating influence of Bullinger and Gualter, and drove them into the more sympathetic but more extreme arms of Geneva.

(1) Z.L.1.363

XVI.

The foregoing survey of the correspondence between England and Switzerland ended at the point at which Zurich decided to take no further part in the Vestiarian controversy, and also at the point at which the controversy itself was beginning to be absorbed into the discussion of much wider issues.

The point of transition to these other problems lay in the discussion of the nature of the Queen's prerogative to legislate for the Church of England as its supreme governor. As soon as it began to be asked who ought to legislate for the Church, whether the Queen might do so without consulting the clergy, or at least after consulting only the metropolitan, then problems of authority, and not purely vestiarian problems, were being defined and argued. This particular matter of the Queen's authority was only a part of a much greater problem. What was the extent of the authority of Scripture? Was there any sphere at all in which the Church might lawfully use discretion in decreeing ceremonies, or was she limited to requiring the observance of those things, and only those things, already decreed in Scripture? Again, what authority should be allowed to the conscience of the individual Christian? Was he to be compelled to observe ceremonies and to wear garments which he conscientiously believed to be wrong?

Almost the only common ground between the two sides in the Vestiarian controversy was a dislike of superstition and a fear that it might make its way back into the Church. It seems strange to the modern mind that anyone should attach "holiness" to a particular

garment, as though the garment of itself commended the wearer to God and made him pleasing in God's sight. Harding denied that the monks of his time held any such view of their habit, and this was, no doubt, the official view of the Church as expressed at the Council of Gangra. But popular religion has a way of departing from the official line, and also a way of being encouraged by those who ought to uphold the official line. The unanimous voice of the disputants on both sides of the Vestiarian controversy was that the Church of their childhood had been ridden with superstition of this kind, not only about the attire of the clergy but about many other of the externals of religion as well. Such superstition was a flat contradiction of their doctrine that a man's faith, and only his faith, rendered him acceptable to God, and they were not without reason when they feared that they might live to see the Gospel perverted in the same way again.

The disputants also agreed in repudiating a double standard of Christian living, a superior type being found in the priest and the monk, and an inferior type in the laity. They compared this idea with the somewhat similar Jewish idea of the superiority of the Chosen Race over the rest of humanity, and hence they objected to the classification of some Christians as "religious", as though more "holiness" was required of these people than of the generality of Christians. The mark of that separation of one kind of Christian from the other had been the habit of the priest or of the monk, just as the peculiar garb of the Jew marked him off as separate from the Gentile. Was it possible to continue to use the habit of a priest

and yet not, at the same time, to imply such a separation?

Here the authority of the Church came into the matter. Could a decree of the Church remove the superstition attached to the habit of the clergy? Could it, for example, ensure that the surplice was worn only for the sake of comeliness and order, and not to mark out the priest as a different kind of Christian from the less "holy" laity? Clearly a decree could not control what went on in a man's mind, but could only declare what ought to go on there. But was this an adequate safeguard against the danger that the wrong thing might be thought? It is seldom that controversy solves a problem; it usually serves only to show wherein the problem lies. In this respect the Vestiarian controversy was no exception to the rule. It succeeded only in indicating the authority of the Church (by whomsoever exercised) as the underlying problem, but it provided no solution to the problem.

When Theodore Beza, in the course of commending Wiburton to Zurich, mentioned such defects (as he thought them to be) in the Church of England as the lack of popular election to the ministry, the absence of a "lawfully appointed presbytery", and the want of "discipline", he passed well out of the area of vestiarian questions. It was the practice of his own Church which led him to think the Church of England defective, and the same practice which led the English Puritans to agree with him. It will be useful to look briefly at the way in which the Church of Geneva was governed, because it was the experience they had had of that government that made the former exiles in Geneva discontented with their own Church and determined to alter

it if they could.

In 1541 the ministers of Geneva led, and perhaps dominated, by Calvin, prepared and submitted to the Council which exercised the civil government of the city a set of Draft Ordinances for its ecclesiastical government. These Ordinances began by declaring that

"There are four orders of office instituted by our Lord for the government of his church. First, pastors; then doctors; next elders; and fourth deacons."(1)

The duties of a pastor were to preach, to teach, to admonish both publicly and privately, to administer the sacraments,

"and to enjoin brotherly corrections along with the elders and colleagues."(2)

Candidates for ordination to this office were to be examined in doctrine and about their morals, and must prove their ability as speakers by private discussions of matters of doctrine. The existing ministers were to decide in the first instance who was to be admitted to the pastorate, but their choice was to be reviewed by the Council which, if it approved, would certify the ordinand ~~was approved~~ to the people as approved.

Pastors were to meet once a week to discuss some passage of Scripture. If any dispute about doctrine should arise among them which they failed to settle themselves, the elders were to be called in to restore order and, if they also failed, the matter was to be referred to the magistrate.

Criminous pastors were to be dealt with by

"the assembly of ministers and elders," (5)

(1) Calvin, Theological Treatises, ~~ed. Reid~~ ed. Reid, p58 (2) Ibid.

(3) Ibid 59 (4) Ibid 60 (5) Ibid 61

(1)

This assembly, or "Consistory" as it was entitled, was to carry out the preliminary investigation of charges against pastors and to report the offenders to the magistrate for punishment and deposition from office. In addition, the pastors were to meet together each quarter for mutual criticism and admonition about their conduct in matters where no question of civil punishment arose. (2)

Doctors were to concern themselves with the teaching of theology, the ancient languages, and dialectic, to children in schools and to students in the college. The method of their appointment resembled that of the pastors, and they were to be subject to the same discipline. (3)

As to the Elders,

"Their office is to have oversight of the life of everyone, to admonish amicably those whom they see to be erring or to be living a disordered life, and, where it is required, to enjoin fraternal corrections themselves and along with others." (4)

They were to be twelve in number and were to be appointed, after consultation with the pastors, by the Council from among the members of the Council, and (5)

"They should be so elected that there be some in every quarter of the city, to keep an eye on everybody." (6)

There were to be two sorts of Deacons, trustees of the funds

(1) The English Puritans avoided the use of the term "Consistory", at least in the early stages of Puritanism, possibly so as to prevent confusion with the Consistory Courts of the Diocesan Bishops. "Seignior" was used as equivalent to "Consistory". But in Geneva the "Seigneurie" was the civil government of the city and its surrounding villages. (2) Reid, op.cit.61 (3) Ibid 62f (4) Ibid 63 (5) Ibid 63f (6) Ibid 64.

and property allocated for the use of the poor, and relieving officers who were to pay allowaances to the poor and tend the sick.⁽¹⁾ They were to be appointed in the same manner as the Elders.

The Consistory was to meet weekly to examine the morals of the people:-

"The elders... are to assemble once a week with the ministers, that is to say on Thursday morning, to see that there is no disorder in the church and to discuss together remedies as they are required. Because they have no compulsive authority or jurisdiction, may it please their Lordships (i.e. the Council) to gáve them one of their officials to summon those whom they wish to admonish. If anyone refuse with contempt to comply, their office will be to inform their Lordships, in order that remedy be applied."⁽²⁾

The procedure of the Consistory was to be that of Matt.xviii.15-17, i.e. admonition was to be used in the first instance, but if that should fail, then the offender must be excommunicated. There is reference, however, to "corrections", i.e. to penances and bodily punishments, that may accompany admonition and excommunication.⁽³⁾ It is also evident from the context that the Consistory was to be regarded as "the Church" for the purposes contemplated in Matt.xviii.⁽⁴⁾ 17.

When the Draft Ordinances were considered by the Council many alterations were made, but only one of them was of major importance. It was the addition of the following article:-

"All this is to take place in such a way that the ministers have no civil jurisdiction, nor use anything but the spiritual sword of the Word of God, as Paul commands them; nor is the Consistory to derogate from the authority of the Seign-eury or ordinary justice. The civil power is to remain unimpaired. Even where there will be need to impose punishment

(1) Reid, op.cit.64f (2) Ibid 70 (3) Ibid 71 (4) Ibid 70.

"or to constrain parties, the ministers with the Consistory having heard the parties and used such remonstrances and admonitions as are good, are to report the whole matter to the Council, which in their turn will advise sentence and judgment according to the needs of the case."(1)

The ministers accepted this article, which denied the Consistory the power to excommunicate on its own authority, and spent the next dozen years in freeing their court from civil control. At first there were only six ministers to twelve Elders, but their places in the Consistory were permanent, while eldership was only an annual office. In time the number of ministers in Geneva, and consequently in the Consistory, rose to eighteen, but the number of Elders stayed at twelve. By 1554, when the exiles from England began to arrive, the Consistory's independence of the Council had virtually been achieved.⁽²⁾⁽³⁾

When the Genevan system of Church government was transplanted to other countries, it had necessarily to be modified. In France, where the civil government was often hostile, Elders and Deacons were elected by the people. Moreover, the single governing body suitable to a Swiss valley was unsuitable to a whole real, and the Consistory became a parochial court with, above it, regional, provincial, and national Synods. In Scotland the people of each parish had a direct voice in the election of their minister, and the weekly "exercise" of discussing a passage of Scripture was thrown open to the laity.⁽⁴⁾⁽⁵⁾⁽⁶⁾⁽⁷⁾

(1) Reid, op.cit. 71, footnote 84 (2) McNeill, History and Character of Calvinism, 177. (3) Ibid 188 (4) Ibid 246 (5) Ibid (6) Ibid 300 (7) Ibid 301.

SOME ELIZABETHAN CONTROVERSIES
ABOUT
THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY

Part III

Whitgift v. Cartwright

Part III

Whitgift v. Cartwright
.....

I.

It is surprising that in Queen Elizabeth's reign questions of Church government remained for so long in the background of Puritan propaganda. In London during Queen Mary's reign there had been a clandestine congregation of Protestants which had elected its own minister and deacons; ⁽¹⁾ it went out of existence upon the accession of Elizabeth. Again in Mary's reign one of the first actions of the exiles at Frankfort had been to elect their own minister, ⁽²⁾ and one of the later disputes at the same place had turned upon the right of the clergy to appoint an order of service and elect a minister without reference to the congregation as a whole. ⁽³⁾ Yet again, only a month after Elizabeth's accession Sampson, as we have seen, was calling in question such matters in the Church of England as the lack of "Discipline", the appointment of Bishops without ⁽⁴⁾ election, and the royal supremacy. Sampson could not have known, when he wrote, what shape the Church of England was to take in the future, and he must have been criticizing it as it had been under Edward VI, at the same time voicing his fear that it would be restored to that pattern.

The explanation of the delay of some ten years in bringing the full Puritan programme of reform to the front seems to have been the notion that the settlement of 1559 was an interim arrangement,

(1) Z.L.ii.160 (2) Troubles at Frankfort, p.3 (3) Ibid p.39.

(4) Z.L.i.1f see p. 25f

a return to 1552, there or thereabouts, so that reformation could proceed from the point at which it had been interrupted by the accession of Mary. But when insistence began to be laid upon the wearing of the surplice, then the Puritans began to complain that the Queen's requirements were more rigid than Edward VI's had been, (1) and they began to realize that Elizabeth regarded the arrangements of 1559 as unalterable, a *modus vivendi* to which she had agreed reluctantly and from which she was not to be moved. Only then did they begin to insist upon their total demands.

The Bishops seem to have intended to ease the severity of the Vestiarian controversy by using the Parliament of 1566 to obtain a relaxation of the Injunctions relating to the habit of the (2) clergy. But most of that Parliament's time, as Neale has shown, (3) was absorbed in discussions about the succession to the throne in the event of Elizabeth's death, and the Bishops do not appear to have made any attempt to get the Injunctions altered.

In this Parliament a number of private Bills which, if they had received the royal assent, would have corrected some of the worst abuses in the Church, came to nothing. The Queen herself intervened to stop the discussion of a Bill which would have required (4) the clergy to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.

(1) Z.L.ii.159 (2) Z.L.i.142 (3) op.cit.165ff (4) In stopping the Bill the Queen stood upon her prerogative to deal directly with ecclesiastical legislation without Parliament and only after taking the advice of the Metropolitan or of an Ecclesiastical Commission. Such a commission might have been made up of a few Bishops, or of all the Bishops, or, if she chose to appoint it as a commission, of the whole Convocation.

It was Elizabeth's policy not to trouble her subjects with tests of their religious beliefs such as the Thirty-nine Articles would have become under this Bill. Provided their actions were in accordance with the law, Elizabeth wished to leave her people in peaceful possession of their opinions. ⁽¹⁾ This Bill was directed against any of the clergy who might still be harbouring papist opinions. But to the Puritans it must have appeared that their Queen was favouring crypto-papists and their scruples at the same time as she was heedless of their own.

⁽²⁾
The Parliament was dissolved on 2nd January 1567. On or about the same date "certain dear brethren" addressed five articles of enquiry to the Church of Geneva. These articles, which are extant in the reply they elicited from Geneva, constitute a further sign of the widening gulf between Puritan and Anglican, and they may well have been prompted by the disappointment caused by the failure of the Parliament to advance the reformation of the Church. The reply from Geneva was signed by eighteen ministers of that Church, and must therefore be regarded as an official communication, not as a private letter from Beza, even though he was the first to ⁽³⁾ sign.

(1) Neale, op.cit.191 (2) Ibid 171 (3) There is a mystery about the date of Geneva's answer. In the 1642 edition of "Troubles at Frankfurt", p.181, it is given as 24th Oct.1547, which is manifestly wrong. In Strype's "Grindal" (S.G.507ff) it is dated 24th Oct.1567, which is much more probable. However, in the examination on 20th June 1567 of certain separatists arrested the previous day at the Plumbers' Hall, Grindal quoted the letter verbatim (~~S.G.507ff~~ Parker Society, Remains of Abp Grindal, p.209) and the accused were clearly already acquainted with it. Strype agrees with the date of this examination (S.G. 174) and is therefore involved in an inconsistency. It would be unsafe to say more than that Geneva's answer was probably written some time in 1567.

Among the queries of the English Puritans, the second and third were about the attire of the clergy, antiphonal singing of the Psalms, the sign of the cross and the questions addressed to the sponsors at Baptisms, kneeling and the use of wafer-bread at the Communion, and so on. Geneva's advice was that these things should be tolerated rather than the ministry abandoned. But if a minister was required to declare that these things were lawful, then he should resign rather than do so.

The fourth query was about the lawfulness of private Baptism by a midwife (or presumably by any other layperson). Geneva regarded this as a practice not to be tolerated. Ministers should denounce it, and should not accept such Baptisms as valid. ⁽¹⁾

It is in the first and fifth queries that the widening of the gap between Puritan theory and Anglican practice is to be found. The first query was,

"Whether we can approve this disorder in calling of men to the function of the ministry, which is that the multitude of those which sue for order shall be enrolled in the ministry both without the voices of elders, and also no certain cure appointed them, but lightly examined of their lives and behaviour. To whom also at the lust of the Bishop shall liberty be given afterwards to preach the Word of God for a time prescribed, otherwise to rehearse only the Church service."

To this the ministers of Geneva replied,

"Such callings of ministers, whether we answer them by the rule of God's express word, or else by the force of canons that are best tried and allowed, are holden and esteemed of us altogether unlawful, albeit we know that it is better to

(1) The private Baptism of a dying infant was condemned because it seemed to imply the necessity of Baptism to salvation, whereas faith was held to be the sole necessity.

"have half a loaf than no bread... If the case were ours, we would not receive this ministry upon these conditions if it were proffered; a great deal less would we sue for it. Notwithstanding, we exhort these men (i.e. the English Puritan clergy)... that... they do courageously abide (in the ministry), yet with the condition that it may be lawful for them holily and religiously to exercise all their whole ministry, and therefore may also propound and urge those things in their cures which do always appertain to the advancement of the better estate ~~therein~~ therein. For otherwise, if they be forced of this liberty, and so willed to wink at manifest abuses that they should also approve these things which doubtless ought to be redressed, what things else can we persuade them, than that they should retire from this to their private life, rather than without conscience to nourish that mischief which doth of force draw with it the whole wasting and decay of all the congregation."

The Genevan ministers paraphrased the fifth query as follows:-

"It is also reported to us that the keys of binding and loosing are practised in certain courts of the Bishops, neither by the sentences and judgments of Elders, which office that Church hath not yet received, nor according to the Word of God, but by the authority of certain lawyers and other like, ~~an~~ which is more oftentimes by the authority of some one man, and that also for such kind of actions as are pure money matters."

They answered it thus:-

"The right of excommunicating and binding of the offender shall be found never to have been, before the time of the papists, in the power and hand of one sole person, but did appertain to all the whole Eldership... Nor did the Apostle (Paul) ever think to burden the Eldership with the hearing of such mere civil causes... Therefore, if in England anything be done contrary to this, surely we ought to think that by such sentences and judgments there is not any man before God any more bound than by the popish excommunications. And we wish that this torment-house of consciences and loathsome prophanation of the ecclesiastical and mere spiritual jurisdiction might, by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, out of hand be abolished... and that Eldership and Deacons may be restored and set up according to the word of God and canons of the pure church... In the meanwhiles, the things which are not well done... may well enough be tolerated... But if so be that (the Puritans) shall be forced

"not only to tolerate this faction, but also to approve this excommunication as lawful, and be constrained to ask unlawful absolution; to assent to this manifest abuse, we then exhort them that they will rather suffer any kind of trouble than to do herein against their consciences."

The Genevan pastors gave a sidelong glance at schism when they mentioned, as a possible outcome of driving the Puritans too hard against their consciences,

"that against the Prince's and the Bishops' wills they should exercise their offices."

But the thought was quickly dismissed as something which

"we do so much the more tremble at because of those reasons which of themselves are plain enough, albeit we do not utter them."

Thus the Puritan minister who was not allowed to use his ministry to advocate and to some extent to carry out in his parish the ideals of Puritanism was left by Geneva with the alternative
(1)
of retiring into private life.

II.

(2)

In the persons of Sampson and Humphrey the University of Oxford had been the hub of the Vestiarian controversy, but in the later stages of the Puritan revolt against the settlement of 1559 Cambridge was to take over the leadership.

In 1565 the Fellows and students of St John's College refused/
(3)
the surplice in their chapel. Thomas Cartwright, the future leader of English Puritanism, played no part in this early example

(1) Troubles at Frankfort, 171-181 (2) Although an Oxford don, Sampson had been educated in Cambridge, and in his early years had been a Fellow of Pembroke. Porter, op.cit.94. (3) Scott Pearson, Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 19. S.A.1.ii.153.

of Cambridge disapproval of the Church of England as by law established, for he was then in Ireland. But in 1566 he returned to his Fellowship at Trinity, and the next year, as a result of his forceful preaching, all but three of the ~~Fellowships~~ Fellows and students of that College discarded their surplices. The affair did not, however, prevent Cartwright's appointment in 1569 as Lady Margaret
(1)
Professor of Divinity, and it was not until he occupied this chair that he became involved in any serious trouble.

Cartwright chose to lecture to the University on the Acts of the
(2)
Apostles. If he had contented himself with exposition no objection would have been made against his lectures, except upon the purely academic ground of the accuracy or otherwise of his interpretation of Scripture. But Cartwright went beyond exposition. He said in effect, "the ~~apostolic~~ Apostolic Church was such and such. The Church of England should be like the Apostolic Church. Insofar as it is not like it, it must be reformed until it becomes like it." Cartwright trespassed, that is to say, upon delicate matters of politics, and so complaints were/
laid
before Cecil, the Chancellor of the University.
(3)
In 1570, after being refused the degree of Doctor of Divinity,
(4)
Cartwright was deprived of his Chair, but he retained his Fellowship at Trinity. Freed from duties in the University, he travelled to Geneva where he became a friend of Beza and for a while lectured
(5)
in the Divinity School.

The chief agent in Cartwright's downfall was John Whitgift, the

(1) Scott Pearson, op.cit. 25 (2) Ibid 26. (3) Ibid 30 (4) S.W.iii.17
(5) Scott Pearson, op.cit. 47

Vice-Chancellor. But this was not the first encounter between the two men. Whitgift was Master of Trinity, and had failed to get Cartwright to wear the prescribed clerical habit.⁽¹⁾ He complained that Cartwright had caused him "much trouble" at Trinity, and the College "great contention".⁽²⁾

Whitgift entered Cambridge as a student at Pembroke towards the end of Edward VI's reign.⁽³⁾ Early in Queen Mary's reign he became a Fellow of Peterhouse under Andrew Perne,⁽⁴⁾ with whom he formed a lifelong friendship. Perne achieved some remarkable feats of conformity to ecclesiastical law during his years in Cambridge. In 1551, as Vice-Chancellor, he led the funeral procession of Bucer, the Regius Professor of Divinity. In 1557 he was again Vice-Chancellor, and preached at the disinterring and dishonouring of Bucer's remains. In 1560 he was yet again Vice-Chancellor, and the chief officiant at the memorial service which restored Bucer to the respect of Englishmen.⁽⁵⁾ Perne was a typical "Vicar of Bray", but there is no need to suspect him of insincerity. Like Cranmer, he must have held the view that it was the duty of a Christian to obey the "godly prince" in matters of religion. Unlike Cranmer, he refused to regard Mary as ungodly, and therefore he never went in peril of his life.

Just as Matthew Parker hid from Mary so, in a sense, Whitgift hid from her behind Perne, who protected him from examination by Cardinal Pole's visitation of the University.⁽⁶⁾ Cartwright, who had

(1) Scott Pearson op.cit. 28 (2) Ibid 429 (3) Dawley, John Whitgift and the Reformation, 39. (4) Ibid 44 (5) Ibid (6) Ibid 45.

entered St John's College in 1550, also in a sense hid from Queen Mary, for he became a barrister's clerk during the latter part of her reign, returning to his college in 1559, and receiving a Fellowship there in 1560.⁽¹⁾ Both he and Whitgift must have conformed to some extent during Mary's reign, or they would have attracted unwelcome attention to themselves, but Whitgift's case was the clearer because of his association with Perne, and Cartwright felt able later on to taunt him with having "a gift for conformity".⁽²⁾

Indeed, conformity brought Whitgift rich rewards. Early in 1567 he was still a Fellow of Peterhouse, but was also Lady Margaret Professor. Four years later he had been Master of Pembroke, Regius Professor,⁽³⁾ and Vice-Chancellor, and was Master of Trinity,⁽⁴⁾ Prebendary of Ely, and Dean of Lincoln. Ahead of him lay the Sees of Worcester and Canterbury.

As Whitgift's career advanced, so Cartwright's declined, and it remained for Whitgift to bring it to an end so far as Cambridge was concerned.⁽⁵⁾ Early in 1572, at the request of his friends, Cartwright left Geneva and returned to Trinity where he had been a Fellow since 1562.⁽⁶⁾ Whitgift now realized that this troublesome member of his College had failed to keep the terms of the oath he had taken upon admission to his Fellowship; he was still in Deacon's orders, and should have been priested within seven years of becoming a Master of Arts; he had held his Fellowship for five years longer than he ought to have done, and without hesitation

(1) Scott Pearson, op.cit. 8 (2) W.ii.51 (3) Dawley, op.cit. 78

(4) Ibid 84 (5) Scott Pearson, op.cit.50 (6) Ibid 10

(1)

Whitgift ejected him from it.

(2)

(3)

Knappen and Scott Pearson describe Cartwright's neglect of his oath respectively as a "technicality" and a "technical offence". But Cartwright did not complain that his neglect was an oversight which he was not allowed to put right. Instead he tried to justify himself by saying that those who had framed the College statutes had required this oath so as to prevent Fellows from taking up studies, secular ~~occupations~~ and to provide the College with a body of preachers. He had fulfilled those purposes sufficiently as a Deacon. He could not, however, have known what was in the minds of those who drew up the statutes, and his description of their purpose is, at the best, mere guesswork. At the worst it may be nothing more than an excuse.

(4)

In the course of their controversy Whitgift asked Cartwright,

"What honesty is there to swear to statutes and laws, and, when you have done so, contrary to your oath to break them, and yet still to remain under them, and enjoy that place which requireth obedience and subjection to them"? (5)

To which question Cartwright replied with another:-

"What conscience is there that bindeth a man to depart from his living in that place where he liketh not of all the orders which are there used? Is it not enough to abstain from them if there be any evil in them?" (6)

The context of these questions was not Cartwright's oath, but they serve to illustrate his attitude to circumstances very similar to his own. He wished to retain his Fellowship, but he had developed doubts about the manner in which ordination was administered in the
)))-----
 (1) Scott Pearson, op.cit. 429 (2) op.cit. 236 (3) op.cit. 66.
 (4) Ibid (5) W.iii.321 (6) Ibid 324

Church of England, and so he tried to make the best of both worlds by disregarding the terms of his oath. This was the "technical offence" (as Scott Pearson says) of perjury, i.e. of breaking an oath, although not perjury in the more usual sense of lying whilst under an oath to speak the truth. But it cannot be dismissed, as Knappen dismisses it, by calling it a "technicality".⁽¹⁾

The controversy which later arose between Cartwright and Whitgift was more than the extension of previous differences, and more than an academic quarrel between two theologians, although these elements played their parts in the controversy. Whitgift was a disciple of Perne's, and had never been out of England. When Cartwright first entered St John's the Master was Thomas Lever, who was to become an exile in Geneva. When Cartwright re-entered the College in 1559⁽²⁾ the Master was James Pilkington, who had been an exile in Geneva. When he lost the Lady Margaret Chair Cartwright himself became a Genevan by residence. If these varying backgrounds are taken into account, the controversy is seen to be much more than a battle between Whitgift and Cartwright. It was a conflict between native English ideas of reform and continental ideas as developed in one Swiss Church; a clash between Canterbury and Geneva.

(1) Brook, Whitgift and the English Church, p.30 expresses doubting surprise that Whitgift should claim that he did not know earlier that he could eject Cartwright under the College statutes. But in the absence of evidence to the contrary Whitgift is entitled to be believed on this point. Brook also says that the requirement that Fellows should be ordained was widely neglected. But there is no evidence that Whitgift in other cases allowed it to be neglected after he had realized that the requirement was there. Whitgift was not the type of man who knowingly allows rules to be disobeyed.

(2) Porter, op.cit. 96.

III.

The years following the Parliament of 1566 saw not only a growth of Puritan opposition to the established religion, but also an increase in papist opposition, for in 1569 there occurred the revolt in the north of England, and in 1570 news reached England of the Papal Bull by which Elizabeth was excommunicated and her subjects released from their allegiance to her. Divisions in the country were therefore much sharper when a new Parliament was called in 1571.

In this Parliament a Bill was passed which required the clergy to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, but only to those of them which dealt with the confession of the true Christian faith and with the doctrine of the sacraments⁽¹⁾. The Bill was aimed at any crypto-papists who might still be in the ministry; Puritans were protected from its force by the exclusion from subscription of those Articles which dealt with Church government and discipline.

Much as she disliked doctrinal tests, the circumstances of the time obliged the Queen to assent to the Bill. The Bishops, for their part, seized the opportunity to discipline their Puritan as well as their papist clergy. To the subscription required by the Act they demanded another by which the subscriber declared that the Book of Common Prayer contained nothing repugnant to the Word of God, and that the manner and order appointed for the administration of the sacraments and for common prayer, together with the apparel appointed for the clergy, were not wicked nor against the Word of God.⁽²⁾

(1) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 478 (2) Frere and Douglas, Puritan Manifestoes, 20, 35,

The second of these additional declarations contained references to the "public authority" and "sufficient authority" upon which the demand that it should be made was based. These references are seemingly to the Act of Uniformity, the Injunctions, and perhaps to the Advertisements. Both declarations were aimed at the kind of subversion which the ministers of Geneva had recommended the Puritan clergy to practise in their cures, but they avoid any violation of the intention of the Act of 1571 to exclude matters of Church government from becoming subjects of subscription.

Parliament was called together again in 1572, and the Puritans used the occasion for a counter-attack. They introduced in the Commons a Bill which Neale calls

"an astounding piece of effrontery." (2)

In its preamble this Bill described as "malicious adversaries of the truth" those who tried to enforce the observance of the Book of Common Prayer, and it confessed that many of the clergy, with the connivance of their Bishops, had not observed that Book for a long time. The Bill prayed the Queen to enact that the penalties laid down in the Act of Uniformity be enforced only against papists. It asked that the clergy, with the consent of a majority of the Bishops, be given discretion to omit any parts of the services they pleased in favour of preaching or "any other godly exercise". As an alternative to omissions from the services of the Prayer Book, the Bill prayed that the clergy be allowed to substitute for them the services used in the French and Dutch reformed Churches in

(1) Frere and Douglas, op.cit.35 (2) op.cit.298

England, i.e. to use the Genevan service book in place of the Book of Common Prayer,

"any Act or Acts, Injunction, Advertisement, or Decree heretofore had or made to the contrary notwithstanding."(1)

After revision into a much more moderate prayer, the Bill was stopped by the Queen, who also commanded that no further measures concerning religion should be discussed until they had been considered and liked by the Bishops. ⁽²⁾ Forbidden in this way to take the initiative in ecclesiastical legislation in Parliament, the Puritans issued the famous "Admonition to the Parliament" in June 1572, less than a month after the stopping of their Bill.

In so far as it was addressed to Parliament, the Admonition bypassed the Queen's prerogative in matters of religion. In so far as it was never presented to Parliament, but was printed and sold throughout the kingdom, the Admonition appealed for popular ~~support~~ support over the head of Parliament. In so far as it was an anonymous publication, the authors of the Admonition confessed that they knew who was hindering the changes they wanted to put into effect in the Church, and that they feared her wrath. Their

"appeal to our sovereign, and the whole state, (against) our bishops, and the rest of that sort,"(3)

included the Queen, therefore, only out of motives of tact.

(1) Frere and Douglas, op.cit. 149-151 (2) Neale, op.cit. 302
 (3) Frere and Douglas, op.cit. 39.

IV.

The "Admonition to the Parliament" properly so called was the first of two pamphlets which were published together. They were furnished with a common preface and with an appendix consisting of two letters from Switzerland. But there was no common title page, and so the whole publication took its title from the first of the pamphlets.

The first pamphlet proffered for its readers' consideration

"a true platform of a church reformed"

which they were invited

"with singular love to embrace, and careful endeavour to plant".

They were also invited to

"learn... with perfect hatred to detest"

the opposite of this platform, the Church of England as by law established. If the readers did not respond to these invitations they would be

"without excuse before the majesty of our God... Who hath by us revealed unto you at this present the sincerity and ~~simplicity~~ simplicity of his Gospel".(1)

A comparison was then drawn, in some detail, between the ministry of the word of God, the administration of the sacraments, and ecclesiastical discipline, all as practised at that time in the Church of England, and

"the prescript of God's word."(2)

-->-----

(1) Frere and Douglas, op.cit. 8. A certainty of divine inspiration was characteristic of many Elizabethan Puritans, and one which made it a difficult task to reason with them. (2) Ibid. 9. Knappen (op. cit. 234) calls this comparison "a shrewd application of the New Testament golden-age standard to the current establishment." Whitgift, however, was able to show that the supposed New Testament standard was no more than a creation of the imagination.

The second pamphlet, entitled

"A View of Popish Abuses yet remaining in the English Church", was an apologia for those of the clergy who had been deprived for refusing to subscribe to the declarations drawn up after the Parliament of 1571. The author declared that these men, although they had objected to the declarations concerning the Prayer Book and the apparel, had had little or no objection to subscribing to those Articles of Religion which concerned doctrine. Nevertheless, in his margin the author asserted that the right government of the Church could not properly be separated from true doctrine.

"Christ should be suffered to reign, a true ministry according to the word instituted, Discipline exercised, sacraments purely and sincerely ministered. This is what we strive for." (1)

The Book of Common Prayer was, the author said,

"an unperfect book, culled and picked out of that popish dunghill, the Mass book full of all abominations. For some, and many, of the contents therein be such as are against the word of God." (2)

As for the prescribed articles of clerical apparel,

"they are as the garments of Balamites, of popish priests, enemies to God and all Christians." (3)

The first of the two letters in the Appendix was the one which Gualter had written to Parkhurst in 1566, wherein he charged the Bishops with "cowardly connivance". The second had also been written in 1566, by Beza to Grindal. In it, Beza only just stopped short of committing himself to what Whitgift was later to describe as

(1) Frere and Douglas, op.cit. 37 (2) Ibid 21 (3) Ibid 35

(4) Ibid 41. The choice of this letter was unfortunate, for Whitgift was able to show that Gualter had repudiated it. (5) Ibid 43

"two false principles and rotten pillars, whereof the one is, that we must of necessity have the same kind of government that was in the Apostles' time, and is expressed in the scriptures, and no other; the other is, that we may not in any wise or in any consideration, retain in the church anything that hath been abused under the pope."(1)

Few Puritans who read Beza's letter can have avoided falling into the errors defined here by Whitgift. Those who fell included the
(2)
authors of the Admonition pamphlets.

In July 1572 two young Puritan clergymen, John Field and Thomas Wilcox, were arrested and imprisoned for writing the Admonition literature. While they were in prison they, or their friends, brought out a second edition of their work, thoroughly revised. Some of the alterations from the first edition were matters of substance, as, for example,

"Then (in the Apostles' time) election (of ministers) was made by the common consent of the whole church."

In the second edition this became,

"Then election was made by the elders, with the common consent of the whole church."(3)

Which, as Whitgift remarked,

"altereth the matter something."(4)

Changes of this kind in the text of the Admonition caused Whitgift to complain that Field and Wilcox, after condemning the whole state of the Church and setting forward a new platform, were

"through unskilfulness and indiscretion at the first, constrained to mislike that new platform also, and to piece it and patch it like a beggar's cloak."(5)

)))-----
(1) W.i.6 (2) All the criticisms of the Church of England which appear in the Admonition re-appeared in the controversy between Whitgift and Cartwright, and it is therefore unnecessary to deal with them in detail at this point. (3) Frere and Douglas, *op.cit.* 10 (4) W.iii.471 (5) Ibid 468

The issuing of a second edition afforded an opportunity, which was taken, of revising the scripture references with which the margins of both pamphlets were liberally sprinkled. Of the Admonitioners' use of Scripture, even after revision, Whitgift said,

"In that book the scripture is most intolerably abused and unlearnedly applied, quoted only in their margent to delude both such as for lack of learning cannot, and such as either for slothfulness or some prejudicate opinion will not, examine the same." (1)

Even Cartwright, who defended the general position adopted in the Admonition, felt obliged to say,

"I will not deny but that there be some few places quoted which might have been spared." (2)

Some of the seemingly absurd scripture references, he went on to explain, were due to printer's errors; others were due to the authors' habit of citing scripture

"not only to prove the matter which (they) handle, but sometimes also to note the place from whence the phrase of speech is taken." (3)

The Admonition could not be effectively answered by ~~the~~ imprisoning its authors, and the task of refuting its arguments was committed by Archbishop Parker to Whitgift.⁽⁴⁾ It was while Whitgift was engaged upon his "Answer to the Admonition" that he ~~is~~ deprived Cartwright of his Fellowship.

Also while the "Answer to the Admonition" was in preparation there appeared in the bookshops "A Second Admonition to the Parliament". Its anonymous author essayed to give members of Parliament fuller information on the methods to be used to bring about the

(1) W.1.58 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid (4) S.W. 1.65

(1)
 changes demanded in the first "Admonition" Although addressed to Parliament, this second Admonition, like the first, was never presented to Parliament, for at the time of its publication Parliament was prorogued and was later dissolved without a further session. Nor was the publication intended for Parliament alone, as the author admitted when he said

"The knowledge of the matters, as it must needs go further, so are they necessary to be further known, and they are the liker to take good effect by means of the general consent of those that like them."(2)

The "how" of further reformation advocated by the author was comprised in three points. So that ministers might be elected by popular vote, all patronage, royal, episcopal, or private, was to be abolished. So that the parishes might be furnished with a learned clergy, the Bishops were to be put into benefices, and any remaining deficiency was to be supplied from the staffs of the Universities. So that the ministry might be adequately paid, Sees and Cathedrals were to be disendowed.⁽³⁾

The author of the "Second Admonition" gave the clearest, not to say the crudest, definition of the place of the Crown in the Church that can be found in Puritan literature:-

"None is so high in her commonwealth as her Majesty; none to use the sword but she, and whom she appointeth under her... so that it be not repugnant unto their vocations, as to ministers. Likewise, none is so high in the Church as Christ, none to do anything, nor anything to be done in his Church, but as it is appointed in His word, either by precise or general direction. And therefore it is allowed and commanded to Christian men to try all things,

(1) Frere and Douglas, op.cit.90 (2) Ibid 81 (3) Ibid 95, 131f

"and to hold that which is good, whosoever forbid without exception, Prince or other... Though the law be offended, that law is to be reformed, and not we to be punished."(1)

The Queen, however, was to be required to enforce ecclesiastical laws in the making of which she was to have no part other than as an ordinary lay member of the Church.

"It is her Majesty that by her princely authority should see every of these things put in practice, and punish those that neglect them."(2)

This author displayed the usual Puritan certainty of Divine inspiration, but he also uttered vague threats of still more inspired writers of anonymous pamphlets yet to appear;

"The same God that hath stirred me, a man unknown, to speak... will daily stir up more as yet unknown... well able to write and speak in the matter."(3)

With unconscious humour he described these future writers as "great troubles" which would come of neglecting his recommendations.

Knappen describes the "Second Admonition" as not

"comparable either in point of artistry or in point of logic to the First Admonition."(4)

The greater artistry of the first "Admonition" may be conceded, but it is a harsh condemnation indeed to say that the Second Admonitioner was less logical than Field and Wilcox. In the Introduction to his "Answer" Whitgift paid special attention to the logic of the two young Puritans, and tore it to shreds. Again and again he succeeded in reducing their arguments to absurdities, and this formed an important and effective part of his refutation. He classified their errors under five headings, viz:-

(1) Frere and Douglas, op.cit, 93 (2) Ibid 130 (3) Ibid 129
(4) op.cit. 235

(a) *Petitio principii*, i.e. assuming that to be true which was in question as to its truth.

(b) Argument from example or from negative example; i.e. the Apostles did so and so, therefore other Christians must do the same; or, such and such things were not done by the Apostles, therefore no Christian must ever do them.

(c) Argument from negative authority; i.e. whatever was not commanded in Holy Scripture must not be done. Whitgift allowed that in matters pertaining to salvation this argument was valid, for nothing that was not in Scripture might be taken as necessary to salvation. In other matters it was not a valid argument.

(d) Argument from negative by comparison; e.g. ministers are to be known by their doctrine, and not by their apparel, therefore ministers must not wear a distinctive apparel. But such negatives must only be understood, Whitgift said, by way of comparison; i.e. a distinctive apparel is a mark of difference, but not one to be so highly esteemed as doctrine.

(e) Attributing the wrong cause; e.g. blaming the Book of Common Prayer for the ignorance of the clergy, when the fault lay either in the clergy themselves or in those who ordained them. (1)

When Whitgift's "Answer to the Admonition" was published it was found that he had, according to the custom of his time, reproduced the whole of his opponents' book verbatim, and had replied to it sentence by sentence. The changes in the second addition of the first "Admonition", together with the Second Admonition, were treated less fully in a short addendum. The letters from Gualter and Beza in the first "Admonition" were balanced by more recent
(2)
letters from Gualter and Bullinger. The letter from Gualter was especially effective, for it not only withdrew the charge of "cowardly connivance" which its author had levelled against the Bishops in his earlier letter, but it also accused the Puritans whose reports had been the cause of that charge of having indulged

(1) W.i.60ff (2) W.iii.496.

in deliberate lying. It also hinted strongly that Beza had been
 (1)
 similarly deceived.

Frere and Douglas gave the date of publication of Whitgift's
 "Answer" as February 1573, and cited Strype's "Life of Whitgift"
 (2)
 as their authority. Strype gives no such date, and it is an im-
 possible one anyway, for Field and Wicox issued a brief rejoinder
 (3)
 to the "Answer" from their prison on 4th December 1572. Scott
 Pearson gives the date as before 21st November 1572, and quotes a
 (4)
 letter from Tomson to Gilby as evidence. He thinks that Frere
 and Douglas confused the date of the "Answer" with that of Whit-
 gift's later work "The Defence of the Answer", which appeared in
 (5)
 print in February 1574. It may be added that the source of this
 confusion can be seen in the covering letter which Whitgift wrote
 to Cecil when he sent him a copy of the "Defence". This letter
 is dated 5th February 1573, but it is an "old style" dating. In
 the "new style" the year would be given as 1574. Frere and Doug-
 las failed to allow for this, and they also mistook "the book of
 Defence" mentioned in Whitgift's letter for the earlier "Answer".
 (6)
 Scott Pearson's date can be accepted with confidence, and even
 though it is not quite precise it is as near as it is necessary
 or possible to get to the actual date.

(1) See p. 110 (2) Frere and Douglas op.cit.xviii. (3) 2P.R.i.83
 (4) Scott Pearson, op.cit.68 (5) Ibid (6) W.iii.60lf.

V.

If Cartwright was concerned at all in the writing of either of the Admonitions, he was only indirectly concerned. The long-standing idea that he was the author of the "Second Admonition"⁽¹⁾ has been conclusively disproved by Scott Pearson. He was, however, Puritanism's leading scholar and the most capable exponent of its views. It was therefore natural that when Whitgift attacked the Admonition literature, Cartwright should defend it, and after his expulsion from his Fellowship he had the leisure to do so.

Frere and Douglas give May 1573 as the date of publication of Cartwright's "Reply" to Whitgift,⁽²⁾ but this is impossible, for on 30th April 1573 Sandys wrote to Cecil,

"I could never come by (Cartwright's) book, although it is current amongst many."⁽³⁾

This suggests that the "Reply" had been in print for some time, but for exactly how long must remain a matter of conjecture. Perhaps March 1573, as Scott Pearson implies, is about the correct date.⁽⁴⁾ This means that Cartwright had carried out his task, including an allowance of time for printing, in about four months.

His work shows the marks of the haste which accompanied its preparation; it is wordy and often turgid, and sometimes self-contradictory as, for example, where Cartwright says that a minister may not preach in another minister's cure, and then suggests that if a minister's health or voice prevents him from preaching, he should

(1) Scott Pearson, op.cit. 74 (2) Frere and Douglas, op.cit.xxiii
(3) Ibid 152 (4) op.cit. 83

(1)

call in a neighbouring minister to help him.

Away from Cambridge Cartwright was badly handicapped by a lack of books to which he could refer. To meet this deficiency he had to rely upon "Collections", books of quotations from, and paraphrases of, the Fathers, gathered together by a variety of editors. The chief of these, and the one to which he acknowledged himself most indebted, was the "Catalogus Testium Veritatis" of Flacius Illyricus.⁽²⁾ These "Collections" were not always dependable, and from time to time Whitgift was able to quote the original text of one or other of the Fathers to confound Cartwright's interpretation of someone else's opinion of what the text meant.

Contrary to custom Cartwright did not reprint the whole of Whitgift's "Answer", but only those parts of it that he wished to refute. The reason for this was probably the difficulty of printing anything at all, and much less a lengthy work, on a secret press. But Whitgift attributed it to a lack of plain dealing, and accused his opponent of misleading the readers by suppressing those arguments that he was unable to refute.⁽³⁾ Cartwright's "Reply" certainly had its defects, but they would not be apparent to anyone but an expert, and so Whitgift had to take up the task of rebuttal.

The "Defence of the Answer" is a massive work, for it incorporates the whole of the original "Answer", the whole of Cartwright's "Reply to the Answer", and Whitgift's lengthy comments on the "Reply".

(1) W.111.23 (2) The "Catalogue" was first published in 1556.
 (3) W.1.16.

Apart from criticising his subject-matter, Whitgift had two main weapons against his opponent. One of the very few secular authors quoted by Cartwright was Aristotle, for whom it appears that he had an admiration. Thus Whitgift taunted him by saying,

"Your definition of *μαρτυρία* out of Aristotle is needless, but only that thereby we may know you be an Aristotelian." (1)

And so Cartwright was brought under the fire of Aristotle's logic. He was found guilty (as indeed he was) of all the errors of reasoning that Field and Wilcox had committed and, in addition, of arguing off the point, of using conjecture wholesale, of trying to prove his points by means of analogies, and so on.

Whitgift's second main weapon was Calvin. If the great Frenchman could be shown to be against Cartwright, then waverers might be deterred from drifting over to the Puritan side, and some of the more reasonable Puritans might even be won back. Hence as the controversy unfolded point by point, Whitgift's quotations from Calvin followed with monotonous regularity. Indeed, when Calvin is not quoted the reader is left with the feeling that something important is missing from the argument.

Whitgift caused confusion in quoting Calvin's "Institutes" because he persisted in using the edition of 1553, a copy of which he had marked and annotated for his own purposes. Cartwright used the final edition of 1559 and sometimes could not find in it the passages to which Whitgift had referred. Whitgift was at fault in this, for he was well aware that there had been two revisions of

(1) W.i.167 ~~xx~~

the "Institutes" after 1553, and he should have taken the latest shape of Calvin's work as that scholar's most considered opinion. (1)

Whitgift was able sometimes to quote even Beza against Cartwright, and the impression created by these comparisons with Calvin and Beza is that the pupil was more zealous than his masters. This, indeed, is generally true of English Puritanism as compared with Genevan reform. As J.T.McNeill has it,

"It was to be characteristic of the English Puritans that they were more unyielding on points of worship and ceremony than their instructors, Calvin, Bucer, and Knox." (2)

Although Whitgift's reasoning was crisp and logical, (Scott Pearson calls it "lucid and impressive"), (3) it was apt upon occasion to break down. He asked, for example,

"How is it possible to receive the holy communion, but either sitting, standing, kneeling, walking, or lying; either at one time or another; in the morning or at night; before meat or after meat; clothed or naked; in this place or in that place, etc? And yet none of these circumstances are in scripture commanded, or by necessary collection may thereof be gathered." (4)

Cartwright did not face this argument squarely, and avoided it by saying,

"M.Doctor (Whitgift) maketh it an indifferent thing for men and women to receive the supper of the Lord clothed or naked. This savoureth strongly of the Adamites." (5)

Whitgift was infuriated by this reply, and retorted,

"I do not say that it is 'an indifferent thing'; I know it doth necessarily appertain to comeliness; but I deny it to be particularly expressed in the scriptures." (6)

(1) W.ii.268,326,502 (2) The History and Character of Calvinism, 310 *** (3) op.cit.129 (4) W.i.62 (5) Ibid (6) Ibid 64

But in the technical sense that things not decided by Scripture are "adiaphora", things indifferent, this was an indifferent thing. Whitgift might reasonably have argued that although it was "indifferent" in itself, it had lost that quality because it was also a matter of decency, which was certainly not a thing indifferent but was commanded in Scripture. He did not, however, give that explanation. Instead, he became confused between the technical term "indifferent" and the popular phrase "a matter of indifference", which means a "matter of no importance". In his confusion he momentarily lost sight of the technical definition of "indifference" as something not expressly commanded or prohibited in Scripture.

Occasionally Whitgift was an advocate in a bad cause. He was willing to admit that it was corrupt practice to commute a sentence of excommunication for a money payment, regardless of the excommunicated person's repentance, or lack of it.⁽¹⁾ But he defended pluralism with its consequence, the non-residence of the Incumbent in at least one of his benefices. On this matter Knappen says,

"When reminded of his own pluralism, (Whitgift) could only mumble 'Anabaptism', and profess his willingness to defend himself against any properly legal charge."⁽²⁾

In neither of the places cited by Knappen did Whitgift offer to defend himself against a legal charge. What he did was to try to justify non-residence by scriptural example. St Paul had called Timothy and Titus away from their flocks, he argued, and therefore⁽³⁾ a pastor might upon occasion be absent from his flock. But in the

(1) W.iii.277 (2) Knappen, op.cit. 239 (3) W.i.508.

context of Elizabethan absenteeism the question was not one of leaving the flock "upon occasion", but rather of continuous absence from the flock on the part of the person charged with the care of it.

Again, on this same subject, Whitgift expressed surprise that Cartwright should favour the uniting of two small parishes, if they adjoined each other, under one Incumbent, but was against the holding of benefices in plurality. ⁽¹⁾ Here Whitgift mistook the matter and argued off the point, a rare thing in him. The kind of plurality to which Cartwright objected was that under which an Incumbent held benefices many miles apart and could only effectively serve one of them.

VI.

Before turning to the details of Whitgift's controversy with Cartwright it remains to trace out some of the results of that encounter.

On 11th June 1573 Queen Elizabeth issued a Proclamation in

(1) W.1.529. Brook (op.cit.50f, 130f, 147f) makes out a case in support of Whitgift's defence of pluralism on the ground that without it the clergy would have become so impoverished that learning would have perished among them. But Whitgift himself recognized it, as Brook shows, to be an evil, and tried to reduce it when he became Primate. The evil of pluralism lay chiefly in the absenteeism which it encouraged. But it must be admitted that there was absenteeism even where there was no pluralism. Hooker never resided in the Wiltshire parish of which he was Rector for four years. Adequate provision for a learned clergyman could not secure even to one parish the benefit of its Incumbent's learning

which she required all copies of

"the Admonition to the Parliament and all other books made for the defence of the said Admonition or agreeable therewith"(1)

to be handed over within twenty days to the Bishops or to the Privy Council. Twenty-one days later the City of London had handed over to its Bishop not a single copy of these books. (2)

On 11th December 1573 the Queen's commissioners for causes ecclesiastical ordered Cartwright's arrest

"for his unlawful dealings and other his most dangerous dealings and demeanours in matters touching religion and the state of this realm."(3)

But Cartwright had already fled to an exile in Germany, Switzerland, and the Low Countries that was to last for eleven years. (4) During these years he published in two parts his rejoinder to Whitgift's "Defence", the "Second Reply" appearing in 1575, and the "Rest of the Second Reply" in 1577. Although lengthy, these volumes added nothing of substance to the position he had already expounded in the first "Reply". (5)

If the sympathies of Geneva were with the Puritans, Zurich upheld the Anglicans. In a letter dated 26th August 1573 Gualter dealt with nine questions addressed to him by Bishop Cox. He approved of the titles and offices of Archbishops and Bishops, set forms of prayer, sponsors other than parents at Baptisms, and also of Confirmation provided that its administration contained no popish abuses. He disagreed with the equality of ministers, and

(1) Frere and Douglas, op.cit. 153f (2) Ibid (3) Scott Pearson, op.cit.433 (4) Ibid 130ff (5) Ibid 145ff

although he had been elected by the people to his own pastorate, he did not disparage other methods of appointment. He thought preaching to be an essential accompaniment of the Holy Communion, but not of Baptism. He approved the public reading of Scripture when there was no sermon, but preferred the reading to be followed (1) by an expository address. Thus, except for the sermon at the Holy Communion, Gualter was in favour of Anglican practice and against the Puritans, even though in some matters he thought ways other than the Anglican ones to be preferable.

On 8th October 1573 Gualter voiced to Sandys his dislike of the "Discipline" practised at Geneva and elsewhere, and advocated by the Puritans:-

"Many parties nowadays are insisting upon I know not what plan of church government, under the plausible name of ecclesiastical discipline; and they tell us that no churches can exist without it. But I am greatly afraid lest they should give birth to an aristocracy, which will shortly degenerate into an oligarchy, and be the beginning of a new papacy." (2)

He gave an example of the "Discipline" in practice. The Principal of a college in Heidelberg had been unjustly excommunicated by the presbytery of that city, which was dominated by the Pastor. He had appealed to the Prince Elector, but had found that ruler powerless to intervene.

On 16th March 1574 Gualter expressed to Cox his liking for State control of the Church in preference to control by a presbytery:

(1) Z.L.ii.225ff (2) Ibid 238 ~~(3)~~

"The Church of old had need of a government of its own, when it was subject to heathen sovereigns... But what is that to those... who... have magistrates well affected towards religion, who are enabled to establish and maintain moral discipline with far greater authority, and consequently more abundant benefit, than if they appointed ten presbyteries in every church."(1)

Six days before this letter of Gualter's, Bullinger had written something to Sandys and Grindal which shows how much the atmosphere of controversy had embittered the relations between Anglicans and Puritans. Those who had been exiles in Zurich had long made a practice of showing their appreciation of the hospitality shown to them in Queen Mary's reign by sending presents, often a length of English cloth, to their former hosts. Bullinger now sadly asked that this pleasant custom should stop, for

"I have seen a letter of your innovators, in which they state that the English Bishops send presents to learned men, to draw them back to their party. These men forsooth (such is their virulence) would be able to throw disgrace both upon us and our ministry."(2)

After the heat of the Admonition controversy had abated somewhat, it was found that the Puritan cause had suffered a temporary set-back. Cox attributed this to the stricter enforcement of uniformity. (3) The flight of Cartwright may have had its effect. Certainly the stabbing of Sir John Hawkins by an insane Puritan, (4) Birchet, helped to discredit the cause. How far Whitgift contributed to the set-back is difficult to assess. If the learned appreciated his works,

"the vulgar... did applaud and cry up Cartwright's Reply."(5)

(1) Z.L.ii.251 (2) Ibid 243, 248 (3) Z.L.i.299 (4) Knappen, op.cit. 243 (5) S.P. ii.253

When the later "Replies" of Cartwright appeared and Whitgift failed to answer them, it must have seemed that he had admitted defeat. In fact, his silence was due to a belief that he and Cartwright could put their time to better use. Perhaps a fair judgment would be that, although they deserved to succeed, Whitgift's "Answer" and "Defence" failed of their purpose. It is not difficult to see why. Whitgift had the more awkward task of pleading for the "status quo", while Cartwright was advocating something that had not been put to the test of experience, at anyrate in England. Then again, Whitgift was swimming against the tide of public opinion, and Cartwright with it, for in spite of the set-back in the Puritan cause, the main flow was still in its favour, and was soon to be resumed. But the greatest cause of Whitgift's failure lies in the nature of the writings of the two men. Whatever its faults, Cartwright's "Reply" moved its readers by the evident zeal and enthusiasm of its author, whose sincerity was confirmed by the price he had to pay for writing as he did. Whitgift's work, on the other hand, has a frosty brilliance about it which chills the heart, however much it may illuminate the mind, and although there is no need to doubt his sincerity, he was very far from having to prove it in loss and exile. His failure, however, is not to be regretted. If he had succeeded his "Defence" might have become the text-book of Anglicanism, and then the world would never have heard of Richard Hooker.

(1) 2P.R.1.215f

VII.

The fundamental difference between Whitgift and Cartwright, the difference which coloured their varying approaches to the many problems which they discussed, was a difference of view of the authority to be attributed to Holy Scripture.

There was, indeed, upon this matter, a great measure of agreement between the two men. Each agreed that, within its own sphere, the authority of Scripture was absolute. Each acknowledged that the Scriptures contained a body of doctrine necessary to salvation, and that nothing might be added to or subtracted from that doctrine. They were even agreed, against the Admonitioners, that certain matters of interest to the Church lay outside the authority of Scripture, and were thus at the discretion of the Church to determine. These things were the "adiaphora", the "things indifferent". But here agreement ended. Where was the line to be drawn between matters left to the discretion of the Church and matters determined for ever by the authority of the Scriptures? The Admonitioners had, in effect, denied the existence of any discretionary authority in the Church; they thought that everything could be, and should be, settled by Scripture. Cartwright allowed the existence of some area, although quite a narrow one, in which the Church was free to legislate for itself. By comparison Whitgift narrowed the field in which the authority of Scripture was to operate, and broadened the area of the "adiaphora". This basic difference is discussed in Tractate II of Whitgift's "Defence", entitled "Of the Authority of the Church in Things Indifferent."

Like planets revolving around the sun, all the other matters which Cartwright and Whitgift discussed revolved around this question of the authority of Scripture, the course which it was thought each "planet" should follow being decided by the power which each of the two controversialists attributed to the pull of the "sun", or to the power attributed to the Church to modify that pull.

The "planets" may be arranged in three groups, of which the first ^{is} ~~was~~ composed of Rites and Ceremonies. Since the matter of clerical apparel was so burning a question in Elizabethan England, Tractate VII, which deals with this subject, will be examined in some detail here, but it will not be necessary to ^{follow} the discussion of all the other objections which Field and Wilcox had gathered together against the rites and ceremonies of the Book of Common Prayer, for the principles underlying each problem are the same.

The second group is made up of questions of Church government. What authority ought a national ruler to have within the Church of that nation? What authority should be allowed to the whole laity, or to elected representatives of the laity, in the exercise of the Church's discretionary powers? How should the Church secure obedience to the laws of God, i.e. what form of "Discipline" should she use?

The third group of "planets" concerns the ministry of the Church. Were all ministers to be equal, or might one rule over many as a Bishop over his clergy? Should ministers be elected by the laity of the parishes in which they were to minister, or should they be

appointed by some outside authority? Should there be such offices in the Church as Archbishop, Metropolitan, Archdeacon, and so on? What was the function of a Deacon, and should there be an order of ^{functions} "Widows"? Some questions of the ~~functions~~ of ecclesiastical persons other than Deacons also fall within this group.

This arrangement of the questions in controversy does not follow Whitgift's order. He followed the order of the "Admonition". But the Admonition was made up of two pamphlets each of which had its own order and each of which overlapped the other to some extent. The result was that Whitgift's order was not order at all, but confusion of the material. His Tractate IX deals with "The Communion Book" (i.e. the Book of Common Prayer) and his Tractate XXI with "Subscribing to the Communion Book." Order can only be restored by re-arranging the material in some way which avoids the limitations imposed upon Whitgift by the follow-my leader attitude he adopted towards the Admonition.

VIII.

Field and Wilcox admonished Parliament to place

"in God's Church those things only which the Lord himself in his word commandeth." (1)

This implied, said Whitgift, that

"nothing is to be tolerated in the church of Christ... except it be expressed in the word of God." (2)

It also implied an argument from negative authority, which was bad

(1) W.i.175 (2) Ibid 176.

reasoning.

Cartwright strove loyally to uphold the Admonitioners, and in their defence drew a distinction between what had been "placed" by God in the Church and what might for a while be tolerated there. As we are to see, he held the view that in Scripture God has set out a pattern, complete in its details, of what the Church is to be like. Unlikeness to the pattern may be tolerated only so long as the Church is making an earnest effort to discover the pattern and to conform herself to it.

Cartwright drew a further distinction, this time between what was commanded in Scripture and what was "expressed" therein, and he asserted that many things were commanded and forbidden in the Word of God without being "expressed", i.e. without the fact that they were commanded or prohibited being expressly stated in so many words. He later called these unexpressed things matters which were "contained" in Scripture. Among these was the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. No doubt Cartwright used this doctrine as an illustration because it is not formulated in Scripture in definite terms, but the Christian is nevertheless required to believe it even though he is not required to do so by any commandment in Scripture.

Whitgift wanted to know how anything could possibly be commanded or forbidden in Scripture without being "expressed" there by a definite command or prohibition? But he recognized that there are some things which are "expressed" in Scripture not because they are

(1) W.i.176 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 178 note 1 (4) Ibid 177

explicitly stated, but because they are gathered by "necessary
 (1)
 collection", i.e. the mind is compelled to infer them from other
 things which Scripture expresses in precise terms. No doubt Whit-
 gift would have included the doctrine of the Trinity among those
 things which must necessarily be inferred from the Word of God.

Up to this point the difference between the two men was verbal,
 Cartwright distinguishing between things "expressed" and things
 "contained" in Scripture, and Whitgift including among things
 "expressed" some things which were matters of inference. They had
 still to come to the point of delimiting the extent of the things
 contained in, or to be inferred from, the Scriptures, and also of
 defining the authority of these things to bind the Christian and
 the Church.

Cartwright granted that argument from negative authority, of
 which error Whitgift had found Field and Wilcox guilty, was illegit-
 imate in human matters, but he would not allow that it was bad in
 connection with God and the Church.

"Forsomuch as the Lord God, determining to set before our
 eyes a perfect form of his church, is both able to do it
 and hath done it, a man may reason both ways necessarily:
 The Lord hath commanded that it should be in his church;
 therefore it must be: and of the other side: He hath not
 commanded; therefore it must not be."(2)

This is Cartwright's basic assumption. But has God, in fact, set
 out a perfect pattern of his Church? This was one of the matters
 in controversy, and by assuming it to be true that God had made such
 a pattern, Cartwright was guilty of "petitio principii".

Only in matters affecting salvation would Whitgift allow that argument from the negative authority of Scripture was good.

"Nothing ought to be tolerated in the church as necessary unto salvation, or as an article of faith, except it be expressly contained in the word of God, or may manifestly thereof be gathered."(1)

For this reason the papists were wrong in making belief in the supremacy of the Pope a necessity of salvation; it was a belief not required by Scripture. But matters not necessary to salvation were less closely to be controlled by Scripture; it was sufficient if they did not contravene the Word of God. Therefore,

"Nothing in ceremonies, order, discipline or government in the church is to be suffered, being against the word of God."(2)

This separation of matters of faith into a class of their own apart from matters of government, etc, displeased Cartwright, and he asked whether the supremacy of the Pope was not at one and the same time a matter of government and a matter affecting salvation? If so, then all ~~matters~~ matters of Church government must be matters affecting salvation.
(3)

This, said Whitgift, was argument 'ex solis particularibus', and therefore bad. The supremacy of the Pope was certainly a matter of government. Belief in that supremacy affected salvation adversely, for it allowed the Pope to usurp the place of Christ as Head of the Church and to overthrow the authority given by Scripture to Princes. It was contrary to Scripture, for it was an unscriptural addition to faith. But it did not follow that every form of Church government was similarly involved with faith. By supposing that they were, Cartwright had come to a popish con-

(1)

clusion for popish reasons.

In his effort to escape from Whitgift's restriction of the negative authority of Scripture to the definition of the content of faith, Cartwright turned next to the question of ceremonies. There were two, he said, which were necessary to salvation, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. If salvation was affected by these ceremonies, then it must be affected in some way by all ceremonies. (2)

This again, declared Whitgift, was argument "ex solis particularibus". Sacraments were not to be classified with other ceremonies from which they were essentially different. There were two kinds of ceremonies, "substantial", which

"are commanded in the word of God as necessary, and have promises annexed to them, as the supper of the Lord, and baptism." (3)

and "accidental", which

"may be done or undone as order requireth, and altered... without any opinion of justification, necessity or worship in the same, pertaining only to external comeliness, decency, order, etc... Such ceremonies I deny to be matters of salvation; and in such I say... the church hath authority to appoint." (4)

To Cartwright's plea that discipline should be regarded as necessary to salvation, Whitgift responded by asking him to consider the meaning of the word "necessary". It

"signifieth, either that without the which a thing cannot be, or that without the which it cannot so well and conveniently be." (5)

"Necessary", that is to say, might refer either to the "esse" of

(1) W.i.182 (2) Ibid 181. Cartwright did not mean that the sacraments were absolutely essential to salvation. An infant who died unbaptized was not ipso facto damned. He meant rather that in normal circumstances the sacraments must be received by Christians.

(3) Ibid 183 (4) Ibid (5) Ibid 184

salvation, or to the "bene esse".

Whitgift would not agree that discipline, or any one form of government, or even government itself, was part of the "esse" of the Church, for sometimes, under persecution, the Church was

"so dispersed that it appeareth not... nor hath any certain place to remain, so that it cannot have any external government, or exercise of any discipline."(1)

He granted that government, when the Church was collected in one place and was at liberty, was of the "bene esse", but even in those circumstances,

"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."(2)

Whitgift's conclusions were based upon the following reasons:-

(a) He could find no one certain and perfect form of Church government laid down in Scripture, as he ought to have been able to do if it were a matter necessary to salvation.

(b) The essential notes of the Church were two, and two only, the true preaching of the Word of God and the right administration of the sacraments. Thus Calvin had said,

"Wheresoever we find (the word of God and his sacraments) there we may certainly know the Church of God to be, although in the common life of men many faults and errors be found."(3)

(1) W.i.184 (2) Ibid (3) Calvin, Brieve Instruction pour armer Tous Bons Fideles contre les Erreurs de la Secte Commune des Anabaptistes, Le Second Article de l'Excommuniment. "Car la maiesté de la parolle de Dieu et de ses sacramens nous doit estre en telle reputation, que par tout où nous la voyons, nous soyons certain que là il y a l'Eglise: nonobstant les vices et macules qui pourrant estre en la vie commune des hommes." Ioannis Calvini Opera, Brânswick 1868, vol 7 col 68.

(c) Calvin, Bullinger, and Gualter had all condemned the Anabaptists for leaving Churches in which excommunication was not practised. But no man could rightly be condemned for leaving a Church which lacked the necessities of salvation. Therefore these three reformers must be understood as agreeing that the practice of excommunication was not of the "esse" of salvation.⁽¹⁾

Whitgift took care to emphasize that his argument did not mean that the Scriptures contained only those things that were of the "esse" of salvation. There were many other things in the Bible, he asserted, besides the bare necessities, and nothing contrary to those other things might be done in the Church. The point of his argument was, that whatever things the Scriptures declared to be necessary to salvation, those things must not receive additions in such a way that the additions in turn came to be regarded as also necessary to salvation.⁽²⁾

(1) W.i.184. This is an accurate account of Calvin's argument in the Second Article of his "Brieve Instruction... contre les Erreurs.. des Anabaptistes". For example, Calvin said, "Or ie confesse bien que la discipline est aussi ~~bonne~~ bien de la substance de l'Eglise, quant est de faire qu'elle soit establee en bon ordre: et quand il n'y a pas bonne police en un lieu, comme si l'excommunication n'est point en usage, que la vraye forme de l'Eglise en est autant defiguré: mais ce n'est pas à dire qu'elle soit du tout destruite, et que l'edifice ne demeure, puis qu'elle retient la doctrine sur laquelle l'Eglise doit estre fondee." Ioannis Calvini Opera, Brunswick, 1868, vol 7 col 68. Bullinger, Adversus Anabaptistas, libri vi. Nunw Primum a Germanico sermone in Lat. conversi per Josiam Simlerum. Tigurinum MDLX. Lib.vi, cap.x, fol 234.2. Gualter, In Priorem D. Pauli Apostoli ad Corinthios Epistolam Homiliae, in cap.v hom.xxiv, fol.65.2. (2) W.i.191.

Cartwright evidently thought that his opponent was restricting too much the area in which the authority of Scripture should operate, for he pronounced that

"the word of God containeth the direction of all things pertaining to the church, yea, of whatsoever things can fall into any part of man's life."(1)

So far as general directions were concerned Whitgift was willing to concede this point, but not so far as it included particular directions, and especially not so far as it covered particular directions for the government of the Church. (2) Here, in turn, Cartwright was disposed to agree with Whitgift's position so far as it applied to matters which might be included in the category of "ceremonies", for he wrote,

"In making orders and ceremonies of the church it is not lawful to do what men list, but they are bound to follow the general rules of scripture."(3)

Cartwright summarized the general rules of Scripture under which ceremonies might be instituted, in the following way:-

- (a) That (the ceremonies) offend not any, especially the church of God.
- (b) That all be done in order and comeliness.
- (c) That all be done to edifying.
- (d) That (the ceremonies) be done to the glory of God.

If ceremonies were instituted according to these rules, then they would be instituted "according to the word of God." (4)

It is to be noticed that Cartwright preferred the positive

(1) W.i.190 (2) Ibid 191 (3) Ibid 195 (4) Ibid

phrase "according to" rather than the Anglican negative used in the first article for subscription in 1571, "not repugnant to" the ~~word~~ (1) word of God. Yet he immediately used a negative himself in the same connection when he said that

"certain things are left to the order of the church... and yet so left... as that it do nothing against the rules aforesaid." (2)

Whitgift did not altogether like these general rules as formulated by Cartwright, and he criticized them as follows:-

(a) This applies only to private persons in their personal behaviour. In ordering her affairs the Church cannot be dependent upon the likes or dislikes of one or two. (3)

(b) This rule is good and necessary, but it raises the further question, Who is to decide what is orderly and comely; private persons, or those to whom the government of the Church is committed? (4)

(c) In I Cor. xiv St Paul applied this rule only to "tongues", prayer, and prophesying, which are things pertaining to instruction. Ceremonies pertain to comeliness and order, and only edify "per accidens", not of themselves. It is sufficient if ceremonies are thought, by those who appoint them, to be profitable in respect of the time, person, and place connected with their use. (5)

(d) This rule governs all human actions whatsoever. No principle particularly applicable to the framing of ceremonies can be derived from it. (6)

At this point Whitgift summed up the position reached by Cartwright and himself. Against Field and Wilcox, who would allow

(1) Frere and Douglas op.cit.20 (2) W.1.195 (3) Ibid 196
(4) Ibid 197 (5) Ibid (6) Ibid 198

nothing in the Church but what was specially, and not generally, commanded in Scripture, they were agreed that the Church had ~~such~~ authority to ordain ceremonies and to make orders which were not expressed in the Word of God. They still differed about the use (1) the Church of England had made of this authority.

Whitgift now turned the discussion to the question of the loss of the quality of indifferency. When might a thing, indifferent in itself, become no longer a matter of discretion?

"To have the word preached is not indifferent, but necessary. To have it preached in this place or in that place, in churches, in fields, or in houses, is indifferent, until such time as the church hath otherwise determined... The sacrament (of Baptism) is necessary. The circumstances of time and place, etc, be committed to the disposition of the church, and remain so long indifferent until the church hath taken order in them. Which being done, then they be no more indifferent."(2)

As evidence that this view was no mere peculiarity of his own, Whitgift quoted Article vi of the Confession of the Dutch Church in London, a Confession which had upon it the approval of Beza:-

"Things otherwise indifferent of themselves after a sort change their nature, when by some lawful commandment they are either commanded or forbidden."(3)

The conclusion to be drawn, according to Whitgift, was that

"to contemn or willingly to break the order appointed by the church in such matters is sin."(4)

This was Whitgift's answer to the further question raised by Cartwright's general rule (b), and he clearly had the nonconforming Puritans, Cartwright among them, in mind. But it was no answer to the question which he had noted as still remaining between Cart-

(1) W.1.200 (2) Ibid 208f. Things commanded by the Church would cease to be indifferent to the individual Christian, that is to say, but would remain at the discretion of the Church to alter.
(3) S.G.520 (4) W.1.209

wright and himself, i.e. whether the order taken by the Church of England in matters of ceremony constituted a "lawful commandment."

An important part of Whitgift's case lay in his claim that he had the support of the ancient Fathers of the Church, of the Canons of the ancient Councils, and of the greatest of the reformers. The very existence of the Canons of the Councils was important to the question of the Church's authority in things indifferent for

"is it not manifest that councils, both general and provincial, by their acts declare that... many things be left to the discretion of the church which be not expressed in the scriptures?" (1)

Although Cartwright used patristic evidence when it suited his purpose, his attitude towards the early Church was one of suspicion.

"If this be a sufficient proof of things to say, such a doctor said so, such a council decreed so, there is almost nothing so true but I can impugn, nothing so false but I can make true. And well assured I am that by their means the principle grounds of our faith may be shaken." (2)

Whitgift was therefore in character when he quoted St Augustine's words,

"Those things which be not written, but kept by tradition, which are observed through the whole world, are to be understood either to be delivered unto us from the apostles themselves, or else decreed by general councils, whose authority is great in the church." (3)

Cartwright was equally in character when he greeted this quotation with the cry of "popery" for, he said,

"You plainly confirm that there is something necessary to be observed which is not contained any ways in the scripture... for... they are necessary to be kept if they be commanded of the apostles." (4)

(1) W.1.220 (2) Ibid 214 (3) Ibid 230. Augustine, Ep.54.i.1.
(4) W.1.231.

St Augustine, however, had not used the word "commanded" of traditions from the Apostles, and Whitgift was therefore able to defend himself thus:-

"Neither Augustine in this place, nor I in any place, have said or confirmed anything not contained in the scripture to be so necessary to be observed that, upon just consideration, it may not be altered by such as have authority."(1)

To support this opinion he called upon Calvin, viz:-

"M. Calvin... doth grant that there were some traditions of the apostles not written, but he denieth them to be taken as parts of doctrine, or necessary to salvation, saying that they be only such as pertain to order and policy."(2)

But Cartwright was suspicious even of Calvin's authority for, he said,

"We do not so read his works that we believe anything to be true because he saith it, but so far as we can esteem that that which he saith doth agree with the canonical scriptures." (3)

Clearly there was a fear in Cartwright's mind that some authority might be set up in addition to, or even in opposition to, the Scriptures. In view of the condition of the Church which Cartwright would be able to remember from his childhood, it was a justifiable fear, but it led him to undervalue the witness of the early Church, and hence to try to distil out of Scripture more than that source could rightly be expected to yield.

Against Field and Wilcox Whitgift had quoted St Augustine thus:-

"In those things wherein the holy scripture hath determined no certainty, the customs of the people of God, and the traditions or decrees of our forefathers, are to be holden for a law."(4)

* (1) W.i.232 (2) Ibid. 234. Calvin, Comm. in I ad Cor.xi.2.
(3) W.i.248. (4) Ibid. 222. Augustine, Ep.36.1.2.

Cartwright disagreed with St Augustine's proposition, and expressed his disagreement in three questions, to which Whitgift attached three suitable answers, viz:-

- C. "How can these things be varied according to time, place, and persons, which you say should be...?"
- W. "There may be just causes why things once determined by the church should not be changed afterwards... If no such causes be, it may alter any use, ceremony, or order which it hath before determined."
- C. "How can we do safelier than to follow the apostles' customs, and the churches of their time...?"
- W. "We must follow such customs of the apostles, and examples, as they have used and done for us to follow. For, as in the scriptures there be some precepts general, some only personal, so are there in the same of examples and orders some that are for ever to be observed, and some for a time only."
- C. "How can we retain the customs and constitutions of the papists in such things...?"
- W. "Whether we have ~~received~~ received, or may retain, customs etc of the papists, is partly to be discussed where I speak of apparel, and partly in other places."(1)

Whitgift's answer to the second of these questions of Cartwright's is of such importance in illustrating the varying approach of the two men to their problem that it deserves amplification. To a statement by Cartwright that

"all the commandments of God and of the apostles are needful for our salvation,"(2)

Whitgift replied,

"There are divers kinds of commandments of God and of the apostles, some general, and given to all; other personal, and pertain only to one singular person, or to one nation and kind of people, etc. Again, there are some which be perpetual, and not to be omitted or altered; other which are temporal, and may be omitted or altered, as the circumstances of time, place, and persons, doth require... The question is, whether these things which (the Apostles) have done and written, be sufficient for the ordering and government of all

(1) W.1.223, 227 (2) Ibid 231

"churches in all times and states, or no; and whether in all things that they have done, we may or ought to follow them."(1)

In these two statements the crucial difference between the two controversialists throughout their entire discussion stands out plainly. Whitgift allowed to the Church a discretion in deciding which Scriptural decrees and examples are perpetual and which temporary. Cartwright took up the position, which he was unable to maintain in practice, that all Scriptural commandments and examples are binding on the Church, which therefore has no discretion about them.

From St Augustine Whitgift collected three rules governing the "adiaphora":-

- (a) "'If the holy scriptures prescribe anything to be done, there is no doubt but that must be observed, as it is there prescribed.'
- (b) 'If anything be universally observed of the whole church' (not repugnant to the scriptures), for so he meaneth, 'not to keep that, or to reason of that, is madness.'
- (c) 'If it be not universally observed, but diversely in divers churches, let every man do as he findeth in that church into the which he cometh, so that it be not against faith or good manners.'"(2)

Cartwright quarrelled violently with the second of these rules. Before the Reformation, he said, many wicked things were universally observed, and this rule would legalize them. Whitgift's gloss, "not repugnant to the scriptures", was insufficient, for it did not mean "grounded by the scriptures". The gloss did not truly represent what Augustine meant; he intended wickedly to give apostolic authority to human decrees.

(1) W.i.235f (2) Ibid 236. Augustine, Ep.54.v.6. (3) W.i.238

In St Augustine's defence Whitgift declared that in the uncorrupt times of the Church in which that Father lived, the rule without the gloss was suitable. Taken with the gloss it was a rule
(1)
suitable to all times.

Out of Calvin's "Institutes" Whitgift summarized eight statements regarding the Church's authority. Only two of these, the second and the fourth, need be quoted here, for the remainder either add nothing to matters already raised, or were not disputed by Cartwright.

- (ii) "In ceremonies and external discipline (God) hath not in scripture particularly determined anything, but left the same to his church... to alter... as shall from time to time be thought most convenient for the present state of the Church; so that nothing be done against that general rule... 'Let all things be done decently and in order.'"
- (iv) "The observing of (the church's rules) taketh not liberty from the conscience, because they be not made to be perpetual and inviolable, but to be altered as time, occasion, and necessity requireth."(2)

Statement (iv) introduces a new idea to the controversy, and Calvin may be quoted to explain it more fully, viz:-

"What liberty of conscience can there be in so precise and strait observing of (the Church's rules)? Truly the liberty of conscience may well stand with it, if we shall consider that these laws and decrees, to which we are bound, be not perpetual or such as are not to be abrogated, but only external rudiments of man's infirmities; whereof, notwithstanding we all stand not in need, yet we all use them because one of us is mutually bound to another to nourish love and charity among ourselves."(3)

Calvin appears to mean that although some do not need the ceremonies and other things decreed by the Church, they must accept them for the sake of those who are helped by them. The Puritan

(1) W.i.239. (2) Ibid 246f. Calvin, Inst.IV.x.30,31. (3) W.i.244. Calvin, Inst.IV.x.31

position, which Cartwright shared, was almost the precise opposite of Calvin's; some persons do not need the ceremonies and other things decreed by the Church, and are offended at them; therefore they must be abolished.

Cartwright was clearly troubled by statement (ii) above, which includes external discipline among the "adiaphora". He denied that external discipline was left to the discretion of the Church, and accused Whitgift of taking advantage of Calvin's omission of the word "some" before "external discipline" to persuade people that Calvin meant to include "all external discipline" among things indifferent. He could not, Cartwright thought, have meant "all discipline", for that would be to place excommunication among the adiaphora, and, it was to be supposed, not even Whitgift himself⁽¹⁾ would do that.

Cartwright supported his interpretation of this passage from Calvin by pointing out that "ceremonies" in statement (ii) were likewise undefined by the word "all" or "some", and he instanced Baptism and the Lord's Supper as ceremonies which had not been left to the discretion of the Church. It must therefore be inferred that Calvin included only "some" ceremonies among things indifferent.⁽²⁾

The controversy now turned to two passages of Scripture and their application to the Christian Church:-

(1) W.i.248 (2) Ibid. It was merely Cartwright's assumption, of course, that Calvin would have made such a dubious classification of the Sacraments as "ceremonies". Without this assumption Calvin's words must be taken at their face value; in this passage he included discipline among the "adiaphora".

"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it." Deut,iv.2

"What thing soever I command you, that shall ye observe to do; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." Deut.xii.32

Under the Gospel, Whitgift declared, judicial law was left to the discretion of the Magistrate and ceremonial law to the discretion of the Church. God had given to Christians a perfect law of faith and morals, and that law alone was absolute and unalterable. Cartwright thought this idea Manichaeian because it suggested (1) that the Old Testament did not apply to Christians. Whitgift, in turn, accused Cartwright of Judaism because he implied that Christians should be bound by the Jewish judicial and ceremonial law. Whitgift said,

"That precept (in Deuteronomy) applied unto us, doth not extend any further than to such things as God hath commanded or forbidden us that be Christians to do in his word." (2)

Cartwright now entered upon a complicated and wrong-headed argument designed to show that Christians had no more, and indeed less, liberty within the laws given to them by God than the Jews before them had had. The Jews, he reasoned, had had many ceremonies appointed to them, each ceremony with its accompanying "adiaphora". Christians had only two ceremonies appointed to them, each with its "adiaphora". Christians had therefore many fewer "adiaphora", and thus less discretionary power, than the Jews. Moreover, Christians had directions for their two ceremonies quite as precise as any the Jews had had for their many ceremonies, and they had, in addition, a much plainer and more express doctrine whereby

(1) W.i.264 (2) Ibid 265

they were to be guided in the exercise of discretion. Therefore the Deuteronomic precept was just as much applicable to Christians as to Jews.⁽¹⁾

Whitgift would not countenance this perverse argument. If, he asserted, the precept of Deuteronomy was to be understood now of the laws to which it originally applied, then Christians must keep the Jewish ceremonial and judicial law. But, he reminded Cartwright, St Paul had described the ceremonial law as "bondage". Certainly the New Testament was plainer in doctrine than the Old, for it illuminated the Old Testament ceremonies with meaning. But that did not mean that the Gospel was an addition to the law, for "Christ is the end of the law."⁽²⁾

What was it, Whitgift asked, to add to the Word of God, or to take away from it? He answered his question thus:-

"To think... or teach otherwise of God than he hath in his word revealed."

To take away from the word was,

"To believe less than in the word is expressed."

To add to the word was,

"To teach or decree anything, either in matters of faith or ceremonies, contrary to the word."

"To make anything necessary unto salvation not contained in the word."

"To make any religion or opinion of merit in anything that (men) themselves have invented besides the word of God."

"To forbid that for a thing of itself unlawful which God's word doth not forbid, and make that sin which God's word doth not make sin."⁽³⁾

Among these definitions Cartwright could discover nothing to

(1) W.i.269f (2) Ibid 265, 267, 272. (3) Ibid 279

which he could object, but he simplified them to his own liking in the following manner,

"Nothing is to be done in the church of God but by his commandment and word directing the same. It is true indeed, if they be not against the word of God, and profitable for the church, they are to be received as those things which God by his church doth command, and as grounded of the word of God. But there is the question." (1)

It will be noticed that this contradicts something that Cartwright had said earlier. He had objected that the phrase "not repugnant to the scriptures" was insufficient to express the idea of "grounded by the scriptures".⁽²⁾ Now he accepts the phrase "not against the word" as the equivalent of "grounded of the word".⁽³⁾ He does not seem to have drawn any subtle distinction between "repugnant to" and "against", and therefore it may be said that on this one matter he had come over to Whitgift's position, and had identified it with his own. But it must not be supposed that he agreed with the idea put forward by Whitgift that some of the examples, and even some of the commandments, in Scripture were of only temporary application. Nor did he agree that in the Church of England as settled by Queen Elizabeth nothing had been done "against the word of God". He merely recognized that there is a divinely appointed authority in the Church to decide certain matters at discretion, provided that certain conditions are observed.

(1) W.1.281 (2) see p. 166f (3) Strictly, Cartwright thought of "grounded by scripture" as including "profitable to the Church" as well as "not against the word". But Whitgift would certainly have considered that anything "not profitable to the Church" was "repugnant to the scriptures", so that the matter of "profitability" can be cancelled out on each side, and the agreement becomes clearer.

IX.

Field and Wilcox had complained that, whereas in Biblical times the minister of God was known by voice, learning, and doctrine, in Elizabethan times he was to be known, it seemed, by a popish and
(1)
antichristian apparel.

Whitgift fiercely attacked the logic of this remark. Christ, he affirmed, had left a perfect pattern of the ministry in respect of conditions, qualities, and offices. Scripture had done the same for rulers and subjects, for masters and servants. Did this mean that a Prince might not be attired differently from his subjects? Assuming that ministers in the Bible wore no distinctive dress, did it follow that ministers in later ages must not do so? Argument 'a facto ad jus' was bad, but argument 'a non facto ad non jus' was worse. If some Apostles and some prophets could be shown to have worn a distinctive dress, that would prove that later ministers might do the same, though not that they must do the same.
(2)

As examples of ministers in Biblical times who were known otherwise than by their dress, Field and Wilcox had quoted the cases of the meeting of Saul and Samuel, the meeting of Judas and Jesus in Gethsemane, and the meeting of the bystanders and St Peter at the High Priest's house. Whitgift made short work of these inept examples, in none of which was the person concerned made known by "learning and doctrine". Saul knew Samuel because Samuel claimed to be Samuel. The multitude knew Jesus at Gethsemane because Judas kissed him. The "voice" by which the bystanders knew St

(1) W.ii.9 (2) Ibid. 10, 15.

Peter was nothing more than his Galilean accent. On the other hand it could be said that John the Baptist was known by his peculiar dress, Jesus wore an unusual seamless robe, and the prophets had special cloaks. (1)

Cartwright described the Admonitioners' examples from Scripture as "probable conjectures" that no distinctive dress had been worn in the cases they had quoted, for otherwise the persons concerned would have been recognizable by their dress. As for Whitgift's examples, the seamless robe of Christ was an undergarment; John the Baptist had indeed, like Elijah, worn a special apparel, but his mission had been extra-ordinary, and his dress had been intended to call attention to his mission; later ministers had not been in the Baptist's unique position, and had not needed to dress as he did. (2)

While agreeing that the Admonitioners' examples were conjectures, Whitgift denied their probability, and immediately descended into some unlikely guesswork on his own account. Saul, he said, was a country boy who could not be expected to recognize a prophet when he saw one. If Peter wore a special robe as an Apostle, then he might have cast it off when he entered the High Priest's house; even if he had still been wearing it he would not have been recognized by it, for it was night-time. He was not, in the first instance, recognized by his speech for, according to St John, the maid knew him before he spoke. Jesus' seamless robe was so rare that St John made special mention of it. (3)

(1) W.ii.10 (2) Ibid.11 (3) Whitgift met the difficulty that the seamless robe of Christ was an undergarment merely by ignoring it.

Whitgift stood on rather firmer ground when he looked among the Old Testament prophets for examples of distinctive attire. Thus he could claim that when the witch of Endor raised Samuel, the prophet was "an old man with a mantle upon him" and was recognizable not so much as an old man as by the mantle. Similarly, Elisha succeeded to Elijah's mantle as well as to his office.⁽¹⁾

Strictly speaking, all Scriptural examples in this matter, and especially negative examples, were beside the point for Whitgift, unless it could be shown that a distinctive clerical attire was prohibited by Scripture. For this reason he quoted with approval Calvin's words,

"To disallow that which God never disallowed is, in a mortal man, a token of too much rashness and arrogance. But let us always hold this, that then the authority of God is usurped, when that is condemned which he hath permitted."⁽²⁾

To the charge that a special attire for the clergy was "popish" and "antichristian" Whitgift responded with an attempt to show that long before the ~~times~~ "pope's tyranny" there had been a distinctive apparel, and he referred to the letter of Bullinger and Gualter to Sampson and Humphrey wherein examples had been quoted from Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoret, Chrysostom, and Pontius Diaconus.⁽³⁾

Cartwright objected to these examples on the ground that the

(1) W.ii.13 (2) Ibid.15. Calvin, Brieve Instruction pour armer Tous Bons Fideles contre les Erreurs de la Secte Commune des Anabaptistes, Le Second Article de l'Ecommuniment. Ioannis Calvini Opera, vol.7, col.78. Brunswick, 1868. (3) W.ii.22. Z.L.i.345ff. see p. 100~~ff~~

cloak mentioned by Theodoret was one which St Cyril disliked, and therefore sold; the dress mentioned by Socrates was the white apparel worn by the Novatian Bishop ~~Sycinius~~, and for which he was blamed because it was too splendid; St John's 'petalum' mentioned by Eusebius could not be proved to have been like a mitre, as Whitgift claimed; St Cyprian's cap was probably common apparel; it was improbable, anyway, that St Cyprian would be wearing a distinctive attire in time of persecution. (1)

Whitgift declared that St Cyril's purpose in selling his cloak was to obtain money to feed the poor; he had not sold it because he disliked it. ~~Sycinius~~ was blamed for wearing a white garment instead of a black one like the other clergy; he asked for scriptural proof that a priest should wear black, a ~~xx~~ circumstance which showed that black was the customary colour for a priest's dress in those days. Eusebius would not have mentioned St John's 'petalum' if it had not been distinctive of that Apostle. The names of St Cyprian's garments, "birrus" (a thin plate) and "dalmatica" (a robe with long sleeves), showed that they were distinctive. (2)

Unless Cartwright was prepared to date the beginning of the "pope's tyranny" earlier than ~~400~~ A.D.400, which he made no attempt to do, St Chrysostom's remark about the white attire of the clergy

(1) W.ii.23. St Cyprian's "birrus" which Cartwright called a "cap" was, in fact, a Roman cloak. (2) Ibid. 24f. Whitgift confused the "birrus" with the "petalum", or metal plate, mentioned by Eusebius. The origin of Whitgift's and Cartwright's mistakes about the "birrus" seems to lie in a misreading of what Bullinger and Gualter had to say about these two articles. See Z.L.i.350

in Church was sufficient to establish Whitgift's contention that such an attire was not "popish and antichristian", but something which began in the early and comparatively pure days of the Church. Cartwright argued that in St Chrysostom's time white was as much esteemed for any persons of standing, and not only for the clergy, as black was similarly esteemed in the 16th century. But even if Chrysostom had been speaking of a distinctive clerical dress, he had not placed the dignity of the ministry in its robes, but in its duty of guarding the Lord's Supper from unworthy participants. (1)

Whitgift answered that Chrysostom's remark was evidence of fact, of the fact of the wearing of white by the clergy in Church. Nor did Chrysostom condemn the clergy for wearing white. When he bade them think of their duty and not of their apparel, ~~xxx~~ he was not using a simple negative, but a negative by comparison; they were to think more of their duty than of their apparel; this was no disallowance of white apparel, but merely a demand that duty should be regarded as the more important of the two. (2)

Although Cartwright defended the attitude of Field and Wilcox towards the prescribed clerical attire, it is evident from what he revealed of his own opinions that his heart was not altogether in his task. He disliked the outdoor habit less than the surplice, because the surplice was used in worship and was therefore more open to misuse. He did not object to the surplice because it carried a pollution that defiled the wearer, as some Puritans believed, nor

(1) W.11.24 (2) Ibid 25f

did he object to it because the papists had used it superstitiously. He objected to it because, having been abused in the past, there was no profit in its present use that could outweigh the past. To wear a surplice did harm, and positive good was required to justify the wearing of it. Because a thing was indifferent-in-itself, that was no ~~xx~~ sufficient reason for its use in Church; there must be a manifest profit to God's people in its use, and glory to God. ⁽¹⁾

The surplice did harm, Cartwright thought, because waverers between papistry and the Gospel were encouraged by its use to think that it added reverence to the sacraments, and commended the ministry; convinced papists were led to believe that the sacraments could not stand by themselves without additional ceremonies, and were also led to hope that other popish ceremonies might be brought back; protestants were filled with fear that after the surplice other popish things, which they hated, might be re-introduced. ⁽²⁾

A man, Cartwright believed, might know the right reasons for wearing a surplice, but he still should not wear it if by doing so he encouraged another, who did not know those reasons, to follow his example and so to sin against his conscience. For such cases St Paul had laid down the rule that what a man might do in respect of himself, he might not do in respect of others. ⁽³⁾

While heartily acknowledging that "profit" must determine the use in the Church of things indifferent-in-themselves, Whitgift dismissed Cartwright's objections to the surplice as worthless. If

(1) W.ii.1 (2) Ibid. 3,6,8. (3) Ibid. 4. I Cor.viii.10f

anyone was hindered by its use from receiving the Gospel, the matter should be put right by correct teaching. The idea that the surplice added anything to the sacraments was certainly bad, but so was the idea that its use could pollute the sacraments; both ideas must be contested and could only be contested by continuing to use the surplice. Convinced papists knew perfectly well that the Church of England set little store by surplices and could do without them if the need to do so should arise. The zeal of those who hated papistry so much that they could abide no scrap of it was preposterous; such people were guilty of defaming the minister who wore the surplice for doing what it was lawful to do and for doing what it was his duty to do. Things indifferent must certainly not be so used as to hurt the weak, but the surplice was no longer indifferent, for it had been commanded by lawful authority. The profit in wearing the surplice lay in obedience to lawful authority. Those who disobeyed offended the Queen who had commanded its use, and they offended God who had commanded everyone to be "subject to the higher powers."⁽¹⁾

Two further questions remain to be answered on this matter of apparel and the related topic of the use of things indifferent in the Church;⁽²⁾ to what extent may the Church use things which have previously been used for an evil purpose? and is there any other profit to the wearer of the surplice and to the beholder of it than mere obedience to lawful authority?

(1) W.ii.3ff,8. (2) The question of the Queen's authority in things indifferent, which Whitgift had just raised, will be discussed in a later section.

Against the Admonitioners Whitgift quoted, as examples of heathen things put to a godly use, the treasure of Jericho which was taken into the Lord's treasure house, the case of Gideon who had sacrificed to God the ox prepared for Baal, and had even used the wood gathered for the burning of Baal's offering, and also the example of the early Christians, who had turned heathen temples into Churches. His conclusion was,

"No devil, no idol, no pope, can so defile the nature or form ... of any of God's creatures, that the liberty of a christian man should be taken away in using and not using them."(1)

In support of this conclusion Whitgift called upon St Augustine, who had approved the conversion of heathen temples to a Christian use provided that they were not used superstitiously, nor converted to private gain. (2) Calvin was called in to testify that

"The use of many things is pure, the original whereof is evil."(3)

(4)
St Paul had quoted heathen poets in his epistles. Martin Bucer had pointed out that Church bells, previously employed in calling people to the Mass, were well used in calling them to hear the preaching of the Gospel, and his principle had been that it was not in the nature of anything to be a note of antichrist. That note lay in professing antichristian religion, and when the profession was changed, no note of antichrist lay in the thing itself. (5)

(1) W.ii.55 (2) Ibid 54. Augustine, Ep.47.3 (3) W.ii.32. Calvin, Comm. in Harm. Evang. in Matt.v.37. (4) W.ii.36. (5) Ibid 38f. See Bucer's letter to John à Lasco in "A briefe examination for the tyme", p65. The book was published in 1566. The letter is undated, but was written c.1550.

If, Whitgift reasoned, the Church might use things previously employed in the worship of false gods, she might equally use things previously employed in the false worship of the true God. The Church might retain anything, no matter by whom invented nor how much abused, provided always that the thing retained

- (a) was not against the Word of God,
- (b) did not have justification and remission of sins attributed to it,
- (c) was not decreed as necessary and unchangeable,
- (d) was not so imposed upon men that they might not omit it upon occasion without offence or contempt.

A further condition was that the Church should not be troubled with a multitude of such things. ⁽¹⁾

Cartwright strove desperately to escape from the conclusion forced upon him by the scriptural examples of the treasure of Jericho and Gideon's sacrifice. Treasure, he said, was necessary for the Lord's house, and wood and an ox were necessary for the Lord's offering, but the surplice had no such necessity about it. ⁽²⁾ Whitgift, however, pinned him down to the implications of these examples. Treasure, wood, and an ox, might have been obtained elsewhere; the fact that they had been taken from heathen Jericho and from the altar of Baal showed that heathen things might be put to ⁽³⁾ a godly use, and, a fortiori, papist things to a protestant use.

Cartwright also objected to St Augustine's idea of Christian liberty to convert to a Christian use those things which had previously been employed in the worship of false gods. A Christian, he thought, might make some private use of things of that kind,

(1) W.ii.44f (2) Ibid 53 (3) Ibid 54.

but not a public use. Similarly in the case of the surplice; it might be put to a private use in the sense that its material might be used to make a shirt, but it should not be put to the public use of distinguishing the minister from other men, nor of distinguishing the minister in Church from the minister outside his Church. The conversion of heathen things to a Christian use ought to be confined to those things which had a necessary use, such as the sun; this had been an object of worship, but it was also necessary to Christians. Even in the private use of things formerly used by the heathen, the interests of weaker brethren ought to be considered. Meat offered to idols was good as beef or mutton, but just as it must not be eaten at the tables of idols, so it must not be ~~afforded~~ served to a weak brother who might be offended by it. Neither could the decree of a Magistrate take away the antichristian note from anything, and replace it by a Christian note, for no decree could change the human heart. ~~To teach,~~ To teach people not to abuse things which, however well they might be used, had still no profit in them, was waste of time. The matter could quickly be put right by one sermon setting out the need to remove those things, followed up by their actual removal. Why set a man to prevent a child from hurting himself with a knife, when the knife could be taken away from the child and the man be set free for some more profitable task?

After noting that Cartwright had merely given a flat denial of

(1) W.ii.32f,39f,42

St Augustine's principles for the conversion of heathen things to a Christian use, Whitgift dealt with the question of "necessity" in this context by asking Cartwright,

"Do you not see that the doctrine of things indifferent is necessary? Understand you not that the taking away of the things from the eyes doth not by and by root the opinion out of the heart? Things abused must not always be taken away when they are abused, but the right use must be taught, and the abuse reprov'd." (1)

Although a child might sometimes hurt himself with a knife, the knife must not be taken from him; he should rather be taught how to use it properly.

The clerical apparel, Whitgift conceded, could not edify of itself. Only the Holy Ghost could do that through the ministry of the Word. The apparel edified "per accidens". It edified because it was lawfully appointed to bring about order and decency without superstition; because those who wore it edified by their preaching; because those who accepted it kept the peace of the Church, which was one of the chief causes of edification. If, as the Admonition claimed, the signification of sitting at the Communion was rest, then the signification that Peter Martyr had attached to the surplice must be allowed, that being white it suggested that ministers were messengers of God like the angels. It was argument 'a non causa ad causam' to say, as the Admonition

(1) W.ii.43 (2) Ibid 56 (3) Ibid 59f (4) Ibid 57f, 60. (5) W.iii. 93. Frere and Douglas, op.cit. 24 (6) W.ii.63. See Peter Martyr's letter to Bishop Hooper in "A briefe examination for the tyme" p.58. The letter is dated 4th November 1550.

(1)

did, that the apparel caused discord. The true cause of discord was the contentiousness of those who quarrelled with the apparel.

A preacher who stammered and stuttered, Cartwright replied, might edify his people, but it was argument "a non causa ad causam" to hold that stammering and stuttering were things that edified. If a preacher in a surplice edified his congregation, it could be argued that without a surplice he would edify them still more. (2) If the use of the surplice was as strong a bond of peace as Whitgift said, why had it not been commanded by Christ nor used by the Apostles, and why did no other reformed Church use it? The sacraments ought to be a bond of unity so strong that dissension about the surplice could not break it. (3) The dissension about the surplice was, anyway, two-sided; those who refused it dissented from those who wore it, but those who wore it also dissented from those who refused it. (4) As for Martyr's signification, if white apparel was a sign of the purity of the angels, then it was a pretence and a lie for the minister to wear it as a sign of his own purity. But if it was desired to signify angelic swiftness to execute the office of a messenger of God, why not provide the minister with a pair of wings? (5) If a signification was to be attached to the wearing of a surplice, then the matter was ecclesiastical, and a matter of conscience, and not, as the Anglicans pretended, a merely civil matter. (6)

Whitgift's reply was, in the first place, a repetition of his earlier assertion that orders made by a lawful authority for the

(1) W.ii.69ff. Frere and Douglas, op.cit. 35. (2) W.ii.59
 (3) Ibid 61 (4) Ibid 70 (5) Ibid 63f (6) Ibid 64.

comeliness and order of the Church, including orders for apparel, were things which edified the Church. Those who wore the apparel, even though they did it with mental reservations, kept the peace of the Church, and so edified the Church. The sacraments ought indeed to be a sufficient bond of unity, but such was the nature of man that they were not, and so God appointed Magistrates with authority to make laws whereby at least external peace and unity might be kept. As for Peter Martyr's idea of the signification of the surplice,

"I... set down M.Martyr's words to show that I might as justly bring in a fit and proper signification of the apparel, as the authors of the Admonition do of sitting at the communion; I did not allow their signification of sitting, neither do I approve any such signification of apparel... M.Martyr doth not say that the apparel is a sign of purity... in the minister... But if he should have said that it may be a sign of the pureness that ought to be in the ministers, you are to seek for an answer as yet... Man, being impure, may have external instruments to bid him (as it were) remember what he ought to be."(3)

Since Cartwright had shown some concern that a surplice might come to be regarded as an additional sacrament, Whitgift felt it desirable to re-assure him. A thing did not become a sacrament by having some signification attached to it, and in the case of the apparel the danger was illusory anyway, for

"No man saith that there is virtue in such garments, or 'power to work godliness.'"(5)

(1) W.ii.62 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 65 (4) Ibid 64 (5) Ibid 65

X.

Although it cannot have been intentional, the effect upon Cartwright of much that Whitgift said in his "Answer to the Admonition" must have been to tempt him into a damaging revelation of his views upon the position of the Queen as Supreme Governor of the Church of England. Mostly, though not quite always, Cartwright passed over those provocations in silence, but the question had to be faced eventually. When Cartwright did at last face it, the meagreness of his treatment of a matter so important to his case showed his caution in committing himself to anything that might be interpreted as seditious because it attacked the royal prerogative.

Field and Wilcox had said,

"To these three, that is the ministers, seniors, and deacons, is the whole regiment of the church to be committed."(1)

Whitgift responded by asking,

"What authority in these matters do you give to the civil magistrate?... Your Admonition smelleth altogether of popularity."(2)

In fact, if the statement in the Admonition is taken by itself it suggests an aristocratic or oligarchic form of Church government, but it will be seen later that a mixture of aristocracy and democracy was the customary Puritan pattern of ecclesiastical government. Into this mixture Cartwright tried to weave a place for the "godly prince", but not as an absolute ruler, for in the Church absolute authority could belong only to Christ.

Cartwright held that a Magistrate's authority was not infinite,

(1) W.111.295 (2) Ibid.

but was limited by the Word of God. Where there was a duly constituted Church in any realm, the orders and ceremonies of that Church were to be appointed by the ministers and lay governors of the Church, as was laid down (so the Puritans believed) in Scripture, and not by the Magistrate of that realm. The Magistrate, however, must enforce the laws decreed by the officers of the Church. (1)

Negatively, it was the Magistrate's duty to see that nothing was done in his realm contrary to the will of God, and if the Church's officers should decree anything "unmeet", it would become the Magistrate's duty to veto their decree, and compel them to do better. (2) Cartwright does not seem to have allowed that the Magistrate should substitute "meet" legislation for "unmeet"; he might veto but not enact. (3)

Whitgift noted that his opponent's division between Church and State was suitable to a heathen nation with a persecuting and unbelieving ruler. He noted, too, that the papists made a similar distinction between Church and State. (4) He protested against the dualism which divided laws into holy and profane and, heathenlike, divorced life from religion. On this point he quoted Musculus,

"Christian people are altogether holy, and dedicated to the name of Christ, not in temples only and ecclesiastical rites, but in their whole life... Wherefore that distinction of ecclesiastical and profane laws hath no place in it." (5)

The papists, Whitgift pointed out, resembled Cartwright in that they allowed the Magistrate 'potestatem facti' but not 'potestatem

(1) W.iii.295 (2) Ibid 296 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid 296f (5) Ibid 298.
W.Musculus, Commonplaces, Title "Of Magistrates", English translation, 1578 p.1308f.

(1)

juris" in the Church, and although Cartwright had mitigated the rigidity of this division, what would happen if the Magistrate were to decide that some Church law was "unmeet"? Would not the Puritans cry out against him as a persecutor and a maintainer of unlawful authority? Would they not insist that the law they approved of was "meet", as they were already doing? (2)

Cartwright's dualism rested upon two passages of Scripture:-

"Jehoshaphat set of the Levites and the priests, and of the heads of the fathers' houses of Israel, for the judgment of the Lord, and for controversies... And he charged them, saying... Amariah the chief priest is over you in all matters of the Lord, and Zebediah... the ruler of the house of Judah, in all the king's matters: also the Levites shall be officers before you." II Chron.xix.8,11.

and

"Every high priest, being taken from among men, is appointed for men in things pertaining to God." Heb.v.1

These passages, Cartwright claimed, showed a distinction between Church and State, and between those who might legislate for each. In the former passage Levites were to be employed in civil government only because at that time there were too many of them for all to be occupied with ecclesiastical affairs, and so, being well learned in the law, they were put to civil tasks. (3)

The papal apologists Saunders and Harding, Whitgift replied, had both used the passage from II Chron.xix in the interests of the papacy in the same way that Cartwright had used it in the interests of Puritanism. But who was it that had authorized the

(1) W.iii.299 (2) Ibid 300 (3) Ibid 301. Cartwright meant that the arrangement whereby the Levites, being ecclesiastical persons, were employed in civil affairs was exceptional, and was not to be repeated in other circumstances.

priests and Levites to rule in the Lord's affairs? Was it not the king? He had authority in both Church and State, and delegated it as he pleased, just as the Queen of England had the same authority and committed matters ecclesiastical to the Archbishops and Bishops, (1) and matters temporal to the Lord Chancellor and other judges. To say that there were too many Levites for the affairs of the Jewish Church was sheer guesswork; their employment in civil affairs was evidence that there was no rigid distinction in the Old Testament (2) between the two spheres of law. As for the quotation from Hebrews, it was beside the point; the context showed what the "things pertaining to God" were. They were not matters of Church government at all, but the offering of "gifts and sacrifices for sins." (3)

When it suited his purpose, Cartwright was ready enough to claim the practice of the early Church in his favour, and he now advanced the case of the Council of Nicea, to which the Emperor Constantine had granted liberty to legislate. (4) The same liberty, he claimed, had been continued by later Emperors, and the Council of Constantinople showed that the Emperors customarily confirmed (5) and enforced decrees previously made by the Church. The independence of the Church from the State was exemplified by the case of Ambrose, who had refused to answer on Church matters in the civil (6) court of the Emperor Valentinian.

(1) W.iii.30lff. Sanders, De Vis. Mon. Eccles., libri octo, Lovan 1571, II.1, p.57. Harding, J.IV.989. (2) W.iii.303. (3) Ibid. (4) Eusebius, Vit. Const. III.vi, xii. (5) W.iii.303f. Cartwright seems to have meant the Synod of Constantinople, A.D.536, see Hefele, History of the Councils, iv. 203f. (6) W.iii.308. Ambrose, Ep.21.

With the facts as Cartwright had stated them, Whitgift had no quarrel. But, he asked, did they not show that Constantine had had ecclesiastical authority residing in him, and could thereby grant it to the Bishops at Nicea? Eusebius had called Constantine,

"As it were a general Bishop, appointed by God."(1)

This Emperor's refusal to decide the Arian controversy himself had not abridged his authority; it merely showed his wisdom and modesty in using those whose learning qualified them to deal with the

(2)
matter. As for the Church in the Roman Empire,

"The continual practice of christian churches (in time of christian magistrates), before the usurpation of the bishop of Rome, hath been to give to christian princes supreme authority in making ecclesiastical orders and laws, yea, and that which is more, in deciding matters of religion, even in the chief and principal points."(3)

The request of the Bishops that Constantine should decide the Arian controversy had been an example of this recognition of royal
(4)
authority.

If by the "Council of Constantinople" Cartwright meant the Council
(5)
of A.D. 549, then, said Whitgift, it must be realized that no Emperor had made more ecclesiastical laws than Justinian, who called that Council, even though by Justinian's time the power of the Bishop of Rome was already great. But if Cartwright meant the 6th Council of Constantinople, A.D. 681, then the Emperor, Constantine
(6)
IV, had been its moderator. And it must be remembered that

(1) W.iii.304f. Eusebius, De Vit. Const.I.44. (2) W.iii.306

(3) Ibid (4) Ibid (5) Whitgift appears to mean the 5th General Council, Percival, op.cit. 299ff (6) Percival, op.cit. 326.

"Orders and laws which were made in such councils were made by the authority of the emperor." (1)

Whitgift thought that St Ambrose had refused to appear before Valentinian, not because he disliked the Emperor's ecclesiastical authority, but because that Emperor was young, unbaptized, ignorant, an Arian heretic, tyrannous, and partial in judgment. In justification of his refusal Ambrose had pleaded the privilege granted to the Bishops by earlier and more godly Emperors of having Church cases tried in Church courts, a plea which showed recognition of the imperial authority in the Church. (2)

Cartwright's final point was to ask, Who was more qualified by training and experience to legislate for the Church than the Church's ministers? (3) This was not to suggest that ministers should claim to be exempt from civil jurisdiction as the papists claimed that their priests should be exempt. Nor was it suggested that the Magistrate should be required to execute the Church law without further enquiry, as the papists required him to do. When religion was in decay and there was no ministry, the Magistrate ought to take order for the Church. Even when there was a lawful ministry, if it agreed upon anything unmeet or unlawful, the Magistrate ought to intervene to see that right was done. The practice in

(1) W.iii.307 (2) Ibid 308f. Ambrose certainly appealed to the liberty granted to the Church by an earlier Emperor, as Whitgift said, but it cannot be held that he wholly approved of the idea of imperial authority over the Church. His position lay somewhere between that of Cartwright and that of Whitgift, but nearer to the former than to the latter. See Greenslade, Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius, pp 54-56. (3) W.iii.310

England was already that the Magistrate referred ecclesiastical matters to ecclesiastical persons,

"only this is the difference, that where it is done now of one or a few, we desire that it may be done of others also."(1)

The wisdom and learning of the clergy, Whitgift replied, only proved the convenience and necessity of allowing them to debate and decide ecclesiastical matters insofar as they remained wise and learned. But what if all, or most, of the clergy were corrupt?

"No godly princes having godly bishops and ministers of the church will alter or change, determine or appoint anything in matters of religion, without their advice and counsel. But if there be dissension among them, shall not the prince determine the controversies?... Wherefore the meetness of the priests and bishops doth not take away any authority from godly princes in matters of the church."(2)

What Scripture had Cartwright, Whitgift demanded, for saying that a prince had less authority when he had a lawful ministry than when he had an unlawful one? A ruler might more safely use the advice of a lawful ministry, but his authority was the same over both lawful and unlawful.⁽³⁾

Finally, Whitgift explained the sense in which he had said that the Church had power to appoint ceremonies. Where the Magistrate of any realm was a Christian, "Church" included the Magistrate as principal governor next under God, and the Magistrate was appointed by God to govern not only in the commonwealth but also in the Church.

"Yea, I will go further with you; I make no difference betwixt a christian commonwealth and the church of Christ."(4)

(1) W.iii.311 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 312 (4) Ibid 313.

XI.

It is convenient at this point to take a look at the ministry of the Church as Cartwright saw it, or thought he saw it, in the pages of the New Testament.

Cartwright's views rested upon his interpretation of certain passages of Scripture, among which were,

"(Christ) gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; For the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ." Ephes.iv.11-12.

and

"God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, divers kinds of tongues." I Cor.xii.28.

Dealing with the various ministers mentioned in these lists, Cartwright declared that the Apostles had three "notes". They were directly called to their office by God, they had seen Christ upon earth, and they were sent into all the world. No-one but the original Apostles could have all these three notes, and therefore there could be no successor to the Apostles. Men might succeed the Apostles in teaching the same doctrine as the Apostles, but not in any other function. The office of Apostle had ceased at the end of the apostolic age.

Cartwright recognized that in the New Testament there was a wider sense in which men might be called "apostles", as when they were sent as representatives from one Church to another like the brethren mentioned in II Cor.viii.23. But besides the Twelve only

(1) W.i.495f (2) Ibid 498 (3) Ibid 497

St Paul, and possibly St Barnabas, could be reckoned Apostles in the sense of the three "notes"⁽¹⁾. It was in this sense that Cartwright understood the term "apostle" in the two passages from Scripture quoted above, and it was this office that he believed had ceased in the Church.

The work of a prophet, Cartwright thought, had been to expound the Scriptures and to foretell the future. The latter ability had become extinct in the Church, and therefore the office of "prophet"⁽²⁾ had passed out of existence with it.

In Scripture only Philip and Timothy were explicitly stated to be Evangelists. The Evangelists, Cartwright believed, had had their callings confirmed by miracle⁽³⁾, and since miracles had ceased, the office of Evangelist had necessarily ceased too. It would be impossible for a Bishop to create further Evangelists by ordination,⁽⁴⁾ for a Bishop was in a lower degree of the ministry than an Evangelist, and the lower could not ordain the higher.

The work of an Evangelist had been to preach at large, and not to be tied to a local congregation. Titus, Silvanus, and Apollos had done this kind of work and were therefore probably Evangelists⁽⁵⁾ and had probably had their callings confirmed by miracles.

(1) W.i.495 (2) Ibid 472 (3) What Cartwright meant by "confirmed by miracle" will appear later, p.202 (4) Cartwright identified a Bishop with a Pastor. His reasons for this identification will appear later, p.293. It is sufficient to notice here that the Pastor (or Bishop) comes after the Evangelist in Ephes.iv.11, and that Cartwright took this to mean that the Pastor was of a lower rank in the ministry. (5) W.i.500

The remaining offices in St Paul's lists, declared Cartwright, were the permanent offices of the Church, and they were the offices of a local ministry in a single congregation. These offices could be divided into two groups, Deacons (the "helps" of I Cor.xii.28) whose work it was to care for the poor and the sick, and Presbyters (or Elders) who were to care for the whole congregation.

The Presbyters were divided, according to Cartwright's reading of the New Testament, into ministerial Elders who exercised the ministry of the Word and Sacraments and also ruled the congregation, and non-ministerial Elders who shared in the ruling of the congregation but not in the ministry of the Word and Sacraments. The ministerial Elders were to be further subdivided into Pastors who, in the exercise of the ministry of the Word, both preached and taught, and Doctors (the "teachers" of Ephes.iv.11) who only taught. Thus the Pastor exercised the whole functions of the Presbyter, the Doctor exercised all these functions except preaching, and the non-ministerial Elders (the "governments" of I Cor.xii.28) only the "ruling" function.⁽¹⁾ These last Cartwright named "Seniors".

Whitgift would by no means accept this analysis of the ministry in the apostolic Church. The apostolic functions of preaching and

(1) W.i.473. Cartwright's "Doctors" were ministerial assistants of the Pastor, and their existence was a further reason for doubting the permanence of the office of Evangelist. The chief minister was the Pastor, and the only position an Evangelist could occupy in a local congregation would be that of assistant to the Pastor. But the Pastor's assistant was a Doctor, not an Evangelist. W.i.503. Cartwright described the Seniors as "ecclesiastical persons", i.e. he did not regard them as laymen. But the impulse to call them "Lay Elders" was not resisted even in Elizabethan times, and it will not be resisted here.

of governing and visiting Churches were still needed, he said, as were also the Evangelist's office of preaching and the Prophet's office of expounding Scripture. Moreover, in Ephes.iv, if Cartwright's quotation from St Paul were continued, it would be found that these three offices, along with the rest, had been given

"until we all attain... unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ",

a remark which was far from suggesting that St Paul thought any of the offices he had mentioned to be merely temporary. (1)

Further, Cartwright was guilty of guesswork. Timothy was never called an Evangelist, but was told to do the work of one, i.e. to preach the Gospel. Prophecy had indeed accompanied Timothy's call to the ministry, but prophecy was not miracle, and Timothy had ~~been~~ been ordained in the ordinary way by the laying-on of hands. After baptizing the eunuch Philip was "caught up by the Spirit" and was "found at Azotus". This was a miracle, but Philip had been an Evangelist before it happened,

"wherefore it could not be a confirming of his evangelistship." (2)

As to the offices which Cartwright regarded as permanent in the Church, Whitgift asked,

"What scripture have you to prove that the doctor is added to the pastor as an aid..? You have no licence to coin new scriptures; and in the old I am sure you cannot find it... And whereas you say that the doctor's office consisteth in teaching doctrine... that the pastor might not be driven to spend so much time in propounding the doctrine... I would gladly know whence you learn that." (3)

(1) W.i.492f (2) Ibid 501 (3) Ibid 503f

Instead of supposing, as Cartwright had done, that the "pastors" (Ποιμένες) and "teachers" of Ephes.iv.11 were two sorts of ministers of the Word, Whitgift put the two titles together to describe a single office, i.e. those who act as shepherds by teaching. For (1) this interpretation he was able to claim the support of Jerome. He passed over in silence Cartwright's identification of ~~ἐπίσκοποι~~ "helps" in I Cor.xii.28 with deacons, as though he had no alternative to (2) offer. On the identification of "governments" with lay elders he said,

"This word 'governors' teacheth ~~us~~ us that Christ hath ordained in his church some to bear rule and govern; but whether one in every congregation or more; whether ministers of the word or others; whether magistrates or seniors, it is not here expressed." (3)

(1) W.i.473. Jerome (Comm. Lib.II in Ep. ad Ephes.iv.11) seems to have noticed the single τοὺς governing ποιμένες and διδασκάλους, for he wrote, "Non enim ait: alios autem pastores, et alios magistros, sed alios pastores et magistros." Lightfoot (Commentary on Philipians, pl92) agreed with this interpretation, which is certainly nearer to the thought of the New Testament than Cartwright's. For example, in Mark vi.34, Jesus "had compassion on (the people), because they were as sheep not having a shepherd; and he began to teach them many things." Jesus, that is to say, acted as shepherd by teaching.

(2) According to Arndt and Gingrich in their "Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament etc", ἀντιλήψεις should be translated 'helpful deeds'. The examples given by Moulton and Milligan in their "Vocabulary of the Greek Testament" suggest that 'assistance' in general was in St Paul's mind, rather than the persons who rendered the assistance, and especially rather than any specific order of persons who rendered assistance to the poor by the distribution of alms.

(3) W.iii.159. According to Arndt and Gingrich, op.cit., κυβέρνησις means 'administration' and "the plural indicates proofs of ability to hold a leading position in the Church." Bayer, Kittel, and Moulton and Milligan are cited in support of this interpretation of the plural. Thus qualifications rather than persons were in St Paul's mind, and nothing that he said excluded anyone who showed these qualifications from ministering the Word. The fact that he mentioned "teachers" apart from "governments" in the same passage does not imply that he was distinguishing two sorts of Church official.

Cartwright's division of Elders into two kinds, ministerial and lay, rested upon a single passage of Scripture:-

"Let the elders that rule well (οἱ καλῶς τειροσσιώτες) be counted worthy of double honour, especially those who labour in the word and teaching." I Tim.v.17. (1)

This passage, Cartwright claimed, showed that in the apostolic Church all the Elders ruled their Churches, but that within the whole number of the Elders there was a smaller number to whom was committed the ministry of the Word. This smaller group comprised the Pastors and Doctors, the rest being the Seniors (or Lay Elders) who were excluded from the ministration of the Word. This, he said, was the opposite of Whitgift's idea of the ministry, in which all the Elders ministered the Word, but only a few ruled the Church. (2)

 (1) Neither Cartwright nor Whitgift had any doubts about the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. If they had had such doubts they would scarcely have been troubled by them, for they were not concerned to give an historical account of the origin and development of the ministry, but to discover what the Scriptures had to say about the ministry. Each of them accepted the Scriptures as a rule for the Church, and their purpose was to find whether, within that rule, the Church was bound to one definite form of ministry and government, or not. Questions of authorship were, strictly speaking, irrelevant to that enquiry. Thus Cartwright attributed the Epistle to the Hebrews to Clement of Rome (W.ii.120), and was not challenged by Whitgift for doing so. The fact that Hebrews was not of Pauline authorship made no difference to their use of that Epistle; it was within the Canon and therefore, so far as it went, it was determinative of their controversy. But when, instead of enquiring what form of ministry, if any, was enacted for the Church by the Scriptures, we ask what form the ministry actually took in the apostolic age, we cannot disregard questions of authorship. It will therefore be useful to make it clear here that the reasons given by Easton (The Pastoral Epistles, pp 9-15, 20f) against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, and for a date in the first decade of the second century, are accepted as conclusive, and the condition of the ministry as shown in those Epistles is taken to be evidence of the sub-apostolic, and not of the apostolic, age.
 (2) W.ii.110.

Whitgift readily agreed that in I Tim.v.17 there was a distinction between two sorts of Elders, and that the existence of non-preaching governors of the Church was recognized there, but he would not have it that the non-preachers were lay Elders.

"Although St Paul maketh a distinction of seniors, yet it is certain that under the name of seniors he doth comprehend such only as be ministers of the word or sacraments... For, unless the apostle St Paul had meant that of ministers some preached, some only ministered the sacraments, he would not have said, maxime qui laborant sermone et doctrina only, but qui laborant sermone et administratione sacramentorum."(1)

The "ruling" which the Elders did, he thought, was much more liturgical and pastoral than disciplinary and administrative, for

"Every preacher that doth his duty in preaching ruleth well; and so do they also that duly and truly administer the sacraments, relieve the poor, visit the sick, privately admonish, etc."(2)

Out of this interpretation Whitgift was able to produce a defence of the existence of the "dumb-dog", the non-preaching parish priest of the Elizabethan Church, for although he did not agree that the non-preaching Elders of I Tim.v.17 were lay Elders, he did agree (3) that they were non-preachers because they were not allowed to preach.

The chief thought in Cartwright's mind about the "presidents" (Προεστῶτες) in I Tim.v.17 was that they were disciplinary and administrative officials, and in Whitgift's that they were pastoral

(1) W.iii.151 (2) W.ii.111 (3) Ibid 458. Whitgift was, of course, just as much guessing at the meaning as Cartwright had guessed at it. He would have done better if he had contented himself with saying that it was by no means necessary to infer the existence of lay Elders from this passage. This, in effect, is what Lightfoot (op. cit. 193) and Easton (op.cit. 159) have done. They agree with Whitgift in thinking that all the Elders were ministers, but they think that they all had the right to preach, even though some of them chose not to do so. This seems a more probable interpretation of the passage than Whitgift's, and certainly than Cartwright's.

and liturgical officers. When the two men came to consider Justin Martyr's use of the title $\delta \pi\rho\omicron\varsigma\epsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$,⁽¹⁾ each of them reversed his previous interpretation to some extent. Thus, arguing against the equal authority of all ministers and for the idea that one minister might rule over another, Whitgift said,

"Justin Martyr... alloweth this superiority, and calleth him that bare rule over the other ministers $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma\epsilon\tau\omega\tau\alpha$."(2)

Cartwright replied that Justin Martyr used the title to describe a liturgical superiority of the president over the people, and that the Apologist had made no mention of other ministers. Pointing to Justin's expression "president of the brethren"⁽³⁾ he asserted that this referred to authority over the congregation. Then he shrank away from this interpretation into complaints that even in Justin's time the Church was corrupt because the title "president", which properly belonged to ministers and lay Elders alike, was already appropriated to one man.⁽⁴⁾ He could not, of course, allow only a liturgical function to Justin's president, nor yet allow a liturgical function to be emphasized, without imperilling the "ruling" function which he had attributed to the "presidents" in I Tim.v.17, and upon which so much of his case depended.

Whitgift answered,

"Whosoever doth duly consider Justin's words, and peruse that whole place, he shall easily understand that those ~~whom~~ whom he there calleth brethren were ministers and deacons; for afterwards, speaking of the people, he calleth them by the name of people."(5)

(1) I Apol.65,67 (2) W.ii.307 (3) I Apol.65 (4) W.ii.308

(5) Ibid 309. In fact, a perusal of "that whole place" leaves a different impression from the one advocated by Whitgift. If one

The "president of the brethren", that is to say, was the superior of the other ministers and of the deacons.

When he had arrived at this conclusion, Whitgift gave two quotations from Beza's "Annotations" and, putting them side by side, used them in opposition to Cartwright on the question of the parity of ministers. The quotations were,

"Timothy, in the presbytery or college of ministers at Ephesus, was $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\alpha$, that is to say, the prelate or bishop, as Justinus calleth it." (1)

and

"This therefore was the common name of bishops, until he, which for policy's sake did govern the rest in the company, whom Justin calleth $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\alpha$, began to be called peculiarly a bishop." (2)

It was certainly a debating achievement to be able to set Beza in opposition to his friend Cartwright, but Whitgift gained the point at the price of some appearance of inconsistency. Having emphasized the liturgical functions of the presidents in I Tim.v.17, he emphasized the 'ruling' function of the president in Justin. In the latter case his interpretation was misguided; it is the liturgical function of the president that is emphasized by Justin.

dismisses from the mind any preconceived idea of a Bishop celebrating the Eucharist surrounded by a band of presbyters, the picture Justin paints is clearly that of a single celebrant assisted by deacons. True, there is a scripture-reader, but he might well have been a deacon, or a member of the congregation, for any indication that Justin gives to the contrary. The only presbyter necessarily required by Justin's account is the president himself. He celebrates the Eucharist, preaches, receives the alms, and cares for the poor. The deacons assist at the Eucharist and take the elements to the absent. There is no sign of any Elders, lay or ministerial, other than the president.

(1) W.ii.308. Nov.Test. cum Th. Bezae Annot. H.Steph. 1565. In Ep. I ad Tim.v.19. (2) W.ii.309. Beza, op.cit. in Ep. ad Phil.i.1.

XII.

Members of Parliament were told in the Admonition that

"Instead of Chancellors, Archdeacons, Officials, Commissaries, Proctors, Doctors, Summoners, Churchwardens, and such like: you have to plant in every congregation a lawful and godly seignory."⁽¹⁾

Whitgift challenged Field and Wilcox to prove, first, that every congregation in the early Church had had Seniors to govern them; second, that this office of Senior, and the authority attributed to it, should be permanent in the Church, and not altered according to circumstances; third, that these Seniors were laymen, and not ministers of the Word.⁽²⁾

To take the third point first, Cartwright declared that Seniors were not ministers of the Word, but yet were not laymen for they were ecclesiastical persons.⁽³⁾ This definition involved Cartwright in a contradiction of which Whitgift took some advantage in a later part of the controversy. Cartwright pleaded for the separation of the government of the Church from that of the State, and denied that ecclesiastical persons could lawfully wield civil authority. The Queen and the nobility could not therefore become Seniors since they must necessarily exercise civil authority in the government of the State. But Cartwright also urged the enlistment of noblemen as Seniors, and gave to the Queen at least a negative power in the Church. This inconsistency was one of several marks of haste which characterized Cartwright's "Reply".

(1) Frere and Douglas, op.cit. 16. In the second edition of the Admonition the word "Doctor" was dropped from this sentence, probably to avoid confusion with the "Doctor" who, in Puritan theory, was to be the assistant of the Pastor. (2) W.ii.153 (3) Ibid 205.

Whitgift agreed that there had been Seniors in the early Church, and quoted Ambrosiaster thus,

"Nam apud omnes utique gentes honorabilis est senectus; unde et synagoga, et postea ecclesia seniores habuit, quorum sine consilio nihil agebatur in ecclesia." (1)

But ~~what~~ Ambrosiaster had not said ~~was~~ that every Christian congregation had Seniors, nor yet that every Jewish congregation had had them. This passage did not therefore prove the universality of the office as Cartwright ~~had~~ claimed that it did.

In Acts xiv.23, Cartwright pointed out, Paul and Barnabas were said to have appointed Elders in every congregation. It was unlikely that there was more than one preacher in each of these congregations, and therefore it must be supposed that the rest were
(2)
governing (lay) Elders.

Whitgift dismissed this typically Cartwrightian argument as vain conjecture, pointing out in reply that St Luke did not necessarily imply that there had been more than one Elder appointed to each congregation. Further, St Luke only used the title "Presbyter" for ministers of the Word except when he was speaking of Jewish
(3)
Elders.

Cartwright now accused his opponent of reasoning negatively from the Scriptures. Because there was no mention of the duties of a Senior in Acts xiv.23, it did not follow that Seniors were
(4)
not included therein. Whitgift replied that the passage in question had been quoted in the Admonition to prove the existence

(1) W.iii.154. Ambrosiaster Comm.in Ep ad Tim.prim.v.1,2. The distinction between Ambrose and Ambrosiaster was not known in Elizabethan times, but will be observed here throughout.

(2) W.iii.154 (3) Ibid 155f (4) Ibid 157.

of Seniors. He had pointed out that it did not do this, but he had not committed the fault of arguing that it disproved their
(1)
existence.

Cartwright further claimed that Whitgift had admitted the existence of Seniors when the Church was under persecution and when there were no godly magistrates. As these conditions were present in the days of the Apostles there must, by Whitgift's own admission, have
(2)
been Seniors in those days.

Whitgift answered,

"That which I have said of the being of seniors in every church, I say still; neither is that the question; for I ask the question of your seniors, not of ministers (whom I call seniors); neither did I mean that in every particular parish there was such a seigniorie, but in every chief city; nor that it was in all times of persecution, and where there was no christian magistrate, but sometimes; neither that this kind of government must be in such times, but that it may be."(3)

On the second question, whether government by a Seigniorie should be permanent in the Church, Whitgift revealed his fear of an "imperium in imperio":-

"In a monarchy and in a kingdom such as this realm of England is, it cannot be practised without intolerable contention and extreme confusion; except you could devise to make every several parish a kingdom within itself, and exempt it from all ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction of prince, prelate, and whomsoever."(4)

(1) W.iii.158 (2) Ibid 163 (3) Ibid 164. Since Whitgift used the term "Senior" sometimes in Cartwright's sense of "lay Elder" and sometimes in his own sense of "minister", it may help to avoid confusion if it is explained that Whitgift could find no evidence for the existence of Cartwright's Seniors in the New Testament or the early Church. He did, however, find evidence that certain of the clergy in the early Church had formed a Council of Seniors by whose advice the Bishops governed their Churches. These Councils were the "Seigniories" which he mentioned as being in every chief city at certain periods. They were not parish seigniories in Cartwright's sense of the term. (4) W.iii.165.

Cartwright argued that as God, in times of persecution, had provided Seniors as aids to the Pastors in overseeing the conduct of his parishioners, it was not to be supposed that God loved his people less, and wished the office to cease, in times of prosperity⁽¹⁾ when supervision was just as much needed. Whitgift retorted,

"One of the most singular benefits that God bestoweth on his church in this world is, that he giveth unto it christian kings and princes."(2)

Government by a Seigniory would detract from the authority of these Christian rulers, and its establishment would display ingratitude to God for this benefit.

Whitgift had next to deal with a claim that just as the Seniors had not, under persecution, performed any part of a Magistrate's duty, similarly it was not proposed that they should do so in England. Their duties had been, and would be, the admonishing of wrongdoers, the comforting of the penitent, and the assisting of the Pastor in dealing with the impenitent by rebuke, suspension from communion, and excommunication. All this could as readily be⁽³⁾ done under a godly prince as under a heathen ruler.

Whitgift wondered what was the scriptural authority for this definition of the duties of a Senior. He marvelled at its moderation by comparison with the complete ecclesiastical authority ascribed to the Seigniories in the Admonition, and he asserted that the duties so defined were in part the duties of all Christians, in part the duty of the Pastor, and in part things which could better⁽⁴⁾ be carried out by the civil authority.

(1) W.iii.165f (2) Ibid 166 (3) Ibid 166f (4) Ibid 167

Cartwright turned next to Jesus' saying,

"If (thy brother) refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church." Matt.xviii.17.

He argued that as the grievances of one Christian against another could not be settled by the whole congregation, the "Church" in this passage could not mean the whole people. Nor could it mean the Pastor alone, for one man could not be a Church. The alternative was that the Pastor and Seniors comprised the "Church" in this saying, which thus provided evidence for the existence of Seniors. Christ had borrowed this manner of speaking from the Old Testament, for example from Exod.iv.29f, where the Elders of Israel were treated as the whole people, and from Josh.xx.6, where judgment by the congregation meant judgment by the governors of the congregation, for only the governors were allowed to judge. But since, Cartwright continued, "tell it unto the Church" was a commandment of Christ, it must always be kept in the Church. But it could not be kept without Seniors; therefore the office of Senior must be permanent. (1)

Whitgift agreed that "the Church" in this passage ought to be understood as "those who have authority in the Church", but rejected the rest of Cartwright's interpretation. "Tell it unto the Church", he thought, might mean either "rebuke the offender in public" or "report the offence to those in authority". The existence of a Seigniorie was not to be inferred from this passage, nor if it could be inferred was it to be supposed that it was to be a perpetual institution, any more than it could be inferred from Matt.v.23f that

(1) W.iii.168f

there ought to be, or ought always to be, altars and offerings in
 the Church.⁽¹⁾

St Paul, Cartwright reasoned, had concluded his first Epistle to Timothy with the command to keep all that had been laid down in the Epistle

"Until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ." I Tim.vi.14
 But the office of Senior was among the things prescribed in the
 Epistle; therefore that office must be perpetual.⁽²⁾

By Whitgift's interpretation St Paul's command was to be applied only to Timothy's exercise of his office. If it were applied to the whole contents of the Epistle, then at all times ministers of the Word who had infirm stomachs must "take a little wine".⁽³⁾

In his Answer to the Admonition Whitgift had stated his reasons for thinking the government of the Church by a Council of Elders to be unsuitable to the time in which he lived:-

"The diversity of ~~the~~ time and the state of the church requir-
 eth diversity of government in the same. It cannot be governed
 in time of prosperity as it is in time of persecution. It may
 not be governed under a christian prince, which doth nourish
 and maintain it, as it may be under a tyrant, when it is con-
 strained to flee and seek corners. It cannot be governed in
 a whole realm as it may be in one little city or town. It can-
 not be governed when it is dispersed through many places as it
 may be when it is collected into some one narrow and certain
 place. To be short, it cannot be governed when it is full of
 hypocrites, papists, atheists, and other wicked persons, as
 when it hath very few or none such; as commonly it hath not in
 time of persecution, when the gold is as it were tried from
 the dross. He, that, according to this diversity of form,
 state, and time of the church, doth not allow a diversity of
 government, doth confound, and not edify."⁽⁴⁾

(1) W.iii.169ff (2) Ibid 171ff (3) Ibid 173 (4) Ibid 176.

To Cartwright's plea that the government of the Church ought to remain the same under all conditions, Whitgift responded by revealing his basic objection to government by a Seignior, i.e. that it would trespass upon the divine right of a godly prince to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, viz:-

"God hath given the chief authority in the government of his church to the Christian magistrate; which could not be so if your seignior might as well retain their authority under a christian prince, and in time of peace, as under a tyrant, and in the time of persecution." (1)

Cartwright's reasons, with Whitgift's answers, for thinking that government by a seignior might continue under a Christian ruler may conveniently be abbreviated and paraphrased and set out in dialogue form, thus:-

- C. The gifts of the Spirit were more bountifully given to the Church in apostolic times than now. This means that a Pastor needs more human help in his work now, for he is less well able to do it himself. (2)
- W. For the same reason, Seniors are less well able to help him. But a Christian Magistrate can help him better than Seniors were ever able to do. (3)
- C. If St Paul in I Tim.v.17 put the Church to the expense of providing for Seniors, still more can the Church afford them now. (4)
- W. Why burden the Church with the cost of a form of government which is superfluous under a godly prince. (5)
- C. The government of the apostolic Church was partly popular, in

(1) W.iii.177 (2) Ibid 178 (3) Ibid 178f (4) Ibid 179 (5) Ibid 180

that the people were concerned in the election of their officers, and partly aristocratic, in that Pastors and Seniors carried out the actual governing. The danger of popular government is confusion; the danger of aristocracy is oligarchy. A godly prince is in a position to see that both these dangers are avoided. Therefore this method of government is more suited to the present time⁽¹⁾ than it was even to apostolic times.

W. The government of the Church is neither popular nor aristocratic, but a monarchy. Christ is the Head of the Universal Church, and under him the head of each national Church is the nation's ruler. No Christian Prince need have one kind of government in his Church and another kind in his State.⁽²⁾

C. Meetings of Seniors were dangerous in times of persecution, yet the Pastor was not in those times allowed to rule the Church alone. Now, in times of safety, there is all the more reason⁽³⁾ for governing the Church by means of such meetings.

W. It was no more dangerous for Seniors to meet for government than for the whole congregation to meet for worship. Under persecution the Church must govern herself as she can, regardless of the danger. But the same kind of government is not therefore⁽⁴⁾ suitable to times of safety.

C. Government by Seniors was practised in the primitive Church throughout almost the whole world. Recently it was practised throughout France. Why then cannot it be practised in a whole⁽⁵⁾ realm?

(1) W.iii.180f (2) Ibid 181f (3) Ibid 182f (4) Ibid 183 (4) Ibid 183f.

W. In the primitive Church, and in France, each Church was, so to speak, a commonwealth in itself, and government by a local Seigniority was fitting. When several Churches are under one governor, ruled by the same laws, and members of one kingdom, then your local Seigniories would create confusion, and rob the Christian
(1)
governor of his jurisdiction.

C. If there are more wicked persons and Hypocrites in the Church now than in days of persecution, there should be more Seniors to
(2)
deal with them.

W. They can be better dealt with by a Magistrate than by Seniors.
(3)

Whitgift's objections to a Seigniority included the difficulty of
(4)
finding, in many parishes, men fit to serve in that capacity, and so his argument with Cartwright continued as follows:-

C. There is a shortage of fit Pastors, but that does not mean that
(5)
there must be no Pastors.

W. The office of Pastor is necessary for the Word and the Sacraments. It is commanded in Scripture, and is perpetual. It does not conflict with the royal prerogative. None of these things can be
(6)
said for your Seniors.

C. God never commands anything impossible. He will pour out his gifts upon anyone called to serve him, and will suddenly make
(7)
him a new man.

W. God does not tie his grace to offices. He imparts it to those

(1) W.iii.184 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 185 (4) Ibid 176 (5) Ibid 185
(6) Ibid 186 (7) Ibid 186f.

who strive for it. By this argument of yours, it would not
 matter what kind of man was called to be a Pastor. (1)

Cartwright now complained that Whitgift wished the Church and its government to be conformed to the State and to the civil government, whereas the opposite should be done; the Church came before the State, and the latter should be fitted to the former as the hangings
 (2)
 were fitted to a house.

In this proposition Whitgift detected a desire to subject the Prince to the Church.

"For, if this kind of government be once admitted, the prince must needs be of some peculiar church and congregation, and therefore subject to the signiory of that church, except it please Master Pastor (who is the chief), and the rest of his neighbours the parishioners, to elect the prince into the signiory, and make him one of them; and yet must the pastor be his superior, and have authority to call him to consultations, and to direct him in matters of discipline; and whether he will or no, he must be ordered and ruled by the pastor, and most part of the seniors. And yet now I remember myself, the prince cannot be of the signiory; for T.C. granteth... that the seniors be no laymen, but ecclesiastical; so that indeed the prince must be a servant, no master; a subject, no prince; under government, no governor, in matters pertaining to the church." (3)

It is hardly surprising that with all this in his mind, Whitgift should describe Cartwright's plan of Church government as giving

"that to seniors which the pope under the like pretence doth arrogate unto himself." (4)

Cartwright's
 Whitgift pointed to ~~the~~ unsatisfactory use of the term κυβερνήτης

(1) W.iii.187f (2) Ibid 189 (3) Ibid 191f (4) Ibid 190. Cartwright's idea of Church government was, in fact, a return to the mediaeval "two-kingdom" theory, with the Church ascendant over the State as in the Papal view it ought to be. See Scott Pearson, Church and State in the Sixteenth Century, p38f.

in I Cor.xii.28, by which it was sought to show that the office of Senior should be permanent in the Church. It was included, he said, along with "miracle-workers" and "healers", which were certainly not permanent offices. ⁽¹⁾ It was also included, Cartwright retorted, along with Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists, which ~~Whitgift~~ Whitgift had said were perpetual. Because the office was mentioned in I Cor.xii.28 along with some others that were temporary, that ⁽²⁾ was not proof that this office of Senior was temporary.

Whitgift answered,

"If I cannot necessarily conclude that the office of seniors is temporal, because it is rehearsed among those offices and gifts that be temporal, much less can you conclude that it is perpetual, the most of the offices and gifts with it expressed being temporal." ⁽³⁾

If, Whitgift maintained, the claim made in the Admonition was true, that a sole governor was more likely to be corrupted by bribery than a number, ⁽⁴⁾ then the more governors, the better the government. But this was against sound divinity, for God had provided Israel with sole governors in the Judges and Kings. ⁽⁵⁾

Cartwright defended the Admonition on this point by declaring its meaning to be government by a few of the best men. He himself advocated a mixed estate for the Church, i.e. a mingling of popular and aristocratic government. ⁽⁶⁾ But he did not mean that this should be applied to the State.

"For the prince may well be monarch immediately between God and the commonwealth; but no one can be monarch between God and his church but Christ, which is the only Head thereof. Therefore the monarchy over the whole church, and over every particular church, and over every single member in the Church, is in Christ alone." ⁽⁷⁾

(1) W.iii.194 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 195 (4) Frere and Douglas, op.cit. 17f. (5) W.iii.196 (6) Ibid 197 (7) Ibid 198.

Replying, Whitgift appealed for scriptural support, as every exponent of the authority of the "godly prince" in search of such support must appeal, to the Old Testament:-

"It is certain that the christian magistrate under Christ hath as great authority as the magistrate had under the law. But then the civil magistrate had chief authority, both in matters of the commonwealth and of the church also... therefore the magistrate ought to have the same now in like manner."

The discussion now reverted to the saying of Ambrosiaster which (1)
 had already been noticed by the two men. Whitgift had used these (2)
 words of Ambrosiaster's against the Admonition to show that the title and function of a Senior had become extinct by Ambrosiaster's time. Indeed, all that could be claimed on the basis of this/saying (3)
 was that there had been Seniors in the Church before there were any Christian Magistrates, for Ambrosiaster had made his remark in the process of commenting upon I Timothy, and had made it about the condition of the Church in Timothy's time.

Cartwright took Whitgift's meaning to be that the office of Senior had ceased as soon as there were Christian Magistrates to take the place of Seniors, and claimed that, on the contrary, the ecclesiastical histories showed that Seniors had flourished in the (4)
 Emperor Constantine's time. Cartwright was promptly challenged by his opponent to quote chapter and verse for this claim. Whitgift was prepared to admit that it might be true, but could not see how (5)
 it could be proved to be true.

Cartwright tried further to disprove what he imagined Whitgift

(1) W.iii.198 (2) See p.209 (3) W.iii.199 (4) Ibid 200 (5) Ibid.

had said by pointing out that Jerome had testified to the existence of a Seignior in his time, viz:-

"Et nos habemus in ecclesia senatum nostrum, coetum presbyterorum." (1)

Whitgift interpreted these word of Jerome's as referring to a college of priests, for in the same place Jerome had defined "presbyters" as ministers. Further, Jerome's "senates" were in every city, not in every parish, and they had authority over the clergy, but not over the laity. Even if they had been Seigniories such as Cartwright meant, there were none of them in Ambrosiaster's Church, and therefore they were indifferent, things not necessary to the Church.
(2)

Cartwright's final attempt to disprove what he supposed Whitgift had tried to prove from Ambrosiaster lay in challenging him to continue the quotation from Ambrosiaster beyond the point at which he had cut it short. Ambrosiaster's next words were,

"Which elders I know not by what negligence they are worn out, unless it be through the slothfulness of the doctors, or rather through their pride, whilst they only would seem to be somewhat." (3)

(1) W.iii.201. Jerome, Comm.II in Isa.iii.3. To Cartwright, of course, Ambrosiaster was identical with Ambrose (died A.D. 397), and therefore Jerome (died A.D. 420) provided evidence of the existence of Seniors at a slightly later date than Ambrose. Ambrosiaster was probably about contemporary with Jerome. (2) W.iii.201f. (3) Ibid 203. Ambrosiaster, Comm. ad Tim. prim. v.1, 2. "Quod qua negligentia obsoleverit, nescio; nisi forte doctorum desidia, aut magis superbia, dum soli volunt aliquid videri."

Cartwright left his opponent to digest these words of Ambrosiaster's, with their implication that the office of Senior ought not to have been discontinued. But Whitgift denied that he had ever used Ambrosiaster for any other purpose than to prove the bare fact that the office of Senior had ceased to exist by Ambrosiaster's time. He added,

"If Ambrose so disliked the abrogating of this seigniorie, why did he not labour to restore it again? Surely, if it had been a matter so necessary, he, being so godly and zealous a bishop, would never have suffered his church to be spoiled of it." (1)

Whitgift concluded his discussion of the Seigniories with a statement that neither they, nor any other particular form of government, could be regarded as necessarily permanent in the Church.

"The manner and form of government used in the apostles' time, and expressed in the scripture, neither is now, nor can or ought to be observed, either touching the persons or the functions... In sundry points the government of the church used in the apostles' time is and hath been of necessity altered, and... it neither may nor can be revoked; whereby it is plain that any one certain form or kind of external government perpetually to be observed is nowhere in the scripture prescribed to the church; but the charge thereof is left to the christian magistrate, so that nothing be done contrary to the word of God." (2)

Among the authorities he cited in support of this pronouncement was Gualter who, inter alia, had said,

"They are too injurious which at this day, either under the name of the traditions of the apostles, or for any other pretence, go about to bind all churches to one and the self-same form." (3)

(1) W.iii.204. Whitgift could not have made this remark if he had distinguished Ambrosiaster from Ambrose. (2) Ibid 214f

(3) Ibid 216. Gualter, In Priorem D. Pauli Apostoli ad Corinthios Epistolam Homiliae, fol. 160, in cap.xi.hom.lvi.

XIII.

Cartwright and Whitgift each defined "Discipline" in a different way. To Cartwright, besides private admonition and reprehension, the term included such public matters as the choice and dismissal of ecclesiastical officers, the excommunication of stubborn offenders and the absolution of the penitent, and the settling of all doubtful matters of morals and doctrine in the Church. ⁽¹⁾

Whitgift thought this too wide a definition, for it included matters of government as well as of "Discipline". Discipline should consist of punishment and correction and not, for example, of the settling of matters of controversy. He therefore regarded Discipline as only a part of ecclesiastical polity, the correction of vice. ⁽²⁾ He believed, too, that the only discipline known in the New Testament (unless admonition and exhortation were taken to be parts of it) was excommunication. In Matt.xvi.19 and John xx.23 the power to excommunicate was committed to ministers of the Word. Examples of its use were to be found in I Cor.v, I Tim.i.20, Tit.iii. ⁽³⁾ 10f.

Cartwright held that the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv) was an example of the Eldership of the Church deciding a matter of controversy which was also a matter of discipline. If Whitgift maintained that excommunication was a power belonging to the clergy, he must also maintain that there was a defect in the Church of England, for in England only the Bishops could excommunicate. ⁽⁴⁾

(1) W.iii.220 (2) Ibid 221 (3) Ibid 220 (4) Ibid 221f.

The Council of Jerusalem, Whitgift replied, was not a parish Seigniorship. If it was to be used to prove a rule, that rule must be that matters in controversy could only be settled by a synod of the learned. Because Christ had committed power to excommunicate to ministers of the Word only, it must not be taken that this power was committed to all ministers of the Word;

"And yet I think all ministers have power to excommunicate, if the church think it good to commit that authority unto them."(1)

The Admonition had made ecclesiastical discipline the third essential "mark" of the Church, along with preaching the Word purely and ministering the Sacraments sincerely. (2) It enumerated the ways in which its authors considered that the Church of England had departed from the comparative soundness of the primitive Church. Excommunication was pronounced by single persons. It was inflicted for trifling offences, or for matters which were not sins, such as nonconformity in ceremonies. It was inflicted by Metropolitan or by Bishop, by Chancellor, by Official, or by Commissary, but not by the Church. Absolution could be obtained without penance by paying the fees of the Court, or by private rather than by public penance. It might be pronounced upon a proxy without the offender appearing in court at all. None of these things had been done in the primitive Church, and they had brought excommunication into contempt. (3)

Whitgift was constrained to admit that there were abuses in the Church of England in the practice of excommunication. Because it

(1) W.iii.222 (2) Frere and Douglas, op.cit.9 (3) Ibid 17f.

was inflicted for trifling matters it was little regarded. But he would not agree that the "Church" in Matt.xviii.17 meant anything other than those in authority in the Church, i.e. the Metropolitan,
(1)
Bishop, Chancellor, and so on.

Cartwright pleaded that Matt.xviii.17 should be interpreted in the light of Matt.v.22,

"Every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council (*τῷ συνέδριῳ*); and whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell of fire."

Some scholars, he agreed, thought that the *συνέδριον* mentioned here had dealt with civil offences, but the Jews had had no civil jurisdiction under the Romans,
(2)
and therefore this council must have been composed of ecclesiastical governors administering ecclesiastical censures. In the last resort the council could pronounce excommunication, as in John ix.22. In Matt.v.22 Jesus transferred this practice of the synagogues to the Church. That was why he spoke so indefinitely of the "Church" in Matt.xviii.17; he had already laid down the way in which the Church was to be represented for the
(3)
purpose of enforcing discipline.

Jesus, Whitgift thought, would not have borrowed this form of government from the Jews, nor any other form which, like this one, had not been prescribed by God in the Old Testament. But even if he had borrowed it and transferred it to the Church, it provided no precedent for parish Seigniories, for the Jewish Sanhedrin had been national. Jesus was not, anyway, laying down a form of Church

(1) W.iii.225 (2) This is pure assumption on Cartwright's part. Roman policy was normally to allow a wide measure of self-government to subject peoples. (3) Ibid 226f.

government; he was laying down degrees of uncharitable dealing,
 (1)
 with corresponding degrees of punishment.

Whitgift's interpretation of Matt.v.22 is preferable to Cartwright's, but we have to go elsewhere in his "Defence" to find a satisfactory explanation of the reference to "the council" in this passage and to the "Church in Matt. xviii.17. Earlier in the controversy he had stated that the Christian Church had not been established when Jesus uttered these two sayings, and that it was to the Jewish Council and the Jewish Church that he had been referring, but of course without any idea that the Jewish Council was
 (2)
 to be repeated in the Christian Church.

Cartwright claimed that in I Cor.v.13 St Paul had joined the Corinthian Church with himself in excommunicating the incestuous Christian. St Paul had therefore said,

"Put away the wicked man from among yourselves,"
 showing by these words that neither a minister alone, nor any other one man alone, might excommunicate. Similarly in II Cor.ii.5-11 St Paul had pleaded with the Corinthian Church to receive the offender again, thus joining that Church with himself in the act
 (3)
 of absolution.

Whitgift regarded St Paul's injunction to put the wicked man away as a direction to shun and avoid the offender, not to excommunicate him, for St Paul had already excommunicated him, as his

(1) W.iii.227 (2) Ibid 171. Whitgift had no reason to doubt that Matt.xviii.17 was a genuine saying of Jesus, but the question of genuineness cannot be disregarded nowadays. (3) Ibid 229

(1)

words plainly showed. Equally, St Paul had pleaded with the Corinthians to take the man back into fellowship after he had absolved

(2)

him.

"Wherefore... he doth not give them any authority to deliver him from the bond of excommunication, for that he did himself; as it may evidently appear by the circumstances of the place." (3)

Cartwright continued the discussion about the excommunication at Corinth by asserting that the "jus excommunicandi" did not lie in St Paul alone. St Paul had exercised that power only so far as it lay in him to exercise it, and only so far as his right stretched. Whatever St Paul might have said, the man would not have been excommunicated in fact if the minister and congregation at Corinth had refused to follow St Paul's directive. And if Whitgift should argue that St Paul's sentence was effective in heaven regardless of the agreement or otherwise of the minister and congregation at Corinth, so the sin would have received condemnation in heaven even (4)

if St Paul had never uttered a word about it.

The offender would still have been excommunicated before God, Whitgift replied, even if the Church at Corinth had refused to expel him. If excommunication meant merely exclusion from the con-

 (1) Whitgift would no doubt have in mind I Cor.v.3, "I... have already, as though I were present, judged him that hath so wrought this thing." (2) W.iii.230f (3) Ibid 231. Unfortunately for Whitgift the case is not so simple as he made it out to be. In I Cor.v. 4f St Paul said "When you are assembled, and my spirit is present, with the power of our Lord Jesus, you are to deliver this man to Satan." (RSV translation). In II Cor.ii.6,10 he said "For such a one this punishment by the majority is enough... Any one whom you forgive, I forgive." (RSV). From the data available in St Paul's words it is possible to argue either Cartwright's case or Whitgift's with equal plausibility and equal indecisiveness. (4) Ibid 233.

gregation, then the minister and people at Corinth could have prevented it. But if excommunication was to be understood as binding in heaven, then nothing that the minister and congregation might have done to the contrary would have been effective. ⁽¹⁾

If, Cartwright asked, the "jus excommunicandi" resided in St Paul alone, why did he invite the congregation at Corinth to join with him in exercising this right? How could it be said that it was in the minister at Corinth if it was only in St Paul? Or if it was only in the minister at Corinth, why had St Paul rebuked the whole Corinthian Church? ⁽²⁾

In this case Whitgift detected an example of a minister who had no "jus excommunicandi" committed to him, and therefore a precedent by which the Church of England might lawfully confine that right to the Bishops. St Paul's rebuke to the whole Church at Corinth was, he thought, administered because that Church had not complained about the offender, nor sought his punishment. ⁽³⁾

Whitgift argued more happily when he pointed out that neither Seniors nor Deacons were mentioned in I Cor.v. By Cartwright's own interpretation it was the whole Corinthian Church that excommunicated the offender, and there was no evidence of the existence of a Seigniorship that had carried out the excommunication on behalf of the Church. ⁽⁴⁾

Cartwright now turned to Matt.xvi.19 and John xx.23, and noticed that some ancient writers had expounded these passages in

(1) W.iii.233 (2) Ibid 234 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid 232

such a way as to allow the power of the keys to all members of Christ, or to those who professed Christ as the Son of God. They had not confined the power of the keys to the Apostles, as Whitgift had done. Nevertheless, Cartwright preferred to regard the power spoken of in these two passages of Scripture as the power contained in the threats and promises which constituted preaching. Excommunication was not mentioned in these two places, but it was mentioned in Matt.xviii.17, and there it was committed to the whole
(1)
Church.

Whitgift preferred to interpret all three passages alike, to interpret them of excommunication, and to interpret them as giving a power to the Apostles alone, viz:-

"He giveth that power in the xviii of Matt, to his disciples, to whom he speaketh the same words in that place that he doth in the xvi of Matthew, and in the xx of John."(2)

Only by supposing that St Paul was the moderator of an excommunication carried out by a Seigniorie was Cartwright able to explain away the simple statement of I Tim.i.20,

"Hymenaeus and Alexander; whom I delivered unto Satan."

But even if, Cartwright continued, it was granted that St Paul had excommunicated alone in these cases, either as an exceptional matter or because he was an Apostle, it did not follow that a Bishop or
(3)
a minister might excommunicate alone.

Whitgift rightly rejected this guesswork of Cartwright's, and demanded that the plain words of Scripture be taken without addition.

(1) W.iii.235 (2) Ibid 235f (3) Ibid 237

St Paul's action here, he declared, was in accordance with the commission to the Apostles in Matt.xvi and xviii, and John xx. If St Paul had excommunicated on his sole authority, it could not be supposed that there was any rule of Christ against such a procedure. If it was bad to argue that an Apostle had done this, and that therefore others might do it, it was worse to argue that because an Apostle had done it others might not do it.⁽¹⁾

As a preface to his examination of Whitgift's quotations from the Fathers on the subject of excommunication, Cartwright said,

"If all men should do contrary to the order of God, yet their authority or example ought not to have the weight of a feather; which I have said before, and do understand in all places, where I do not express it."⁽²⁾

To which Whitgift retorted,

"Why do you make this protestation before there be cause? When any authority is alleged contrary to the order of God, reject it, and spare not; but you must show us that order of God to the which it is contrary."⁽³⁾

Among the cases cited by Whitgift was that of the excommunication of the Emperor Theodosius by St Ambrose. Cartwright claimed that it could not be shown that Ambrose had pronounced this excommunication on his sole authority. If he had, his fault was the less because he had wanted an Eldership, but could not get one.⁽⁴⁾ If it was wrong to argue negatively from Scripture, it was still more wrong to argue negatively from the Church Histories, for they did not attempt to set down every detail. But Whitgift was arguing negatively, in Cartwright's opinion, when he asserted that Ambrose had

(1) W.iii.237 (2) Ibid 239f (3) Ibid 240 (4) This remark was based upon the identification of Ambrosiaster with Ambrose, as already noticed.

excommunicated alone. In fact, Cartwright claimed, Theodosius had been excommunicated by a synod of Bishops called together when the massacre which Theodosius had ordered at Thessalonica became known. The synod had decreed that the Emperor was not to be absolved until he had done ~~penance~~ penance, and Ambrose had pronounced excommunication on the authority of the synod. (1)

There was no reason to suppose, replied Whitgift, that Ambrose could not have had an Eldership if he had wanted one. The Eldership of which he had spoken would, anyway, have been composed of priests, and would not have been one of Cartwright's Seigniories. The fame of Ambrose's excommunication of Theodosius lay precisely in the circumstance that it was his sole act. It was an error to say that the synod excommunicated the Emperor, or to say that it was called together because of the Emperor's crime. It was already in session for other reasons when news of the massacre reached it. And just as Ambrose had excommunicated the Emperor on his sole authority so, as Theodoret had shown, he absolved him on his sole authority. The laity, even on Cartwright's showing, had certainly had nothing to do with the affair. (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)

To prove the unlawfulness of excommunication by one man alone, Cartwright quoted Tertullian as follows:-

 (1) Ibid 242f (2) Here again the force of the remark depends upon the identification of Ambrosiaster with Ambrose. (3) Ibid 243 (4) Ibid 244f. (5) Theodoret, Hist.Eccles.v.18. See also Ambrose, Ep.51. Whitgift's account of the affair agrees with these authorities, and Cartwright's does not. (6) ~~Ibid~~ W.iii.245f.

"If there be any which have committed such a fault, that he is to be put away from the partaking of the prayer of the church, and from all holy matters or affairs, there do bear rule or be presidents certain of the most approved ancients or elders which have obtained this honour, not by money, but by good report."(1)

Whitgift accused Cartwright of mispunctuating Tertullian in this quotation. There ought to be a "full stop" after the word 'affairs', and a new sentence begun at "There do bear rule". Zephyrus, in his Commentary on Tertullian's Apology, had punctuated in this way, for he had inserted his comments after the word 'affairs'. This quotation from Tertullian ought therefore to be translated,

"It is a great argument and example of the latter judgment, if any man hath so offended that he is banished from the communication of prayer, of company, and of all holy affairs. Approved seniors have authority to rule, which have obtained this honour, not by money but by a good report."(2)

These elders, said Whitgift, were ministers who ruled the congregation in its worship. Tertullian had not made it clear whether they were or were not concerned with excommunication, but even if they were,

"I did never so give the authority of excommunicating to the bishop alone, that I think he may not have other assistance joined unto him for the execution of it (if the order of the church so require); yet this proveth not but that the bishop may execute alone, if that authority be given unto him by the order of the church."(3)

Apart from the authority of a single person to excommunicate, Cartwright's claim that the quotation justified the contention that the laity had a place in pronouncing excommunication could not be upheld.
(4)

(1) W.iii.252. Tertullian, Apol.xxxix. (2) W.iii.252f (3) Ibid 253
(4) Ibid.

Cartwright asserted that almost every page of Cyprian's epistles showed that in that Father's time ministers did not excommunicate upon their sole authority, but required the people's consent, and referred difficult cases to synods. He cited five places from Cyprian in support of this contention.

In one of these citations Whitgift could find nothing to the point. In another, Therapius was reproved for absolving Victor before the time of penance had been completed, and for absolving him in secret. This was against the order of that Church, but Cyprian had allowed the absolution to stand because

"we thought not good to withdraw the peace which was once given (howsoever) of a priest of God." (3)

In yet another case Cyprian had declared that when he first became a Bishop he had determined to do nothing without the counsel of his priests and deacons, nor without the consent of the people. But this had nothing to do with excommunication and, further, it showed that Cyprian might have acted alone if he had wished, but that he had determined not to do so. In another of the citations Cyprian had rebuked certain priests for absolving without the Bishop's consent. There was nothing here about the people's consent, but the citation succeeded in proving that the Bishop's consent was required before absolution was pronounced. In the remaining citation Cyprian had refused to absolve those who had been excommunicated by all the clergy. No-one denied, Whitgift said, that a

(1) W.iii.254 (2) Ibid 256. Cyprian, Ep.59. In fact, para.15 of this epistle is, so far as it goes, to the point and in Cartwright's favour. (3) W.iii.254. Cyprian, Ep.64 (4) W.iii.255. Cyprian, Ep.14 (5) W.iii.255f. Cyprian, Ep.16.

synod might excommunicate, and where many persons had excommunicated, one single person must not absolve. But the fact that Cyprian had been asked to absolve on his sole authority showed that this was the normal practice.⁽¹⁾

Finally, Cartwright called in St Augustine to testify that, provided a majority of the people were not guilty of the same offence, it helped to impress the excommunicated person with fear and shame if the Church as a whole joined in the act of excommunication.⁽²⁾ Indeed, said Cartwright, St Augustine gave the people too much place in the act of excommunication, for he held that if a majority of the people were guilty of the same offence, then excommunication should not be attempted, since it would be impossible to obtain a sufficient number of votes in favour of it.⁽³⁾

St Augustine, Whitgift explained, wanted excommunication to be used only when it would not create schism in the Church, i.e. only when the offence was such as the majority detested.

"St Augustine meaneth him to be excommunicated of the whole Church, not whom the whole Church doth 'ex officio' excommunicate, but whose excommunication the whole Church doth well like of, whose fact the whole Church doth detest, and whose company and fellowship the whole Church doth avoid and eschew."⁽⁴⁾

Among canons of the Councils quoted by Whitgift in support of his claim that excommunication and absolution were in the hands of the Bishops alone in the early Church was the 5th canon of Nicea. This canon forbade a Bishop to absolve anyone who had been

(1) W.iii.256. Cyprian, Ep.26 (2) Augustine, c. Ep. Parmen. III.ii. 13. (3) W.iii.256f (4) Ibid 257f.

excommunicated by another Bishop. But so that the prohibition might not work harshly by taking away the right of appeal against a sentence pronounced unjustly or for personal reasons, each Province was bidden to hold a synod every six months to review cases of ex-communication. (1) Why, asked Whitgift, should this rule be enacted if a Bishop might not excommunicate alone? It was precisely the possibility of indignation or partiality in a single excommunicating Bishop that the synod was to look into. (2)

We have now a fairly complete picture of Cartwright's Seigniories. The Church was to be organized largely upon a parish basis rather than on a Diocesan basis. Each parish was to have its governing body composed of the minister, teacher, deacons, and lay Elders. All the work of the Church was to be brought before this Seignior, and to be controlled by it, but in certain matters, of which excommunication was one, the ratification of the parish as a whole was to be sought.

But in Cartwright's scheme the Church was not quite completely to be governed at the parochial level. In his plans he provided also for a tier of synods of

"shires, or dioceses, or provinces, or nations of as great or of as small compass as shall be thought convenient by the church, according to the difficulty or weight of the matters which are in controversy." (3)

The erection of parish Seigniories, Cartwright realized, would mean the end of the Bishops' Courts, but he was content to have it so. These courts, he maintained, had usurped the functions which

(1) Bright, Canons of the First Four General Councils, x, 15ff.

(2) W.iii.260 (3) Ibid 263

properly belonged to the parish minister and lay Elders in their Seigniorship. Further, the episcopal courts had so much work to do that the Bishop had to transfer to his Chancellor the power to excommunicate. This power, by Whitgift's own argument, belonged only to ministers of the Word, and it could not be transferred to another person by itself, and apart from the ministry of the Word. Again, the episcopal courts dealt with civil cases as well as ecclesiastical, and inflicted fines which were civil and not ecclesiastical penalties. All this was wrong.⁽¹⁾

As a primitive example of the transfer of some, but not all, of a Bishop's powers to another, Whitgift cited the case of the ⁽²⁾ *Χωρεπισκοποι* who had flourished at about the end of the third century. Cartwright asserted that these men were suffragan Bishops, or rural Bishops, and not mere deputies; they had differed in name from Chancellors much less than they had differed from them in function.⁽³⁾ But Whitgift insisted that they had been, whatever their title, substitutes for the Bishop in a part of his powers,

"which, being granted, it will soon fall out that (bishops) may as well have chancellors."⁽⁴⁾

(1) W.iii.265, 267f (2) Ibid 270 (3) Ibid 270f (4) Ibid 273. If the Chancellors whom Whitgift had in mind were laymen, then his argument was bad, for he had certainly declared that the power to excommunicate belonged only to ministers of the Word. But he may have been thinking of Chancellors who were in Holy Orders. Such Chancellors, being ministers of the Word if they were licensed to preach, would fall within the class of those who, according to Whitgift, might excommunicate if authorized by the Bishop to do so.

XIV.

Upon the interpretation of two sayings of Jesus there rested an important part of the Admonitioners' case, and of the Puritan plan for the future of the Church of England. Since Whitgift and Cartwright were in broad agreement about its interpretation, one of these saying may be dismissed here briefly. This saying was,

"Be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your teacher, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father on the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, even Christ." Matt.xxiii.8ff.

Field and Wilcox used this passage to support their condemnation of episcopacy. They said,

"The dominion that (the bishops) exercise... is unlawful, and expressly forbidden by the word of God." (2)

The conjunction of this remark with Jesus's saying implied an interpretation of the saying which Whitgift rejected completely. Did Jesus mean, he asked, that names and offices of superiority were prohibited to the clergy? Did it follow that the name and office of a Bishop, as used in the Church of England, was repugnant to the Word of God?

"Shall not children call their parents Father? Shall not scholars call their teachers Master?" (3)

He expounded the saying as a condemnation of ambitious and arrogant affection of superiority, and as a warning not to depend as much upon human authority as upon divine law. As a guide to the correct interpretation he pointed to the words which followed closely after Jesus' saying, in the same place,

"Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased." Matt.xxiii.12.

(1) W.i.149 (2) Frere and Douglas, op.cit.30 (3) W.i.148.

The second saying of Jesus was, taking it in its context,

"When the ten heard it they were moved with indignation concerning the two brethren. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant." Matt.xx.24ff, cf Mark.x.41ff.

The discussion also covered the Lucan variant of this saying,

"The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them; and they that have authority over them are called Benefactors (εὐεργέται). But ye shall not be so: but him that is greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve." Luke xxii.25f

If Cartwright had assented to Whitgift's interpretation of this saying he would not have sacrificed the whole of his case against episcopacy, but he would have surrendered the advantage of being able to claim support from Christ's own words, and this he could not afford to do.

Whitgift claimed it as an opinion common to all writers that the saying in question condemned only ambitious desire for authority and tyrannical use of it when obtained, but not authority itself. (1) He pointed to the verbs used in Matthew, κατακυριεύουσιν and καταξουριάζουσιν, and expounded them as referring to rule with oppression and to ruling "as a man list". He also called Cartwright's attention to the words in Matthew "he who wishes to be great." (2) In Matthew and Mark, he said, Jesus condemned the ambition of the two brethren, and in Luke the ambition of all the Twelve, who were quarrelling among themselves about their greatness. Applied

(1) W.i.157 (2) Ibid 163

generally, these passages prohibited ambition and desire to rule in all men, but did not condemn superiority, magistracy, or jurisdiction as such.⁽¹⁾

Cartwright had an advantage in interpretation over Whitgift, for this saying had been addressed by Jesus to the Apostles, and not to the general public. Was the saying to be applied to all Christians, or only to those who, like the Apostles, were ministers of the Gospel? It suited Cartwright's standpoint to confine the application to ministers, and he plunged at once into a new expression of his dualism of Church and State. Kings, he said, might rule, but

"bearing dominion doth not agree to one minister over another."⁽²⁾ There was also a difference of title to be noticed in the saying. Jesus had allowed "gracious lord" (⁽³⁾ *εὐσπύς*) and other majestic titles to civil rulers, but had forbidden them to ministers of the Gospel. Not all authority, however, was forbidden in the saying. A prince might rule over his people and a minister over his congregation. But a minister must not rule another minister, even though some ministers might display pre-eminence in virtue and gifts.⁽⁴⁾

As regards the Greek verbs used in the Matthaean version of the saying, Cartwright denied that a bad sense was to be attributed to the prefix *κατά*. He gave this prefix an intensive sense, so that the verbs meant "to rule forcibly" or "absolutely", and he pointed out that St Luke had used the uncompounded forms of the verbs, showing that Christ had forbidden authority itself as between the Apostles.

(1) W.1.165 (2) Ibid 148f (3) "gracious lord" was the translation used in the Geneva Bible in this place, and was commonly repeated by Puritan writers when quoting the passage, see p. 617
(5) Ibid 160.

Moreover, in St Luke's version the phrase "he that is greater among you" took the place of St Matthew's "he that wishes to be great."⁽¹⁾

St Luke, Cartwright thought, had provided a saying of Jesus in which there was no suggestion that the rulers of the Gentiles were tyrannous. On the contrary, Jesus had shown that they were beneficent, and had neither condemned their supposed tyranny nor denied them the title due to their position.

"Seemeth it unto you a probable thing that St Luke meaneth tyrants and oppressors, when as he saith they are called beneficial and gracious lords? Men do not use to call oppressors liberal or bountiful lords."⁽²⁾

It must therefore be supposed that Jesus had condemned both superiority in title and superiority in authority ~~to~~ the Apostles in their relationship to each other.

Finally Cartwright pointed to the verb ἡγανάκτυον in Matt.xx.24. This word, he thought, signified a disdain felt for someone raised to a position of which they were not worthy. The ten Apostles resented James and John assuming that they were superior to them, and Jesus's rebuke was addressed to James and John for making such an assumption.⁽³⁾

If, answered Whitgift, Jesus had meant to put a difference between civil rulers and ministers he would have said simply, "kings and princes", and would not have specified "rulers of the Gentiles" who were notorious for their tyranny.⁽⁴⁾ Regarding the title εὐεργέτης, "bountiful and benefactors", Whitgift said of the Gentile rulers,

(1) W.i.163 (2) Ibid 165 (3) Ibid 166 (4) Ibid 150

"if either they vaingloriously desired that name, or were so called, when they deserved rather the names of tyrants and oppressors, doth it therefore follow that they be unlawful names for such as may deserve them..? The name of "gracious lord" is a name of superiority and of reverence, according to the manner of the country where it is used, and therefore may well agree either to the civil or ecclesiastical persons."(1)

His general conclusion was that

"such superiority in government, as by your own confession may be in ministers over the people, may also be in one minister above another, for anything that this place hath to the contrary."(2)

In defence of his translation of the verbs compounded with *κατά*, Whitgift quoted Erasmus:-

"The preposition likewise soundeth in the evil part, declaring that power to be tyrannical, and joined with the hurt of the subjects."(3)

He also pointed out that Beza, commenting on the Matthaean version of the saying, had referred to Acts xix.16;

"The man in whom the evil spirit was leapt on them, mastering (*κατακυριεύσας*) both of them."

In this passage there could be no doubt about the bad sense of the
(4)
verb.

St Luke, Whitgift continued, must be interpreted in harmony with
(5)
St Matthew and St Mark, and not against them. And so,

(1) W.1.152 (2) Ibid 162 (3) Ibid 164. Erasmus, Annot. in Evang. sec Matt. cap.xx.25. (4) W.1.164. Nov. Test. cum Th. Bezae Annot. H.Steph. 1565. Evang. sec. Matt. xx.25. In the 1594 edition of his Annotations Beza omitted the reference to Acts xix.16 and interpreted Matt. xx.25 in the same way as Cartwright. (5) In fact, Cartwright interpreted Matt. xx.25 in harmony with what he took to be the meaning of Luke xxii.25, while Whitgift began with Matt. xx.25, decided what its meaning was, and interpreted Luke xxii.25 to suit. Cartwright, that is to say, started with the uncompounded verbs, and Whitgift with the compounded. The different starting points determined the different interpretations.

"in that Christ there saith 'he that is great among you', he insinuateth that there must be some great among them, whom he there teacheth how to use himself."(1)

The meaning of *ἀγανακτῆς*, Whitgift believed, was not confined to a disdain of those promoted beyond their deserts. It was

"any kind of indignation... for any cause."(2)

Jesus had not supported the ten Apostles in their indignation at James and John. He had addressed his rebuke to all the Twelve for thinking positions of authority to be of any importance by comparison with positions of service.

"This I think", said Whitgift, "that (the ten) were as ambitious in disdaining as the other (two) were in desiring."(3)

(1) W.i.165 (2) Ibid. 168 (3) Ibid 167. The Lexicons of Liddell and Scott (new edition), Moulton and Milligan, and Arndt and Gingrich, all support Whitgift's translation of *ἀγανακτεῖν*. They also agree that *κατακυριεύω* and *κατεξουσιάζω* may be used in a bad sense, implying tyrannical rule, but in neither case do they exclude the sense of "rule" simply, without reference to the nature of the rule. Both Whitgift and Cartwright over-stressed the force of the prefix *κατά* in trying to decide the meanings of these verbs. The true meaning of Jesus's saying can only be decided by the context. The point of his saying lay in the contrast between a desire to rule and a desire to serve. If the desire to serve be lacking, the desire to rule is no more than a desire to dominate. Whitgift's interpretation is much more nearly correct than Cartwright's, for it treats the saying in its context.

XV.

The Admonition to Parliament contained some strong protests about the methods used in the Elizabethan Church for selecting candidates for ordination. There was insufficient trial of their learning and manner of life. ⁽¹⁾ They were not chosen by the Church, but they themselves chose valuable benefices and had themselves ordained so that they could occupy them. Instead of congregations choosing their own ministers, or at least consenting to their appointment, ⁽²⁾ ministers were thrust upon them by the Bishops.

While admitting that in the "old church" trial had been made of the teaching ability of candidates for the ministry, Whitgift denied that this had been done when Matthias was made an Apostle (Acts i. 15ff) or when the Seven were made Deacons (Acts vi. 1ff), as the Admonition claimed. In both cases the suitability of the candidates for their offices was already known, and therefore examination was unnecessary. These passages from Acts merely showed that qualified persons were required for the ministry, and not that examination was in all cases necessary. The qualifications for ordinands were set out in I Tim. iii. and Tit. i. The Ordinal in the Book of Common Prayer required the same qualifications in those who were to be ordered. If this provision was neglected the Church as a whole ⁽³⁾ should not be blamed, but only those who were guilty of the neglect.

Cartwright agreed that there had been no examination of the abilities of Matthias and Barsabbas because they were already well

(1) Frere and Douglas, op.cit. 9 (2) Ibid 10 (3) W.1.296-300.

known, but he thought that the Apostles had "put forward two" so that the assembled brethren might object to one or both of them if they wished. ⁽¹⁾ However, as Whitgift had already admitted that there ought to be trial of a candidate's ability where this was not already known, ⁽²⁾ Cartwright went on to complain of certain faults that he found in the Ordinal. First, it was unsafe to commit the examination of candidates to one man. The presenting of Matthias and Barsabbas had put the onus of decision about their suitability upon the many, as did also the manner in which the Seven were sought out. ⁽³⁾ Second, it was inappropriate that an Archdeacon should be the examiner. Was not an Archdeacon a Deacon? ⁽⁴⁾ Why should a Deacon be given the task of judging the suitability of an office which required higher gifts than were ^{needed} ~~need~~ for his own. ⁽⁵⁾ Third, I Tim.iii. showed that those who examined and those who ordained should be the same persons. But in the Ordinal the Bishop was the ordainer and the Archdeacon the examiner. ⁽⁶⁾ Fourth, although opportunity was given in the ordination service ~~xxxxx~~ for the Church to object to an ordination, no such opportunity was given to those whom it most concerned, ⁽⁷⁾ the congregation to whom the ordinand was to minister. Further, the congregation at an ordination usually knew nothing at all about the candidates, and were given no chance of finding out anything about them before the service had proceeded beyond the point at which an objection might be made. ⁽⁸⁾

(1) W.1.297 (2) Ibid 296, 299 (3) Ibid 300f (4) This was one of Cartwright's favourite little pieces of pretended ignorance. He was well aware that an Archdeacon was seldom, if ever, a Deacon. (5) Ibid 304 (6) Ibid 306 (7) Ibid 307 (8) Ibid 309f.

The Ordinal, Whitgift replied, required both the Bishop and the Archdeacon to satisfy themselves of the ordinands' fitness, so that it was not a fact that examination was committed to one only. But even if it were committed to one, who was more capable of judging than a Bishop, who would know by experience what was required in a minister? (1) If the Archdeacon was a Deacon, and for that reason was not qualified to judge of the fitness of ministers, still less, by the same argument, were the people qualified to judge, as Cartwright (2) wished them to do. It could not be gathered from I Tim.iii. that ordainers and examiners should be the same persons, although it might well be fitting that they should be the same. But in that passage St Paul had made one man, a Bishop, the judge of ability in (3) ministers. A congregation could only learn the ability of its (4) future Pastor by having him to live among them for at least a year. If he did this during the lifetime of the old Pastor, the congregation would be put to the expense of a double maintenance. If he did it after the old Pastor's death, the vacancy would be inconveniently prolonged. In either case the appointment would become a matter of disagreement and faction among the members of the congregation. (5) Testimonials were already required from persons well acquainted with an ordinand, and his ordination was sufficiently publicized in advance to allow opportunity for objections to be made. Where there were abuses, they were faults in persons, and not in (6) the Ordinal.

(1) W.1.301 (2) Ibid 304 (3) Whitgift's reasons for assuming that Timothy was a Bishop will be examined later. (4) Ibid 306 (5) Ibid 307f (6) Ibid 310f

To claims in the Admonition that the cases of Matthias and the Seven were examples of election by the people, Whitgift denied that Matthias was so elected; he had been appointed by lot, by which method God made the choice, not the people. The Seven had admittedly been elected, but only by permission of the Apostles, who had appointed their number, defined their duties, and ordained them.

Attention was next paid to the meaning of the word $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ in Acts xiv.23. Field and Wicox had cited this passage in support of their theory that no minister should be appointed without having been elected to office by his congregation. Cartwright held that $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ ought to be translated in its classical sense of "elect by show of hands", or simply "elect". He admitted that ecclesiastical writers some centuries after St Luke had used the word in the sense of "ordain by the laying-on of hands", but he pointed out that in Scripture the phrase used for the imposition of hands was $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omega\nu\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omega\nu$. How could a word, he asked, which meant "lifting up the hand" be used to signify "laying down the hand"? Regarding Acts xiv.23,

"St Luke saith here that Paul and Barnabas ordained, because they, being the moderators of the election, caused it to be made, assembled the churches, told them of the necessity of having good pastors and governors, gathered the voices, took heed that nothing should be done lightly, nothing tumultuously or out of order. And so, to conclude, it is an evil reason to say, as M.Doctor (Whitgift) doth, that, because St Luke hath it that Paul and Barnabas ordained, therefore the people were excluded." (6)

(1) W.1.339 (2) Ibid 340f (3) Ibid 341 (4) Cartwright here gave as examples the LXX, I Tim.iv.14, v.22, II Tim.i.6, Acts viii.17, ix.17, xix.6. (5) W.1.346f (6) Ibid 342.

Thus to Cartwright $\chi\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ in Acts xiv.23 meant "ordain by election" or "cause to be elected".

Whitgift was aware of the primary and classical meaning of $\chi\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$, but preferred, in translating Scripture, to employ the later sense of ~~$\chi\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$~~ "ordain by the laying-on of hands." (1) He was clearly puzzled by this usage, for he said,

"He that layeth his hands upon a man's head doth lift them up before he can lay them on." (2)

He thought $\chi\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ signified a wider meaning than $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omega\nu$ $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omega\nu$, the former indicating the whole process of ordination, (3) and the latter only the actual ceremony of imposition.

In II Cor.viii.19 the context in which $\chi\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ occurs demands "choise" by the churches as its meaning, though not necessarily choice by the technical processes of "election". Cartwright used this passage to argue as follows:-

"If it were thought meet that St Paul should not choose himself, of his own authority, a companion to help him, being an apostle, is there any archbishop that shall dare take upon him to make a minister of the gospel, being so many degrees... inferior to St Paul? And, if St Paul would have the authority of the church to ordain the minister that should aid him in other places... how much more did he think it meet that the churches should choose their own minister which should govern them." (4)

(1) W.1.345 (2) Ibid 350 (3) Both controversialists came near to the actual meaning of $\chi\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ in Scripture when they discussed $\tau\iota\pi\omicron\kappa\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in Acts x.41 (W.1.351). Cartwright noted that the ceremony of imposition was excluded here, and Whitgift noticed that election was excluded, except in the sense of choice by one person. Moulton and Milligan (op.cit.) agree with both exclusions, and show that in the New Testament $\chi\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ had already lost its classical meaning without having yet acquired its later ecclesiastical meaning. It is astonishing that Souter (Pocket Lexicon of the Greek New Testament) should give only "elect" and "elect by show of hands" as the meanings of $\chi\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$, for, as Arndt and Gingrich (op.cit.) point out, in Acts xiv.23, "Paul and Barnabas" form the subject and $\chi\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\eta\theta\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ "does not involve a choice by the group; here the word means 'appoint, instal'". (4) Ibid 350.

Whitgift answered that the meaning "elect by the people" in this passage was required by the phrase $\delta\pi\sigma\tau\omega\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ added to $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$. In the absence of some such qualifying phrase the verb was elsewhere to be taken as signifying either the imposition of hands, or the whole act of ordination. In the present case, St Paul's companion was chosen by the Churches so that the Apostle's integrity in handling the money entrusted to him should not be called in question. (1)

Whitgift admitted that in many parts of the Church, though not in all, from the Apostles' time until Cyprian's, and even later, (2) the people's consent was required for the appointment of ministers. Responding to Cartwright's challenge that he should show a case earlier than Cyprian where this consent was not required, he quoted Cyprian's words about election by the people; it was a custom

"which also is observed with us, and almost throughout all provinces." (3)

"Almost", but not quite, all. There were provinces where the custom was not observed.

Even Cyprian, Whitgift claimed, had required the consent of the people only in the sense that they should be present at ordinations, and be given an opportunity to object. Cyprian had taken silence for consent, and had not required consent to be by election nor by acclamation. (4)

Whitgift placed the matter of the election of ministers by the people firmly among the "adiaphora":-

(1) W.i.356 (2) Ibid 360 (3) Ibid. Cyprian, Ep.67.5. (4) W.i. 362.

"I say that in the whole scripture there is no commandment that it should be so, nor any example that maketh therein any necessary or general rule, but that it may be altered as time and occasion serveth. For in such matters not commanded or prohibited in scripture, touching ceremonies, discipline, and government, the church hath authority from time to time to appoint that which is most convenient for the present state."(1)

Cartwright thought that apostolic examples ought to be treated
(2)
as rules. But, asked Whitgift, which examples were to be followed? In Acts i the Apostles chose two men and God decided between them by lot. In Acts vi the people chose Seven and the Apostles laid hands on them. In Acts xiv the Apostles ordained presbyters. In II Cor.viii the Churches chose a companion for St Paul.

"Have you any commission to make a mixture of all these examples, and so make one rule whereunto all churches at all times must of necessity be bound?"(3)

It was Whitgift's opinion that the election of ministers by the
(4)
people of the Elizabethan Church would be pernicious and harmful. Cartwright thought that this opinion constituted a condemnation of the Churches of Geneva, France, and part of Germany, in which such
(5)
election was practised. Whitgift repudiated this idea

"because every church may do therein as it shall seem to be most expedient for the same."(6)

Cartwright now brought forward his reasons for thinking that the election of ministers by the people was in all circumstances an ad-
(7)
vantage. What concerned all should receive the consent of all. If it was reasonable to elect a governor in worldly affairs, such as a mayor or bailiff, it was still more reasonable to elect a governor in spiritual matters. "The spiritual man discerneth all

(1) W.1.363 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 365 (4) Ibid 368 (5) Ibid 369
(6) Ibid 368 (7) Ibid 370.

things", and therefore Christian people were well able to elect a
 fit Pastor to look after their souls' welfare. People who had
 chosen their own Pastor would love and reverence him the more because
 they had done so, and would therefore follow his example the more
 readily. If a congregation should choose ^{an} and unfit Pastor, then the
 minister and Elders of neighbouring congregations should try to
 stop the appointment. If they were unsuccessful they should take
 the matter to a synod, and if still unsuccessful ask the Queen to
 exercise her veto.

Whitgift answered that the Bishops and clergy were already
 appointed according to the consent of the people, for the Ordinal
 had been allowed and granted by the representatives of the people
 in Parliament. Not all members of the Church had the spirit of
 discernment, and even those who had it were not thereby enabled to
 judge infallibly of the qualities of a Pastor. Parishes which had
 a papist majority among them would love and reverence a papist for
 their minister, but this was no good reason for allowing them to
 choose a papist. Experience showed that parishioners loved their
 minister for just so long as he served their affections, and if they
 had chosen him they would be the more likely to think him bound to
 please them. What Scripture was there for asserting that neighbour-
 ing congregations, or a synod, or the Queen, should interfere to
 hinder the election of a minister considered to be unsuitable? And
 what confusion this process would create:-

(1) W.i.372 (2) Ibid 374 (3) Ibid 375 (4) Ibid 372 (5) Ibid 373
 (6) Ibid 375. ~~xxx~~

"For how many meetings of churches should we have! how many synods! what parts-taking! what running up and down! what loss of time! what cause of offence! what quarrels! yea, what not?" (1)

Whitgift drew attention to the differences between apostolic times and Elizabethan times, and the differences which must result in the government of the Church and in the ordination of ministers. In apostolic times the Church was under persecution; her membership was small, and Christians knew each other sufficiently to be able to form a good idea of each other's qualifications. Now the Church was too numerous for all Christians to know each other's abilities. Many a parish could not produce a fit minister from its own number; (2) he must come from among people unknown to that parish. Again, under persecution most Christians were sincere in their profession of the faith; now there were many hypocrites. In the Apostles' time Christians were knowledgeable in their faith, and they included in their number no idolaters or papists; now many were ignorant, and (3) many were papists at heart.

To these reasons Cartwright could find no effective reply. He argued that the bad characters mentioned by Whitgift were neither in the Church nor of the Church; they should be excommunicated and (4) thus deprived of any part in the election of a minister. It was not until Whitgift came to his final objection to the popular choice of ministers that Cartwright made any serious attempt to refute him,

(1) W.1.377 (2) Ibid 378 (3) Ibid 382, 384f (4) Ibid 382f, 385f. This solution does not face the difficulty that until they were excommunicated, such people would have a voice in the election of a minister. Equally it fails to deal with the problem of the insincere Christian.

and then he committed another of his occasional pieces of wilful and pretended misunderstanding. Whitgift reasoned that as there had been no "godly prince" in apostolic times there could be no established Church then, and so the government of the Apostolic Church could suitably be "popular". But things were different in 16th-century England. ⁽¹⁾ As though he did not know that "established" ⁽²⁾ meant "allowed by the Magistrate", Cartwright argued that the Apostolic Church was fully established (i.e. firmly founded) without a "godly prince". ⁽³⁾ Whitgift agreed that, in so far as this applied to the invisible Church of the elect, Cartwright was correct. But in the case of the external and visible Church only the sword of the Magistrate, he asserted, could provide the Church with effective ⁽⁴⁾ government.

This part of the controversy drew from Whitgift a definition which clarifies the difference which, as he thought, the presence of a Christian civil ruler should make to the individual Christian subject;

"In the time of persecution (Christians) have no magistrate (among their number); they be all equal; neither is one bound to obey another by any civil law; none hath chief and special care over the rest as magistrate to compel: wherefore it cannot be otherwise then, but that such offices and functions should be chosen by common consent." ⁽⁵⁾

Whitgift willingly conceded that a Christian Prince might, if he wished, commit the appointment of ministers to the people, but the evidence that Cartwright had produced to show that certain of the Roman Emperors had done this merely proved that they had the power

(1) W.1.389 (2) Ibid 395 footnote 4 (3) Ibid 389 (4) Ibid 391
 (5) Ibid 396.

to do it. It did not prove that they or other rulers must necessarily do it, nor did it prove that it would be expedient to do the same in England.

Where the Admonition had protested against the appointment of ministers in the Church of England on the sole authority of the Bishops, and had stated that the ordering of ministers did not appertain to Bishops, Whitgift had pointed to the authority (expressed or implied in I Tim.v.22 and Tit.i.5) bestowed by St Paul on Timothy and Titus.⁽¹⁾

Cartwright took these references to the Pastoral Epistles to mean that Whitgift thought St Paul had commanded the whole process of ordering ministers to be in the hands of one person. This would have been inconsistent with what Whitgift had already said about the election of ministers by the people in apostolic times. For if St Paul had commanded the ordering of a minister by a single person, then the election of that minister by the people could not be a thing indifferent, as Whitgift had said it was; it must rather be a thing contrary to Scripture. St Paul, Cartwright thought, had commanded Timothy and Titus only with respect to the part which they would play in the ordination of presbyters. The Apostle had had no idea that they should monopolize the process of ordination, but had merely thought of them as moderators of that process and had directed them how to act as such, without excluding others from playing their parts in the process..Indeed, St Paul had shown that others

(1) W.i.425f. Frere and Douglas, op.cit.10.

besides himself had taken part in Timothy's own ordination, even in the actual ceremony of the imposition of hands, for in II Tim. 1.6 he had mentioned his own part and in I Tim.iv.14 that of the Elders. But even if St Paul had permitted Timothy to ordain on his sole authority, that would not justify a Bishop doing the same, for Timothy had been an Evangelist, and therefore of higher rank and authority than a Bishop.⁽¹⁾

Whitgift, who assumed that Timothy and Titus had been Bishops, explained that he had cited the two places from the Pastoral Epistles to show that ordination did, in spite of the Admonition, appertain to Bishops, but not to show that it appertained to Bishops solely.⁽²⁾ Nevertheless, as Bullinger had said, there were occasions in apostolic times when one alone chose and ordained,

"As when Peter sent Mark, and Paul both called and sent Timothy, Titus, and Luke."⁽³⁾

If the election of ministers had necessarily belonged to the people, St Paul would not have addressed Timothy and Titus as he had done; he would have written direct to the people, or would have instructed Timothy and Titus to convey his directions to the people.⁽⁴⁾

To rebut Cartwright's interpretation of I Tim.iv.14 Whitgift employed Calvin's translation of *τοῦ ὑπερβυτηρίου* in that place:-

"I do not understand as if Paul were speaking of the college of Elders. By the expression, I understand the ordination itself: As if he had said, Act so, that the gift you received by the laying on of hands, when I made you a presbyter, may not be in vain."⁽⁵⁾

(1) W.1.426f (2) Ibid 428 (3) Ibid 429. Bullinger, Adv. Anabaptistas III.iv., fol.89.2 (4) W.1.430. (5) Calvin, Inst.IV.iii.16. In his Commentary on I Tim.iv.14 Calvin had second thoughts about this matter and said, "They who think that presbytery is here used for

Taken in this way, I Tim.iv.14 could not be used as an authority against the exercise of the whole process of ordination by a single person.

In connection with these two passages in which Timothy's admission to the ministry was mentioned, Cartwright complained that Whitgift had not sufficiently distinguished between the election of a minister and the imposition of hands upon him. ⁽¹⁾ The precise meaning of this remark is not clear, for Cartwright did not elaborate it. Whitgift took him to mean that "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" in I Tim.iv.14 included "election by the people". But Cartwright had already used this place, along with II Tim.i.6, to prove that the imposition of hands was the duty of the minister of the Word and the Elders only, and not of the people. ⁽²⁾ He could not use the same passage for both purposes, said Whitgift, but to remove all doubt,

"to 'lay on hands' sometimes signifieth the ceremony only of laying on of hands, and sometimes the whole manner and form of ordering." ⁽³⁾

It was in the latter sense that the two passages under consideration were to be understood, and they therefore provided examples of the whole process of ordering being under the authority of one person.

the "college of presbyters or elders" are, I think, correct in their opinion; although after weighing the whole matter, I acknowledge that a different meaning is not inapplicable, that is, that presbytery or eldership is the name of an office." *Πρεσβυτερία* certainly does not mean "presbyterhood". Arndt and Gingrich (op.cit.) show that the word was used of the Jewish Sanhedrin, and was repeatedly used by Ignatius for a council composed of Bishops, presbyters and deacons, and for the Apostles as a "presbytery" of the Church. Whitgift's employment of I Tim.iv.14 as an example of ordination upon the sole authority of a single person cannot therefore be admitted.

(1) W.i.427 (2) Ibid 355 (3) Ibid 431.

Cartwright now provided examples from the literature of the
 early Church of the election of the clergy by the people, but only
 to have them countered from the same source by examples of "sole"
 appointment together with examples of the factions and contentions
 which had accompanied popular elections. After referring to what
 Gregory of Nazianzus had had to say upon this subject, Whitgift
 declared,

"No man denieth but that the people at this time had interest
 in the election of the minister in divers churches; but that
 doth not prove that they ought to have so now, or that the
 bishop hath no interest in the same; nay, inconveniences of
 popular elections did then manifestly appear." (4)

For Cartwright, and even for the Admonition in its second and
 revised version, popular election meant election by the presbytery
 of Elders with the consent of the people. Hence, when he turned
 his attention to the case of Origen, Cartwright said,

"Eusebius... speaking of Origen, which was admitted, not of
 one bishop but of many bishops, to teach, sheweth how the bish-
 ops were reprehended by the bishop of Alexandria... because
 they had admitted him without the election of the presbytery
 of the church, which were the chief in the election in every
 church, and unto the which the churches did commit the govern-
 ment of themselves in every several town and city, and saith,
 that it hath not been heard... 'that the layman should teach
 when the bishops were present.' Whereby it is evident that
 he counted him a layman, which was only admitted by the
 bishops, although they were many, not being first elected by
 the presbytery of that church whereof he was the teacher." (6)

This perverse interpretation of Eusebius was based on the assump-
 tion that the Bishops' invitation to Origen to teach in their pre-
 sence was, and was intended to be, an ordination to the office of

(1) W.1.438, 441, 443f, 449 (2) Ibid 439ff, 442f, 444ff, 449f
 (3) Oration xviii.33,35,36 (4) W.1.447 (5) Frere and Douglas, op.
 cit.10 footnote 2 (6) W.1.452. Eusebius, Hist.Eccles.VI.xix.16-19.

"Doctor". By quotation of Eusebius's actual words Whitgift had no difficulty in showing that there was no mention of any defect in Origen because he lacked election by a presbytery. That defect was nothing more than a product of Cartwright's imagination. All that the Bishop of Alexandria had complained about was that a layman had been allowed to teach in the presence of Bishops. Whatever else might be said for Cartwright's conclusion that election by a presbytery was an essential element in ordination, that conclusion could not be argued from Origen's case. (1)

Cartwright's parting contribution to the discussion about the election of ministers was to declare that if anyone alleged that election by the people would be disorderly, he should know that it was not proposed to allow children, boys, or women to take part. Only the heads of families would be concerned. He did not state his authority for this limitation and Whitgift, surprisingly, did not ask him for it. (2)

XVI.

"As the names of Archbishops, Archdeacons, Lord Bishops, Chancellors, etc, are drawn out of the Pope's shop, together with their offices, so the government which they use... is anti-christian and devilish, and contrary to the scriptures... For the dominion that they exercise, the Archbishop above them, and they above the rest of their brethren, is unlawful, and expressly forbidden by the word of God." (3)

Thus Field and Wilcox.

In his Answer to the Admonition Whitgift admitted that there was

(1) W.1.454. (2) Ibid 456 (3) Frere and Douglas, op.cit.30.

a fundamental equality of ministers, though not such a one as Field and Wilcox envisaged. He said,

"It is not to be denied but that there is an equality of all ministers of God's word 'quoad ministerium'... for they all have like power to preach the word, to minister the sacraments; that is to say, the word preached, or the sacraments ministered, is as effectual in one (in respect of the ministry) as it is in another. But, 'quoad ordinem et politiam'... there always hath been and must be degrees and superiority among them."(1)

For the origin of this inequality 'quoad ordinem et politiam'

Whitgift referred to Jerome's words,

"In the beginning a bishop and ~~xx~~ a priest was all one. But, after that there began to rise factions in religion, and some said they held of Apollos, some of Paul, some of Cephas, and some of Christ, it was decreed that one should be chosen to bear rule over the rest; to whom the chief care of the church should appertain, and by whom sects and schisms should be cut off."(2)

These words, Whitgift claimed, were proof that distinction of degrees within the ministry began in apostolic times, and to show how the distinction ~~xx~~ was put into effect in Alexandria in the earliest times of the Church there, he quoted Jerome again:-

"From St Mark unto Heracl^{us} and Dionysius, bishops, the ministers used to elect one among themselves, whom they placing in a higher degree, called a bishop."(3)

If Whitgift had held that Holy Orders was a sacrament, he could

(1) W.ii.265 (2) Comm.in.Ep.ad Tit.1.5. "Idem est ergo presbyter qui et episcopus, et antequam diaboli instinctu, studia in religione fierent, et diceretur in populis: Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cephae (I Cor.1.12), communi presbyterorum consilio, Ecclesiae gubernabantur. Postquam vero unusquisque eos quos baptizaverat suos putabat esse, non Christi, in toto urbe decretum est, ut unus de presbyteris electus superponeretur caeteris, ad quem omnis Ecclesiae cura pertineret, et schismatum semina tollerentur." (3) Ep.146.

not have allowed that there was an equality 'quoad ministerium' as between a Bishop and a Priest, for the Bishop could have administered a sacrament from which the Priest was excluded in the Church of England. But he held that the laying-on of hands was to be classed as a ceremony, quoting Calvin with approval thus,

"It was not a vain ceremony; because God did fulfil with his Spirit that consecration which man did signify by imposition of hands."(1)

But, said Whitgift,

"Everything that signifieth anything is not a sacrament; for them matrimony were a sacrament; and so were laying on of hands."(2)

It was Cartwright's purpose to show reason why

"the superfluous lop and spread of these immoderate offices"(3) of Archbishop, Archdeacon, etc, should be taken away, then to show that the very titles of these offices were antichristian (i.e. of papistical origin), and finally to show that these offices as used in the Church of England were strange and unheard of in "Christ's Church", because they implied a superiority among the clergy. The title of "Bishop" had its origin in the New Testament, and Cartwright could not attack that; all he could do was to assail the confiscation of that title to one minister among many, and the superiority given to that one minister. In practice it was the title of "Archbishop" which bore the weight of Cartwright's assault, the others being subject to the same criticisms.

(1) W.i.490. Calvin, Commentary on I Timothy (Calvin Translation Society, 1856) p116. On the same page Calvin refers the reader to his "Institutes IV.iii.16 where the laying on of hands is commended if not superstitiously used. In the "Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances" of 1541, with which Calvin had much to do, imposition of hands was disallowed because of past superstition (Calvin, Theological Treatises, SCM 1954, p.59. (2) W.ii.66 (3) Ibid 80.

The discussion proceeded thus:-

Cartwright: St Peter called Christ "Archshepherd" or archbishop. In the Epistle to the Hebrews Christ is called "the great Shepherd". In Acts and Hebrews he is called the "Archleader". These are titles of Christ alone, and they are not to be given to men. (1)

Whitgift: "Some names that be proper to God are also attributed unto man... They belong to God properly and per se, to man per accidens and in respect that he is a minister of God."

Thus Christ called himself "Pastor", and St Peter called him both "Bishop" and "Pastor". As Cartwright must agree, Scripture applied these titles to men as well as to Christ. St John called Jesus "Lux Mundi", and yet Jesus gave the same title to his disciples.

"In respect of Christ and his spiritual government, there is neither magistrate nor archbishop... but in respect of men, and the external face of the Church, there are both, and that according to Christ's own order..."(2)

C. "The ministry is by the word of God, and heavenly, and not left to the will of men to devise at their pleasure."

The Pharisees asked John the Baptist,

"If thou be neither Christ, nor Elias, nor of the prophets, why baptizest thou?"

This question would have had no point if the functions of Christ, Elijah, and the prophets, had not been ordinary and instituted by God. To establish the authority of his own extraordinary function, the Baptist had found it necessary to quote the word of God.

"Whereby (it) appeareth that... it was not lawful to teach the true doctrine of God under the name of any other function than was instituted of God."(3)

(1) W.ii.82 (2) Ibid 83f (3) Ibid 87.

W. On the contrary, the Pharisees did not say "of the prophets", but, "if thou be not that prophet", i.e. the prophet like Moses whom they had been taught to expect. The Pharisees were not asking about ordinary functions of their Church such as Levite or priest, but about extraordinary persons, Christ, Elias, "the prophet". An argument based upon the supposition that these extraordinary persons were ordinary offices is false. (1)

C. In the Old Testament the only ministry was that appointed in the Law, except for extraordinary ministries confirmed by miracles or by plain testimony from God or by the special moving of the Spirit.

"So it appeareth that the ministry of the gospel, and the functions thereof, ought to be from heaven and of God, and not invented by the brains of men... God hath not only ordained that the word should be preached, but hath ordained also in what order and by whom it should be preached." (2)

W. "You would make the reader believe that to institute an archbishop is to institute a new ministry... I... deny that there is any other ministry in the church, because there are archbishops, than is by the word of God confirmed... You have not yet proved... that there ought not to be governors or superiors among the ministers of the gospel, to whom any other names may be given than is expressed in the word." (3)

C. "In the whole volume of the (old) testament is there any kind or degree of ministry whereof God is not the certain and express author?" (4)

W. "Under the Law there were offices and titles in the church which are not commanded in the scripture... as archisynagogus... scribes... *σπαρχοὶ τοῦ ἑκδου* ... and those seniores populi and that *συρξερῶν* whereupon you ground your seigniory." (5)

C. The ark, the tabernacle, and the temple, are figures of the Church.

"Is it a like thing that he, which did not only appoint the temple, but the ornaments of them, would not only neglect the ornaments of the church, but also that (ministry) without the which... it cannot long stand?" (6)

(1) W.ii.88 (2) Ibid 88f (3) Ibid 89f (4) Ibid 90 (5) Ibid 91
(6) Ibid 92-96.

- W. "All men know how uncertain a reason it is that is grounded upon figures and types, except the application thereof may be found in the scriptures, for a man may apply them as it pleaseth him... I say with M. Calvin, 'It is certain that the ark was a figure of the church by the testimony of Peter, but it is not meet to apply every part thereof unto the church.' As for the tabernacle and the temple, what is prescribed for them concerns ceremonies and worship, not external policy and government of the church." (1)
- C. "Without the ministries of archbishop, etc, the church may be fully builded and brought to perfection; therefore these ministries are not to be retained." (2)
- W. "The church, in a kingdom where it hath an external government, where it includeth both good and bad, where it is molested with contentious persons, with schisms, heresies, etc, cannot enjoy complete unity, nor be perfectly governed touching the external form and government, without such offices and governors." (3)

As might be expected, Cartwright's argument from Scripture against the titles and offices of Archbishops, Archdeacons, etc, revolved mostly around Ephes.iv.11-12 and I Cor.xii.28. The former of these passages, he said, gave a picture of a ministry which could bring the Church to perfection, and yet it included neither Archbishop nor Archdeacon. True, it did not include Elder or Deacon either, but that was because it was a picture only of the preaching ministry. Of that ministry it was a complete picture. Evangelists and Pastors were omitted from I Cor.xii.28 because in that passage, Cartwright thought, St Paul had been reproofing the ambitious, and therefore had needed to mention only some of the offices which might
(4)
be the objects of ambition.

Archbishops and Archdeacons, Whitgift replied, were omitted from Ephes.iv.11-12 for precisely the reason that Cartwright had indicated. The list of offices given there was a list of preaching

(1) W.ii.92,95. Calvin, Commentary on Genesis (Calvin Translation Society, 1847) p257f. (2) W.ii.97 (3) Ibid 97f. (4) Ibid 98,100f

(1)
offices. Archbishops and Archdeacons were administrative officers.

Cartwright next asked where, in either of these passages, Archbishops were to be found. Bishops and Pastors were one and the same, but if it were to be said that Archbishops were included in Pastors, that would be to make St Paul prophesy an office that had not come into being until long after his death. St Paul, however, had ~~not~~ been prophesying; he had named what God had given, not what God would give.
(2)

Just as the term *ἐπισκοπος* was invented by the Council of Nicaea, Whitgift replied, but the thing it signified was already in the New Testament, so with the office of Archbishop. The thing, though not the name, was to be found in the New Testament.
(3)

If, Cartwright continued, Archbishops were included in Pastors, then their office must be regarded as necessary in the Church. But, in fact, the upholders of that office did not argue for its necessity.
(4)

In so far as they ministered the Word and Sacraments, answered Whitgift, Archbishops were at all times necessary. But in so far as government and policy were concerned, and that was the respect in which they were called "Archbishops", they were not at all times necessary to the Church.
(5)

At this point Cartwright forgot himself and contradicted one of his earlier statements. Having declared that Ephes.iv.11-12 con-

~~It~~(1) W.ii.101. Here Whitgift stated that the list in I Cor.xii.28 was more complete than that in Ephes.iv.11-12, for it contained eight offices as against five. He did not mean that the list in I Cor.xii.28 was absolutely complete. He was merely anticipating and denying in advance the theory that Cartwright was later to put forward, that the two lists taken together provided a complete list.
(2) Ibid 102 (3) Ibid 102f (4) Ibid 102 (5) Ibid 104.

tained a list only of the preaching ministry, he now described this idea as the last resort of those who argued for the office of Archbishop. Could it seriously be held, he asked, that the Apostles had had nothing to do with order and discipline, and that in their time there were Archbishops and Archdeacons who governed the Church? (1)
This would amount to placing the Apostles under Archbishops.

Whitgift explained that he regarded Ephes.iv.11-12 as a list of those who held ministerial functions in the Church, but this did not exclude the same persons from holding functions of government as well. The Apostles had had both kinds of function, which indicated that Archbishops might also have both in later times of the Church. Because in St Paul's time the Church was perfect without Archbishops, it did not follow that it would be perfect without them in modern times, any more than it followed that the Church was imperfect because it no longer had Apostles, prophets, gifts of healing, or tongues.

"This kind of reasoning... is unskilful, because it doth not distinguish the times of the church, neither considereth necessary circumstances." (2)

Cartwright noted that the offices mentioned in Ephes;iv.11-12 were "given". This meant, he thought, that there were always gifts attached to these offices. But to add offices to the list would be to make more offices than gifts. Therefore the additional offices (3)
must be superfluous.

(1) W.11.104 (2) Ibid 105, 108 (3) Ibid 113. Cartwright did not hesitate, however, to add offices himself (the "helps" and "governments" from I Cor.xii.28) so as to complete the list to his own satisfaction.

Whitgift replied,

"God doth not tie his gifts to any certain and definite number of names or titles of offices, but bestoweth them as it pleaseth him, to the commodity of his church, upon such as be meet to use them, by what name or title soever they be called."(1)

To Cartwright's question whether the "first... second... third..." of I Cor.xii.28 was not a difference of order laid down by St Paul, Whitgift agreed that it was. But he enquired if Cartwright meant by his question that the same order was to be used in modern times. If so, then there must be Apostles and ~~prophets~~ prophets in the Church, which Cartwright had denied. If not, then the order of I Cor.xii.28 was not perpetual, but might be changed to suit the convenience
(2)
of the Church. For,

"God hath left to his church authority to appoint both names and offices, as shall be for the same most convenient and profitable; the which authority the church hath also from the beginning used, as in appointing catechists, lectors, and such like, not superfluous but most necessary offices, and profitable for the church in those times wherein they were."
(3)

In rebuttal of Cartwright's oft-repeated objection that Archbishops and Archdeacons constituted a new ministry, over and above that ministry laid down in Scripture, Whitgift asked whether Jerome meant that a new ministry had been created when he described how the presbyters of Alexandria set one of their number to govern the
(4)
rest for the avoidance of schism? It was not a new ministry, and neither was the office of an Archbishop.

"It is... to execute that office of government which the apostles themselves did."(5)

(1) W.ii.114f (2) Ibid 109 (3) Ibid 116 (4) Jerome, Ep.146
(5) Ibid 117

But even if it were a new ministry, it would be permissible to ~~XXXXX~~ appoint it as a help to the ministries appointed by God. What would be impermissible would be to take away a ministry instituted
(1)
by God to be perpetual.

Among the many authorities quoted by Whitgift to show that the titles of "Archbishop" and "Archdeacon" were in use in the Church before the "papal tyranny", the Canons of the Council of Nicaea
(2) took the foremost place. From these Whitgift was able to show that the Council had confirmed an ancient custom whereby the Bishop of Alexandria had a primacy in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis. The Council had also acknowledged a somewhat similar primacy in the Bishops of Rome and Antioch, and had conferred honorary primacy upon the Bishop of Jerusalem without, however, trespassing upon the primacy of the Bishop of Caesarea, in whose province Jerusalem lay. The title given to these primates was "Metropolitan". Their jurisdiction was such that no-one made Bishop in their provinces without
(3)
their consent was to be regarded as a Bishop.

(1) W.ii.117 (2) In his "Answer" Whitgift named the 6th, 13th, 25th, 26th and 27th Canons. In response to Cartwright's insistence that there were only twenty genuine Canons of Nicaea Whitgift, in the "Defence", withdrew from 25, 26, and 27, and used 6, 7, and 13. Even on this restricted ground he was inaccurate, for he said "In the 13 Canon mention is made of a patriarch and of an archdeacon divers times... as it is also in the seventh canon... In the 13. canon the name of archbishop is added." Nothing of this appears in the true text of the Canons. So far as the titles "Patriarch" and "Archbishop" are concerned, Whitgift is guilty of anachronism. "Patriarch" was used loosely of all Bishops in the time of Gregory of Nyssa, and was not appropriated to the holders of the great Sees until the 6th century. The title "Archbishop" has a roughly parallel history. It was used in the 4th century as a mark of respect for the occupants of the great Sees, and was later extended to ~~metropolitans~~ metropolitans having jurisdiction over a province. See W.ii.141f, 147f, 151f, Bright, op.cit. xi, xiii, 104, 223. Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. Cross on "Patriarch" and "Archbishop".
(3) W.ii.144

Cartwright tried to argue that the title "Metropolitan" was no more than a name given to the Bishop of any city designated as the chief city of a (Roman) diocese, and no more signified primacy over other Bishops than to call a man a minister of London signified that he was a superior of a minister of Newington. (1) For an answer he was referred to the sixth Canon of Nicaea, and to the wide jurisdiction (2) accorded there to the Bishop of Alexandria.

In a series of conjectures introduced by phrases such as "there is great likelihood", "I am moved to think", "it is not like", (3) Cartwright suggested that an Archbishop in St Ambrose's time was merely the chief figure at an ordination, being appointed for the one occasion only, and retaining no primacy whatsoever after the ordination service was concluded. For this use of his imagination he was referred, again, to Canon 6 of Nicaea, and in addition to (4) Calvin, and all other learned writers none of whom had ever taught (5) that the office of Archbishop ~~was~~ was held by course.

Despite the fact that he had already, and rightly, stated that (6) the title "Archdeacon" did not occur in the Canons of Nicaea, Cartwright now claimed that in Canon 14 Archdeacons were made subject (7) to, and not the superiors of, ministers of the Word. He was told that he

"must learn to make a distinction between an archdeacon and a deacon," (8)

for the Canon referred only to the latter.

(1) W.ii.147 (2) Ibid 149 (3) Whitgift had quoted "De Dignitate Sacerdotum" as Ambrose's work, but it is spurious. (4) Inst IV.iv.4. (5) W.ii.155-157. We shall return later to the Puritan notion that episcopal office in the early Church was held by course, p. 650ff (6) W.ii.150 (7) i.e. Canon 18, see Bright, op.cit.xivf (8) W.ii 177f.

Whitgift himself was not altogether happy in the conclusions which he reached on the matter of these titles. He said,

"Forasmuch as the original and beginning of these names, metropolitan, etc, cannot be found (so far as I have read), it is to be supposed that they have their original from the apostles themselves." (1)

To justify this claim he quoted St Augustine, as follows:-

"That which the whole church doth hold, not being appointed by councils, and yet is always observed, it is truly to be believed that it is no otherwise appointed than by the authority of the apostles." (2)

But when Cartwright challenged him to show the titles in Ignatius, Clement of Alexandria, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, or the writers quoted by Eusebius, he fell back feebly into a condemnation of the argument from silence. (3)

Whitgift now undertook to find in the ante-Nicene Church the office of Archbishop, even though the title could not be found there. What he had to seek was this:-

"It is the chief and principal office of an archbishop to keep unity in the church, to compound contentions, to redress heresies, schisms, factions, to see that bishops, and all other of the clergy which be under him do their duty." (4)

The obvious case to be used as an example was that of Cyprian who, Whitgift alleged, in his capacity as Bishop of Carthage had exercised jurisdiction over

"the churches in Afric, Numidia, and both the Mauretanies." (5)

(1) W.ii.186 (2) Augustine, Ep.54.i.1 (3) W.ii.146f. By trying to prove too much with the aid of St Augustine's dubious proposition, Whitgift spoiled the effect of his argument. It was not his purpose to find an apostolic origin for the titles, but to show that the Church had liberty to invent such titles along with the offices to which they belonged, and had exercised that liberty before the "papal tyranny" when she was comparatively uncorrupted. He had done this with the title "Metropolitan", and it was unnecessary to press the matter further. (4) W.ii.193 (5) Ibid 194.

Cartwright objected that a jurisdiction as wide as this was impossible in Cyprian's time, for Cyprian himself had said that a Bishop was chosen by the voice of the people. How possibly could the people of so great an area be gathered together for an election? The very fact that Cyprian was elected showed that he was the Bishop (1) merely of one city or one congregation. Whitgift solved this problem by asserting that Metropolitans and Bishops alike were elected by the people of that city only from which they took their title, (2) and by no others.

Cartwright reminded his opponent that Cyprian had objected to Florentius making himself a "Bishop of Bishops", and had often (3) addressed other Bishops as "brethren" and "fellow-bishops". This, replied Whitgift, merely showed that in ministry Cyprian was equal with the rest; it did not mean that he was not their superior in other matters. St Peter had similarly called those to whom he had written "fellow-ministers", but that did not imply that their author- (4) ity was equal with that of an Apostle.

Cartwright now turned to Cyprian's words,

"The church is knit and coupled together as it were with the glue of the bishops' consenting one with another," (5)

and complained that the placing of one Bishop over another contra- (6) dicted this idea of mutual agreement. It was clear that Cartwright had not distinguished sufficiently between constitutional rule and tyranny, and Whitgift therefore reminded him that in the Church of England, as in St Cyprian's time, the Archbishop administered the

(1) W.ii.197 (2) Ibid (3) Cyprian, Ep.66.3 (4) W.ii.207. I Pet.v.1
 (5) Cyprian, Ep.66.8 (6) W.ii.211

law but did not make it upon his sole authority, and that the Bishops in their Dioceses were in the same position. Either might use persuasion to end a dispute, but neither might go beyond the law
(1)
laid down by the consent of the Church.

The controversy turned next to the practice of the Apostles. Cartwright recalled St Jerome's words,

"At first a bishop and a presbyter were all one." (2)

He also recalled Jesus's condemnation of divorce on the ground that

"from the beginning it was not so." Matt.xix.8.

Putting these two sentences together he pleaded that there should be a return to first principles in the case of the Christian ministry.

Further, St Jerome had said,

"As the elders know themselves to be subject by a custom of the church unto him that is set over them, so the bishops must know that they are greater than the elders rather by custom than by any truth of the institution of the Lord." (3)

And Christ had asked the Pharisees,

"Why do you break the commandments of God to establish your own traditions?" Matt.xv.6.

Putting these two passages together, Cartwright concluded that Bishops and presbyters should go back to the original divine institution of the ministry, and rule the Church in common.
(4)

(1) W.ii.212. Whitgift's comparison between the position of the Archbishop in the Elizabethan Church and St Cyprian's position is only partially true. The Act of Uniformity required consultation, which need not necessarily end in agreement, between the Archbishop and the Queen in certain matters. The Church as a whole, through Parliament, had consented to this arrangement. But it was not an arrangement whereby the Archbishop administered decisions which had been discussed and settled with his fellow-Bishops. Such discussions might take place, but they would have no legal effect.

(2) Jerome, Comm.in Ep. ad Tit.1.5 (3) Ibid (4) W.ii.225, 227.

To go back to the beginnings of the Church, replied Whitgift, would involve the appointment of Apostles, the abstention from things strangled, and such-like matters which not even Cartwright himself would approve. In matters of faith and of things necessary to salvation, indeed, it was always good to go back to first principles, but not in other matters. It had not, anyway, been proved that Christ had commanded equality of ministers, and it was begging the question to argue as though he had.⁽¹⁾

Cartwright's next point concerned heresies and schisms in the time of the Apostles. Since there were no Archbishops in those days to settle such matters, there was no purpose in retaining that office in Elizabethan times.⁽²⁾ Whitgift replied that the Apostles themselves had had the authority and office, though not the title, of Archbishops.

"For they had the government and direction of divers churches, both in matters of doctrine and discipline: they ended controversies, repressed errors, kept them in quietness, ordained them bishops, and visited them... What other office than those hath the archbishop?... Notwithstanding that part of the office of the apostles is ceased which consisted in planting and founding of churches throughout the world, yet this part of government and direction remaineth still, and is committed to Bishops... Now, if I shall prove by good authority that among the apostles themselves, and in their times, there was one chief (though he were not called archbishop), then I suppose it will not seem strange unto you, that in this state of the church it should be convenient to have the like in every province or diocese."⁽³⁾

(1) W.11.227f (2) Ibid 228 (3) Ibid 230. This is the nearest approach that Whitgift made to an assertion that Bishops are the successors of the Apostles. But the succession he envisaged was not tactical through a continuous line of consecrators back to the Apostles. It was not a succession of traditional doctrine inherited through previous occupants of the same See. It was not even the deliberate and continuous repetition of an apostolic pattern of Church government. It was merely the continuance of a function of government.

This office of government was necessary to the Church, not because it had been an apostolic office and function, but because human nature being what it was, this office was the best way of ruling the Church. It would still be the best way even if it had not happened to be also the way in which the Apostles had governed.

"I affirm that, if it had not been so in the Apostles' time, yet it might have been both lawfully and necessarily at other times." (1)

In support of this opinion that the necessity of episcopal authority was to be found in human nature, Whitgift called in the help of Calvin, viz:-

"That the twelve apostles had one among them to govern the rest it was no marvel; for nature requireth it, and the disposition of man will so have it, that in every company (although they be all equal in power) yet that there be one as governor, by whom the rest may be directed." (2)

Cartwright now raised the question of the Council held in Jerusalem to decide the matter of the circumcision of the Gentile Christians at Antioch. Why, he asked, was not an Archbishop appointed there to settle the matter on the spot? Why had not Peter, or Paul, or Barnabas settled it? Instead, the matter had been referred to the judgment of the whole Church. (3)

An Archbishop, Whitgift answered, did not take upon himself the determination of matters in controversy, but settled them according to decisions already made by the Church. If there were no previous decisions which applied to the case in question, he called a synod, presided over it, and obtained a ruling. (4)

(1) W.ii.232 (2) Calvin, Inst.IV.vi.8 (3) Acts xv (4) W.ii.232
(5) Ibid.233. Although Whitgift preferred to regard Peter as the president of the Council of Jerusalem, he felt no certainty about

Jerome's statement that at Alexandria

"from St Mark to Heracla and Dionysius, bishops, the ministers used to elect one among themselves, whom they, placing in a higher degree, called a bishop,"(1)

led Cartwright to argue that St Mark must have died before the process of raising one presbyter above the rest had commenced, for (2)

"it is certain that St Mark did not distinguish, and make those things divers, which the Holy Ghost made all one. For then, (which the Lord forbid) he should make the story of the gospel which he wrote suspected."(3)

As regards the period between the death of St Mark and the episcopate of Dionysius, Cartwright tried to argue that although there had been Bishops ruling over the presbyters of Alexandria, there had been no such Bishops elsewhere, for

 matter (see p. 276) and he may have been hinting here that James was the president. Whitgift had already in his "Answer", upon the authority of the "Epistle of Anacletus", suggested with some hesitation that James had been the Archbishop of Jerusalem. For depending upon this pseudonymous epistle of a much later age than its supposed author he had been soundly rated by Cartwright, and had admitted that his authority was counterfeited (W.ii.136f). But if James had to be denied the title of "Archbishop" he might at least be credited with having exercised the function of an Archbishop. It would have been possible for Whitgift to have argued plausibly along this line if he could have regarded the Council of Jerusalem as provincial, a meeting in which both Antioch and Jerusalem played their parts. But the account in Acts xv suggests that the Council was a meeting only of the Church of Jerusalem, called to decide upon what terms it would maintain fellowship with the Gentile Christians of Antioch. On this view of the Council it could at best be argued that James, if he was the president, was acting as the constitutional Bishop of a meeting of a local Church, but not that he was acting as an Archbishop within Whitgift's definition of that office. But on the same view of the Council it was difficult to argue that St Peter, if he was to be regarded as the president, had acted as Archbishop. If Whitgift was aware of these difficulties, they may have been the cause of his indecision on the question of whether James or Peter had been the president. (1) Jerome, Ep.146 (2) It is possible to interpret Jerome's phrase "from St Mark" as including St Mark's lifetime or, alternatively, as though it meant "after St Mark's time."
 (3) W.ii.250

"It is to be observed that Jerome saith it was so in Alexandria, signifying thereby that in other churches it was not so."(1)

The glaring 'non sequitur' of this remark caused Whitgift to exclaim,

"This argument passeth all that I ever heard... No marvel it is though you riot in your logic, when such stuff is set abroad."(2)

Even though it were granted, Whitgift continued, that St Mark was to be excluded from the time when Bishops ruled over presbyters at Alexandria, Jerome was still witness to the great antiquity of the superiority of a Bishop over presbyters, and therefore of the establishing of that superiority in the best and purest times of the

(3)

Church.

(4)

As Cartwright noticed, the arguments Whitgift used to justify the office of Archbishop were equally valid to justify the office of Universal Bishop. It was Whitgift's theory that the government of the Church must match the government of the State in which the Church is situated. In England supreme power of government resided in the Queen, who governed ecclesiastically through the Archbishop of Cant-
(5)
erbury as she governed civilly through the Lord Chancellor. But Whitgift would not grant that this would hold good if one Caesar ruled over all Christendom, and could delegate his ecclesiastical authority to a Universal Primate. Whitgift's reason for this denial was feeble in the extreme; it was that Calvin and Dean Nowell had
(6)
denied the ability of one man to rule the whole world. But it was no answer to Cartwright's reminder that there had been in the past Christian Emperors over all Christian realms, merely to say,

(1) W.ii.250 (2) Ibid. 251 (3) Ibid 250 (4) Ibid 244f (5) Ibid 246. (6) Ibid 245. Calvin, Inst.IV.vi.2. Nowell, A Confutation as well of M.Dorman's last Boke, etc, fol.321.

"This office of government may well be executed in one province... but it could not be so over all Christendom." (1)

Cartwright referred back to the words which Whitgift had already quoted from Calvin, viz:-

"That the twelve apostles had one among them to govern the rest, it was no marvel; for nature requireth it." (2)

This meant, he said, that in a meeting of a parish seignior or of a synod of wider jurisdiction, the pastors, elders, and deacons at each meeting, and for that meeting only, should choose one of their number as chairman by a majority vote, for this was what the Apostles had done. The chairman's task was to draw up the agenda, sum up the discussion, act as teller in the voting, and be the meeting's spokesman in giving any praise or administering any rebuke decided upon by the meeting. But as soon as the meeting came to an end, that chairman's authority ended with it. (3) A president of this sort was not simply to be called a governor or moderator, but a governor or moderator for that action only. He was to be subject to the same standing orders as the rest of the meeting, and subject also to censure by the meeting. At the next meeting of the same body some other member might be chosen as president. (4)

The pattern of this method of conducting Church meetings, Cartwright maintained, was to be found in the Acts of the Apostles. Peter had acted as president at the election of Matthias, and as the Apostles' spokesman on the Day of Pentecost.

"But you will say, Where are the voices of the rest, which did choose Peter unto this? First, you must know that the scrip-

(1) W.ii.248 (2) See p. (3) W.ii.269 (4) Ibid 271

M

"ture setteth not down every circumstance, and then surely you do Peter great injury that ask whether he were chosen unto it; for is it to be thought that Peter would thrust himself to this office or dignity without the consent and allowance of his fellows?"(1)

In Acts xv and xxi.18 James was the president of the Church in Jerusalem, and Peter so no longer. This circumstance displayed the temporary nature of the presidency.
(2)

This was the kind of Bishop, Cartwright maintained, that Justin Martyr had meant when he called him *ὑποστάτης*. The nearer in time the Church was to the Apostles, the more it kept to this pattern of temporary superiority; the farther ~~was~~ away from the Apostles, the more had this superiority degenerated into a tyranny.
(3) Because it was this kind of presidency that Calvin had had in mind, he had been careful to say that one, and not Peter particularly, had ruled over the Apostles.
(4)

All this idea of a temporary presidency was Cartwright's own invention, Whitgift declared, and it was contrary to all histories, Councils, Fathers, and scholars, who were united in declaring the office of Archbishop and the jurisdiction of a Bishop to be

"permanent, and affixed to certain places, not moveable, nor during one action only."
(5)

If the office ceased at the end of each meeting, who called the next meeting? Who fixed the place of meeting and determined the business to be discussed?
(6)

"Whosoever shall well consider the first of the Acts and the xv, and other places where mention is made of Peter's speaking, as he shall perceive that this was Peter's peculiar office...

(1) W.ii.272 (2) Ibid 275f (3) Ibid 277f (4) Ibid 278 (5) Ibid 269f
(6) Ibid 270

"so shall he easily understand that he was not at any time chosen to that office by voices, much less at every particular meeting... Dare you presume upon vain conjectures, without warrant of scripture, to build the foundation of your kind of government, which you before said is a matter of faith and salvation?"(1)

Peter, Whitgift continued, retained his supremacy for so long as the Apostles remained together, and executed it whenever they met. At the Council in Acts xv Peter spoke first to appease the tumult that had arisen, Paul and Barnabas spoke next, and finally James who, (2) as an Apostle, had an interest in the matter under discussion. Because James spoke last he was not necessarily to be regarded as the moderator of the meeting. The fact that James was moderator of the meeting recorded in Acts xxi.8 was not to the point, for Peter had not been present at that meeting. But if James was moderator of the meeting in Acts xv, he was moderator by virtue of his office as (3) Bishop of Jerusalem. It was, moreover, incorrect to say that Calvin had not mentioned Peter in the quotation under discussion. A little further on in the same place Calvin had said,

"The apostles did give this kind of pre-eminence unto Peter." (4)

Cartwright agreed that St Paul was superior to Timothy and Titus in that he was an Apostle while they were only Evangelists. He agreed, too, that Titus, being an Evangelist, was superior to the Pastors of Crete. But he would not agree that Titus had been Archbishop of Crete. Titus had had one flock in Crete, Cartwright asserted, and had ordained ministers only in the sense that he had

(1) W.ii.274 (2) It is noticeable that both Whitgift and Cartwright regard James as an Apostle (3) Ibid 276f. Whitgift appears to be reluctant to ascribe the primacy in Acts xv to James, even though he had previously named James as Archbishop and had seemed to suggest that James presided at the Council of Jerusalem. He was anxious here to maintain the permanency of Peter's primacy. (4) Inst.IV.vi.8

presided over their election. The Pastors of Crete had made him their president because, no doubt, of his many gifts and of his office of Evangelist, which was a degree above that of Pastor. (1)

Insofar as St Paul had been a minister of the Word and Sacraments Whitgift did not grant that he had had any superiority at all over Timothy and Titus, but he did grant that the Apostle had been their superior in government. This showed what Cartwright had denied, that there might be superiority among the ministers of the Word and Sacraments. (2) There was no word of Scripture to suggest that Titus had ever been an Evangelist, and if he had had only one flock in Crete then he must have been, by Cartwright's own definition, a Pastor, and not, by the same definition, an Evangelist. As for Cartwright's interpretation of the case of Titus in its other details, Whitgift said, (3)

"I see that you confidently take upon you to expound Paul's meaning against his plain words, and against the judgment of the old interpreters, and divers of the new." (4)

One of the commands to Timothy now came under consideration:-

"Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses." I Tim.v.19.

Cartwright interpreted this passage to mean that Timothy was granted authority only to moderate in the trials of accused presbyters. St Paul, he thought, had no more excluded the other ministers from acting as judges than he had excluded them ^{from} the godliness which he

(1) W.11.281-285 (2) Ibid 281 (3) Ibid 284 (4) Ibid 285. Whitgift would no doubt have in mind the command to Titus to appoint presbyters "in every town" ~~(Tit.1.5)~~ (Tit.1.5), and the fact that Titus is shown, in the Epistle addressed to him, to have received his authority from St Paul, and not from the Pastors of Crete.

had commended to Timothy. The appearance of granting Timothy the authority to act as sole judge was due merely to the circumstance that the Epistles to Timothy had been written to one person only. The omission of any mention of the authority of the other ministers to act as judges was not to be taken to mean that they were excluded from acting in that capacity jointly with Timothy. ⁽¹⁾

Whitgift interpreted the passage as making Timothy judge, and therefore as granting him authority, over all the other ministers at Ephesus. ⁽²⁾ There was, indeed, a sense in which the passage applied to others besides Timothy, but not in the way that Cartwright thought:-

"These words of St Paul indeed be not spoken to Timothy alone, but to all bishops of like authority... Many things in these (Pastoral) epistles pertain to all Christians, many things be proper to bishops such as Timothy was, and many common to all ministers. But this, Adversus presbyteros, must needs be ~~more~~ proper to those who have under them other ministers, committed to their government: which every pastor hath not." ⁽³⁾

 (1) W.ii.286 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 286f. In the case of Timothy Whitgift was entitled to claim that he had found within the pages of the New Testament the transference of a part of the apostolic authority to one man, but he was not therefore entitled to call Timothy a Bishop. If the Pastoral Epistles are taken at their face value, as Whitgift did take them, Timothy's stay at Ephesus was temporary. He was recalled in II Tim.iv.21, and no provision was made for a successor. His work in Ephesus was a mission, not an episcopate. His authority was personal to himself, it was not attached to an office. The oversight which he was to exercise cannot therefore strictly be regarded as 'episkope'; he was an apostolic delegate rather than a Bishop. By naming Timothy "Bishop" Whitgift revealed his indifference as to the origin of a Bishop's authority to govern. That authority might come from an Apostle. It might come, as in the case of Alexandria, from the presbyters who elected the Bishop. It might come, as in England, from the "godly prince". So far as the Church of England was concerned, Whitgift was interested in the Queen's authority to govern. That authority came from God, and all other governing authority in England derived from it. Whitgift would certainly not have said that the ministerial authority of the clergy came from the Queen. It, too, came from God, but whether through the Church as a whole or through the ministry only, he did not explain.

The shorter text of the Epistles of Ignatius was scarcely known
 (1)
 before Ussher published it in 1644. It is not, therefore, surprising
 that out of six quotations by Whitgift from these Epistles, only
 (2)
 one comes from the genuine text. Nevertheless, sufficient is said
 in the genuine text of Ignatius about the office of a Bishop to
 justify a glance at what Cartwright had to say about this Father:-

"When (Ignatius) calleth (the bishop) 'prince of priests'... he meaneth no more the prince of all in the diocese as we take it, or of the province, than he meaneth the prince of all the priests in the world, but he meaneth (the prince of) those fellow-ministers and elders that had the rule and government of that particular church and congregation whereof he is a bishop... And the principality, that he which they called a bishop had over the rest, hath been before at large declared." (3)

Cartwright, that is to say, thought that the type of Bishop that Ignatius had in mind was one who merely took the chair at a meeting of the local Church officials and then ceased to have any superiority unless, and until, he was elected to preside at the next meeting.

Whitgift replied,

"(Ignatius) maketh degrees of ministers, and the bishop to be the chief; he placeth deacons under priests, and priests under bishops, so that he giveth the bishop superiority and government over both priests and deacons." (4)

Only one more of the many authorities used by Whitgift to refute the Admonition on the matter of the titles and offices of Archbishop, Archdeacon, etc, need be quoted, and that is Calvin, ~~xxxxx~~ viz:-

 (1) Srawley, The Epistles of St Ignatius, 13. (2) W.ii.304f, Ignatius, ad Smyrn.viii. (3) W.ii.305f (4) Ibid 306. This is a fair representation of Ignatius's exhortations to obedience in these Epistles, but Cartwright was certainly correct in saying that the Bishop envisaged by Ignatius was Bishop of one congregation, and not of a Diocese (Srawley, op.cit.34.) On the other hand there is no trace in Ignatius of governing lay Elders such as Cartwright supposed. Ignatius compared the presbyters with the Apostles, but without distinguishing between governing and ministerial functions.

"That every province had among their bishops an archbishop, and that the Council of Nice did appoint patriarchs which should be in order and dignity above archbishops, it was for the preservation of discipline. Therefore for this cause especially were those degrees appointed, that, if anything should happen in any particular church which could not there be decided, it might be removed to a provincial synod; if the greatness or difficulty of the cause required greater consultation, then was there added patriarchs together with the synods, from whom there was no appeal but unto a general council. This kind of government some called 'hierarchiam', an improper name, and not used in the scriptures; for the Spirit of God will not have us dream of dominion and rule in the government of the Church; but if, (omitting the name) we consider the thing itself, we shall find that these old bishops did not frame any other kind of government in the Church, from that which the Lord hath prescribed in his word."(1)

Against this statement of Calvin's, Cartwright was able to point to the practice of the Church of Geneva, where episcopacy had been abolished, and also to quote Calvin on his own account:-

"I grant... order cannot stand amongst the ministers of the word unless one be over the rest; I mean of every several and singular body, not of a whole province, much less of the whole world."(2)

By "every several and singular body", Whitgift replied, Calvin could not have meant single parishes, since not all parishes had more than one minister. Of necessity he must have been thinking of several Churches which made up a single body, and therefore of a Diocese or a Province. Perhaps he had had Geneva in mind, which with its surrounding villages might be compared with London and its Diocese, or with Canterbury and its Province.⁽³⁾

"Neither do I think that Master Calvin ever showed his misliking of these degrees in this Church (of England) as they be now used; for... the great abuse of them under the pope made him more to dislike of them than he would have done... He testifieth as much as I desire, that is, the antiquity, and the cause, and the use of these offices."(4)

(1) Inst.Iv.iv.4 (2) Comm. on Philippians (Calvin Trans. Socy. 1851) p.23. (3) No doubt Calvin had Geneva in mind, but Geneva was not comparable in size with an English Diocese or Province. (4) W.ii.324f.

XVII.

Whitgift's discussion with Cartwright about the functions of a Deacon proceeded, on both sides, upon the assumption that this office in the Church had originated in the appointment of the Seven, as recorded in Acts vi.3ff. ⁽¹⁾ That a Deacon should preach, administer Baptism, and assist at the Communion appeared therefore to Cartwright, Field, and Wilcox, to be a perversion of the original office, which had existed solely for the relief of the poor. Whitgift pointed out that Philip, one of the Seven, had taught and baptized the Ethiopian eunuch, ⁽²⁾ but Cartwright argued that this Philip was probably ~~not~~ the Apostle of that name. If he was not, then he was no longer a Deacon when he baptized the Ethiopian, but an Evangelist, for when the Church was scattered after the martyrdom of Stephen, Deacons were no longer needed in Jerusalem and Philip's office as ⁽³⁾ Deacon had ceased.

By way of reply Whitgift turned to three passages in the Acts of the Apostles. In Acts viii.1 it was clear that the Apostles had remained in Jerusalem after the scattering of the Church, and Philip the Apostle was presumably with the rest. The Philip mentioned in viii.5-17 could not therefore have been the Apostle, but the one who had been a member of the Seven. This Philip preached and baptized, but apparently had no authority to impose hands. In Acts xxi.8 this Philip was described as an Evangelist, but he also re-

(1) Among modern writers some, e.g. Lightfoot (op.cit.186) agree with this assumption, while others, e.g. Jalland (The Origin and Evolution of the Christian Church, 82) disagree with it.

(2) Acts viii.26ff (3) W.iii.61.

(1)
 mained "one of the Seven".

Cartwright objected further that to allow a Deacon to baptize and to preach, but not to celebrate the Lord's Supper was to separate the one Sacrament from the other, and to separate the Eucharist from the preaching of the Word, whereas God had joined the Word and the Sacraments together; to which assertions Whitgift replied, with unusual mildness,

"I do but in that point agree with the scriptures, and all other writers for the most part, both old and new."(2)

Cartwright refused to allow Whitgift's claim that St Stephen's speech at his trial amounted to preaching, for to have conceded this point would have meant admitting that one of the Seven, and therefore a Deacon, might preach. The speech, he said, was not a sermon but a defence.⁽³⁾ Whitgift referred his opponent to the charges brought against Stephen in Acts vi.13f, and invited him to compare those charges with the contents of the ~~xx~~ speech. There was certainly defence there, but much more also. If a defence might not at the same time be a sermon, then St Peter had not preached in Acts ii,⁽⁴⁾ nor St Paul in Acts xxiv.

In order to demonstrate that in the primitive Church more had been included in the office of a Deacon than simply the care of the poor, Whitgift now brought forward the evidence provided by Justin

(1) W.iii.58f. St Luke's remark in this passage does not necessarily imply that Philip remained "one of the Seven", and that therefore the office was permanent. The remark may amount to no more than identification of the Philip in question as that Philip who had ~~once~~ once been "one of the Seven". (2) W.iii.60 (3) Ibid 62 (4) Ibid 62f.

(1)
 Martyr. In reply, Cartwright could only complain that these
 activities of the ^{Deacons} ~~Deacons~~ in Justin's Church were no lawful part
 of their office. Among other things they had carried the elements
 from the Eucharist to those who had been absent from the service.
 If this was a function of a Deacon then the boy whom Eusebius had
 described as carrying the Sacrament to Serapion must have been a
 (2)
 Deacon. To take the elements out of the Church was, anyway, an
 abuse of the Sacrament, and an indication that Justin's Church was
 (3)
 corrupt in its practices.

One of the faults that the Admonition had found in the Church of
 England was that the diaconate was treated merely as a step to the
 priesthood, and as a kind of minor priesthod. (4)
 Whitgift, on the
 other hand, referred to the passage

"They that have served well as deacons gain to themselves a
 good *Βασις*, and great boldness in the faith which is in
 Jesus Christ." I Tim.iii.13.

He interpreted *Βασις* as a 'step', and the whole passage as showing
 that a Deacon might earn promotion in the ranks of the ministry by
 good work. (5)
 Cartwright translated *Βασις* as 'reputation', such a (6)

 (1) W.iii.64. Justin, I Apol.65. Whitgift might have gone further
 and shown that Justin's Deacons did not care for the poor, but left
 that task to the president. But, on the theory that Deacons origin-
 ated in the Seven, this would have amounted to an admission that
 there was something wrong with Justin's Deacons, and would have
 played into Cartwright's hands. (2) Euseb.Hist.Eccles.VI.xliv.1-6.
 (3) W.iii.65f (4) Ibid.68 (5) Ibid (6) Ibid 69. According to Souter
 (Pocket Lexicon) *Βασις* means a step on a stairway, and hence a
 stage in a career, as Whitgift thought. Liddell and Scott, and
 Moulton and Milligan, allow either Whitgift's or Cartwright's mean-
 ings. Arndt and Gingrich give a much more satisfactory explanation
 of the passage. They say, "Perhaps a technical term of the myst-
 eries underlies the... reference, (a step in the soul's journey
 heavenwards)."

reputation as would enable the bearer of it to carry out his duties
(1)
with the confidence mentioned by St Paul.

Cartwright asserted that whereas in the New Testament a Deacon's
duty had been to care for all the poor, "Widows" had been charged
with the more limited duty of caring for the sick poor, and strang-
(2)
ers. But where, Whitgift enquired, could such a separation of
duties be found in I Tim.v.10, the passage upon which Cartwright had
rested his assertion? That passage gave a widow a much wider sphere
(3)
of action. She must be

"well reported of for good works; if she hath brought up child-
ren, if she hath used hospitality to strangers, if she hath
washed the saints' feet, if she hath relieved the afflicted, if
she hath diligently followed every good work."

In Rom.xii.6-8, Cartwright continued, there were to be found all
the perpetual offices of the Church, Pastor, Doctor, Elder, and
Deacon ($\delta\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$). Even the Widow was not omitted ($\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\upsilon$) (4)
Whitgift saw here not the names of ecclesiastical offices, but of
Christian virtues and abilities, and he claimed, with justification,
(5)
that the whole context of the passage was in his favour. Nor did
he fail to point out that if this passage in fact constituted a list
of the perpetual offices of the Church, then prophets must be in-
(6)
cluded as perpetual, a thing which Cartwright had earlier denied.

In the same passage of the Epistle to the Romans, Cartwright
maintained, St Paul had warned his readers against interfering in

(1) W.iii.69 (2) Ibid 281 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid 282 (5) According to
Arndt and Gingrich $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega$ in this passage should be translated as 'do
acts of mercy', and $\delta\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ as 'he who gives', without refer-
ence in either case to the holding of any office under which those
deeds of charity were carried out. ~~W.iii.283f~~ (6) W.iii.283f.

another man's office, and had confined Deacons to the relief of the poor. If the Apostles had found themselves unable to do this work in addition to the preaching of the Gospel, neither was it to be supposed that Deacons could do both things unless they were possessed of greater gifts than the Twelve had had, which was unthinkable. (1)

All this Whitgift rejected. The relief of the poor, he declared, had not been a strain upon the Apostles' abilities. They had appointed Deacons because they themselves were travelling about and could not care properly for the poor for that reason. (2) In a Christian State it was not necessary that this task should be carried out by Deacons. (3) The State could do the work, and do it better than the Church.

With considerable hesitation Cartwright advocated the revival of the order of "Widows". His reasons were as much financial as scriptural, viz:-

"They must needs live at the charge of the church, and, seeing they must needs do so, it is better they should do some duty for it unto the church again, than the church should be at a new charge, to find others to attend upon those which are sick." (4)

His hesitation was due to doubts whether there was as much need for such an order in Elizabethan England as there had been in the days of the Apostles, and also to doubts as to whether sufficient widows could be found to form the order.

In all this Cartwright left his case wide open to the merciless reasoning of his opponent. If, Whitgift replied, the order of Widows was commanded by St Paul, and if, as Cartwright had previously said,

(1) W.iii.285 (2) Whitgift had evidently forgotten his earlier argument that the Apostles were still in Jerusalem even after the death of St Stephen, and thus he neglected the reason given in Acts vi. 1f for the appointment of the Seven. (3) W.iii.285f (4) Ibid 292f

everything that had been commanded in the First Epistle to Timothy
 (1)
 was to be kept perpetually in the Church, then there could be no
 hesitation about the matter; the order of Widows must be restored.

"These 'ifs' and 'ands' can take no place; for there are
 widows good store in this realm of England, so that that
 excuse will not serve... But, if the institution of widows
 be so necessary, why should they not be in every congregation
 as well as deacons...? If this be sufficient excuse why the
 church hath no widows, to say that they cannot be gotten, or
 there is none meet, why will not the excuse serve the church
 for lack of your seniors also?"(2)

(1) W.iii.171f (2) Ibid 293f The Church of Geneva had no order
 of Widows, otherwise Cartwright would no doubt have pressed the
 point with more vigour

XVIII.

Preaching was, in Cartwright's opinion, the chief function of the ministry. Of the non-preaching clergy he said,

"If the state of the church be such as you speak of, that it will scarce yield three preaching pastors and bishops in some dioceses; may you therefore make reading ministers..? Seeing that St Paul hath commanded expressly, that (a minister) should be 'able to teach, and to convince the gainsayers', I would learn of you gladly, what necessity there is that can cause a man to break the moral law of God, to bring in a tradition of man. You may as well break any other commandment of God for necessity's sake, as break this..."(1)

He described the Elizabethan "dumb-dog" as

"a reading minister (if I may so call him)",(2)

and declared, on the authority of Hos.vi.6, that

"the Lord pronounceth that they shall be no ministers to him, which have no knowledge."(3)

Reading of the Scriptures, Cartwright believed, was not as effective as preaching the message of the Scriptures. Reading might nourish a faith already created by preaching, but

"St Paul saith that 'faith cometh by hearing, and hearing of the word preached' (Rom.x.14); so that the ordinary and especial means to work faith by, is preaching, and not reading."(6)

The Word preached and the Word read were one and the same, but as a matter of experience

"it pleaseth the Lord to work more effectually with the one than with the other, thereby approving and authorizing that means and ways which be especially ordained for us to be saved by."(7)

There might be rare and exceptional cases where a man had reached faith by reading rather than through preaching, but in general

(1) W.1.541 (2) W.111.28 (3) W.1.541 (4) W.111.30 (5) Ibid 31
(6) Ibid 30 (7) Ibid 36 (8) Ibid 35.

"there is no salvation to be looked for where there is no preaching."(1)

Cartwright would not grant that the reading of another man's
(2)
sermons constituted preaching, nor yet that the reading of the
preacher's own sermons previously written out was preaching. The sermon must be delivered 'extempore'.

"If there be any such, as, being able to preach for his knowledge, yet for fault either of utterance or of memory cannot do it, but by reading that which he hath written, it is not convenient that he should be a minister in the church."(3)

It was no part of Whitgift's purpose to minimize the value of preaching, but only to justify in the sorry circumstances of the Elizabethan Church the ordination and employment of "dumb-dogs", and to urge the benefits that might accrue from a simple hearing of the Scriptures read. Of frequent preaching he was suspicious, for

"he doth not always feed the best, nor take the greatest pains, which preacheth most often, but he that preacheth most learnedly, most pithily, most orderly, most discreetly, most to edifying."(4)

He thought that, in Rom.x.14, St Paul meant by preaching any kind of publishing of the Gospel by the external voice, including reading. To hold otherwise than this, he considered, put the power of persuasion in the preacher and his manner of delivery, and not in the
(5)
substance of the Word. Christ had commanded his hearers to "search the scriptures", and had indicated that eternal life was to be found
(6)
by doing so. Moses had commanded the Law to be read, so that the
(7)
people might hear and learn and observe it. Jeremiah had written

(1) W.iii.34 (2) Cartwright was no doubt thinking of the Homilies which the non-preaching clergy were bidden to read to their congregations. (3) Ibid 42 (4) Ibid 1 (5) Ibid 30 (6) Ibid 32. John v.39 (7) W.iii.44. Deut.xxxi.11-12.

out one of his sermons and had given it to Baruch to read aloud in
(1)
public. In Acts xv.21 were the words,

"Moses... hath in every city them that preach him, being read
in the synagogues every sabbath."(2)

All these examples suggested that reading might be taken as the
equivalent of preaching.

It was a common Puritan tenet that the preaching of the Word
must precede the administration of the Sacraments, and thus the
question arose whether the Sacraments administered by a non-preach-
ing clergyman were true Sacraments. Cartwright stated that

"as the life of the sacraments dependeth of the preaching of
the word of God, there must of necessity the word of God be,
not read, but preached unto the people, amongst whom the
sacraments are administered."(3)

Whitgift pointed out that this principle probably invalidated Cart-
wright's own Baptism, since it was highly unlikely that there had
been a sermon on that occasion. Moreover, the life of the Sacra-
ments did not depend either upon reading or upon preaching, but
(4)
upon the promise of God expressed in his Word.

The scriptural basis for the idea that preaching must precede
the administration of the Sacraments comprised the examples of John
the Baptist, who had baptized those to whom he had previously
preached, of Jesus, who had preached before the last Supper, and of
the Apostles, who could be shown from various passages in the Acts
to have used the same method. Whitgift tried, not very convincingly,
to show that Jesus had not preached immediately before the Supper,

(1) W.iii.32 ~~122~~ Jer.xxxvi.1-8 (2) W.iii.44f (3) Ibid 22 (4) Ibid

(1)

nor John immediately before baptizing. Beyond this he was not prepared to go in separating sermon from Sacrament, for

"It is not denied but that men must first be converted to Christ by the preaching of the word, before the sacraments be ministered unto them... Our question is whether preaching be so necessarily joined with the administration of the sacraments, that neither the faithful which well understand the use of them, neither infants whose capacity will not serve to learn, may be made partakers of the sacraments without a sermon preached before."(2)

Here Cartwright's moderation showed itself again.

"I will not precisely say... that there must be preaching immediately before the administration of the sacraments,"(3)

he declared. But he would not allow that a man unable to preach might administer the Sacraments, and therefore,

"I can imagine no case wherein it is either meet or convenient, or else almost sufferable, that the sacraments should be ministered without a sermon before them; for the minister being (as he ought of necessity to be) able to preach, he ought so to do."(4)

Subsidiary to the duty of preaching the minister must, Cartwright believed, use private admonition to his parishioners, visiting them from house to house and looking into their manner of life. This would enable him, in public, to preach to his people's condition, so that he neither consoled the impenitent nor drove the contrite to despair. He must be ready to deal with doubts and questionings, and must provide his flock with a pattern of Christian living. But he could do none of these things if he were an absentee, and he must therefore reside permanently in his parish and consequently must not hold benefices in plurality. If necessity required his absence from

(1) W.iii.16,21 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 22 (4) Ibid 23 (5) W.i.512f
(6) Ibid 514 (7) Ibid 515 (8) Ibid 518 (9) Ibid 529.

his parish for an appreciable length of time he must provide a
 (1)
 fully qualified deputy.

This last provision caused Whitgift to ask where a deputy was to be found if, as the Puritans advocated, no man was to be ordained 'sine titulo'. There would be no unbeneficed men available, and
 (2)
 those already beneficed would be tied to their own flocks.

Ordination 'sine titulo' was one of the scandals of the Elizabethan Church. If Field and Wilcox are to be believed,

"Bishops... do make 60, 80, or a 100 (præests) at a clap, and send them abroad into the country like masterless men." (3)

Those who were licensed to preach could obtain a precarious living by delivering, at a fee, the quarterly sermons that the many non-preaching beneficed clerks were required to provide in their churches. The non-preachers might be engaged as deputies by non-resident Incumbents. All were placed in a position where they were tempted to canvass the patrons of vacant benefices, and some even went to the length of advertising their need and their abilities on posters
 (4)
 displayed at Paul's Cross and elsewhere. Field and Wilcox, however, treated the matter less as an abuse of practice and more as the result of a defect in principle, the consequence of unlawful ordination. They pointed to the case of Matthias, who had been appointed an Apostle only after the death of Judas had caused a vacancy among the Twelve, and gathered from this example that ministers should
 (5)
 never be ordained except to fill already existing vacancies.

(1) W.i.527 (2) Ibid (3) Frere and Douglas, op.cit.10 (4) Ibid.32f
 (5) W.i.469

Whitgift would not accept the comparison between Matthias and a minister of the Elizabethan Church. Matthias had been appointed to no certain cure; he had been appointed to a vacancy of number, not to one of place; he had been appointed "that the Scriptures might be fulfilled". None of these considerations applied to a minister, but even if they did, scriptural examples were not to be raised into rules unless a specific commandment to ~~not~~ imitate them accompanied
(1)
the examples.

In his reply Cartwright asked a question which revealed a function which he considered to be essential to a minister:-

"What shepherd can there be unless he have a flock?"(2)

"Minister" and "pastor" were synonyms to Cartwright, and one of the functions of a minister was to minister to a definite congregation. There was no "indelible character" in the minister. Without a flock he ceased to be a minister. From this premise he argued that an unbeneficed minister who was licensed to preach was a lawful minister because his flock consisted of all the parishes of the Diocese, or Province, or realm, to which he was licensed. It was bad policy to give a minister so wide a cure, but it was a cure of sorts, and the minister was a minister of a sort. But the unbeneficed non-preacher was not licensed to read the services within any definite sphere. After ordination he must wait until a cure was given to him,

"And therefore, when the bishop hath laid his hands on them, they are no more ministers than before his hand came upon them,

(1) W.i.469f (2) Ibid 473

"because they have no charges; and therefore the patron, or person that hireth them to read, and setteth them a work, are their bishops, and make them ministers, and not the bishop of the diocese."(1)

As a definition of what a "flock" should be like, Cartwright quoted Tit.1.5,

"Appoint elders in every city."

And lest anyone should think that this allowed of a Bishop over other ministers within a city, Cartwright also quoted Acts xiv.23,

"They... appointed... elders in every congregation."

Out of these passages an important conclusion was to be drawn, viz:-

"It appeareth that both no pastor or bishop ought to be made without there be a flock, as it were a void place for him; and that a flock is not a realm, or province, or diocese (as we now call a diocese), but so many as may conveniently meet in one assembly or congregation."(2)

For Whitgift "minister" included "pastor", but was a much wider term of classification and not a synonym. Replying to the Admonition he said,

"True it is that, if he be a pastor, he must have a certain flock; for therein doth a pastor differ from the rest of the degrees of ministers in Christ's church, mentioned in the fourth chapter to the Ephesians. But you must learn that there be not only pastors in the church, but also apostles, prophets, evangelists, doctors... who are all called ministers, and have their place in the church of Christ."(3)

None of the arguments and examples brought forward by the Puritans, Whitgift believed, forbade the Church to appoint, over and above pastors, some to preach who had no definite cure, as Paul and Barnabas, and Cartwright himself, had been appointed. Nor did the Scriptures forbid the appointment of master-shepherds with the over-

(1) W.1.475 (2) Ibid 478 (3) Ibid 492 (4) Ibid 479.

(1)
sight of many flocks and of many shepherds.

Cartwright wished the Church and the clergy to give up certain functions which he regarded as civil matters, and to confine themselves to purely ecclesiastical affairs and methods. Until the early years of Queen Victoria's reign cases now heard in the Admiralty, Probate, and Divorce Division of the High Court were handled in the Church Courts. If the Puritans had been heeded, the change would have been made centuries earlier. Further, the Elizabethan Church, through the Court of High Commission, had its prisons to which it might, and did, commit offenders. The Puritans considered punishment of this kind to be a civil affair, and wished the Church to confine its co-ercion to warning, rebuke, and excommunication. Yet again, the Archbishop of Canterbury sometimes took part in the government of the country as a member of the Privy Council, and (2) other Bishops held similar civil offices from time to time. All such work done by ecclesiastical persons was inconsistent with the Puritan dualism of Church and State, and so Field and Wilcox said,

"In that they have civil offices joined to the ecclesiastical, it is against the word of God. As for an archbishop to be a lord president, a lord bishop to be a county palatine, a prelate of the garter... a justice of the peace, or justice of quorum, an high commissioner etc... and therefore they have their prisons... which is also against the scriptures, this is not to have keys, but swords..." (3)

Among the passages of Scripture which the Admonition had brought against the clerical holders of civil offices was Luke xii.14, where

(1) W.i.474 (2) Whitgift was to become, some years after the controversy, Vice-President of the Marches of Wales and later a member of the Privy Council. (3) Frere and Douglas, op.cit. 30f.

Jesus, refusing to decide how an inheritance should be shared out, asked,

"Who made me a judge or a divider over you?"

Whitgift responded by pointing to I Cor.vi.1-5 to show that judgment between men was not prohibited to Christians by this saying of
(1)
Jesus. He thought that Jesus

"spake it touching his own person only, and not as a rule pertaining to other Christians."(2)

Cartwright, on the other hand, believed that Jesus had uttered the saying in his capacity as a minister of the Gospel, and thus had excluded all other ministers of the Gospel from civil judgments of
(3)
a like nature.

A further passage cited by Field and Wilcox in the same connection was Rom.xii.7,

"If (our office is) ministry, let us give ourselves to our ministry; or he that teacheth to teaching..."

Whitgift treated this passage as a general exhortation to all Christians to be diligent in their vocations. As a Bishop's task was to govern by discipline as much as by teaching, he might hold a civil office as a means whereby he could more easily maintain
(4)
discipline. Cartwright placed the passage in its Pauline context of a body which has its various parts, each part fulfilling its own function, and then treated it as a prohibition of any part from taking over the function of another, i.e. of a cleric from taking
(5)
up the duties of a magistrate.

(1) W.iii.408 (2) Ibid 410 (3) Ibid 409 (4) Ibid 412 (5) Ibid 411f.

Among passages quoted in the Admonition

"to prove that the regiment of the church should be spiritual",
 was I Tim.v.2, (1)

"Exhort older women like mothers, younger women like sisters".
 Cartwright explained that this meant that a minister must not use
 civil punishments in his work, but must correct faults only by
 exhortations and the like, and, moreover, by exhortations suited
 to the condition of the offenders. Whitgift, on his part, wondered
 how a direction to exhort could be turned into a prohibition of
 civil office and civil discipline. (2)

The Admonition also referred to Ephes.1.22,

"(Christ is) the head over all things to the church, which
 is his body."

This passage, Cartwright explained, meant that Christ is Head and
 spiritual Governor of the Church. The government of the Church
 which is under him must likewise be spiritual. A civil Magistrate
 is appointed by Christ, and is under him, but he is not appointed
 by Christ-who-is-the-Head-of-the-Church, he is appointed by Christ-
 (3)
 who-is-God.

Whitgift would not agree to this division of the offices of
 Christ. The Church, he said, had an outward and visible form, and
 therefore needed an outward government. Christ governed the Church
 through Magistrates as well as through ministers, and in this re-
 spect the outward government of the Church was not solely spiritual.
 Christ, by himself, governed spiritually only. By his ministers he

(1) Frere and Douglas, op.cit. 32 margin. (2) W.iii.418

(3) Ibid 419.

(1)
governed both spiritually and externally.

Whitgift quoted the example of Christ, who had used a whip in the Temple, to support the use of force by a minister of the Gospel, and Cartwright was reduced to asserting that the example was "singular and extraordinary", his favourite exit from tight corners. (2) Cartwright, on his part, claimed that St Peter had punished Ananias with words, but not with imprisonment, to which Whitgift retorted that if a minister might punish with death, he might punish with the lesser sentence of imprisonment. (3)

The root of Cartwright's dislike of the use of bodily punishment by the Church lay less in anything that he could find in Scripture against it than in his fear of Rome, Scripture being introduced to justify the opinion already formed independently of it. He asked,

"How can we justly reprove the papists for the use of both the swords, spiritual and material, when as we are found in the same fault ourselves?" (4)

Whitgift replied,

"The bishop of Rome doth challenge unto himself the whole power and authority of the civil magistrate... He boasteth that temporal princes have authority from him, and that it is in his power to displace and place them. This we utterly and most justly condemn; but that jurisdiction civil that we allow in ecclesiastical persons is not the whole power of the civil magistrate, but only so much as may help to the good government of the church, and the suppression of vice. Neither do we challenge it as due, but receive it from the civil magistrate as convenient, and execute it by his authority, not by our own." (5)

(1) W.iii.419. Cartwright meant that Christ governs a man in his conscience through the exhortations, etc, addressed to that man by the minister. Whitgift agreed, but added that Christ governs also by himself, speaking directly to the conscience without the intervention of the minister, and also externally by bodily discipline inflicted by the Magistrate or by the minister acting for the Magistrate. (2) Ibid 445f (3) Ibid 448 (4) Ibid 424 (5) Ibid.

XIX.

However much they disagreed over the practice of the Church of England in the matter of ceremonies, and however much they disagreed about placing matters of ecclesiastical government and discipline within the discretion of the Church, Whitgift and Cartwright were at least in agreement ^{that} some things could be classed as "adiaphora" and that those things included ceremonies. In this Cartwright showed himself to be a moderate, but hardly a representative, Puritan, as will later appear. Curiously enough, it is Whitgift who, in one matter concerning ceremonies, appears at first sight to be the extremist, for he expressed his dislike of the signification attached by Peter Martyr to the wearing of the surplice, and the signification attached by Field and Wilcox to sitting at Communion. But even as he expressed this disapproval, Whitgift admitted that a ceremony might serve a useful purpose in reminding the Christian of his duty, and there is thus an apparent contradiction in his words that calls for solution. The explanation is to be found in his defence of the employment of the sign of the cross in Baptism. This ceremony has a "profitable signification" which is indicated in the words which accompany its use. The significations advocated by Peter Martyr and the Admonitioners were not expressed in words, and therefore the ceremonies in which those significations were to be seen were "dumb ceremonies" like many of those which the papists had used, and of which no-one knew the meaning. Whitgift did not, therefore, wholly discount the value of ceremonies as a means of prompting a devotional attitude in worship. What he disliked was

the idea that a ceremony had any value as an act of worship apart from the mind of the worshipper, and he evidently feared that unless the significance of the ceremony was constantly expressed in words, the outward action might come to be regarded as worth performing for
(1)
its own sake.

Cartwright's moderation is further to be seen in the compromise which he attempted to make between the view of the Queen as Supreme Governor of the Church, and the extreme Puritan position which would have given her exactly the same ecclesiastical status as the rest of the laity. But Cartwright's compromise provided for deadlock. He appealed to the Queen, in effect, to put her royal prerogative in commission while retaining an over-riding veto. He claimed that this was no more than an expansion of the existing arrangement whereby the Queen legislated for the Church after consulting the Archbishop of Canterbury or the High Commission, but in fact the difference was much greater, for he required her to divest herself of the power to initiate ecclesiastical legislation. The Queen's role was to be entirely negative, her power merely the right of obstruction. He is silent upon the possibility that the Church might excommunicate the Queen and the Queen in turn veto her own excommunication as "unmeet". Any system of government needs a final and determinative authority to which the fiction of infallibility is annexed. In Cartwright's system neither the clergy nor the Queen could "do no wrong" and, as Whitgift foresaw, sooner or later a stalemate must inevitably have arisen between clerical decision and royal veto.

(1) W.iii.128, 130f.

Then whichever side gave way would establish a precedent for future yielding, and thereafter the system of government would be, not Cartwrightism, but either royal supremacy or royal subservience.

The truth is that in so far as it left in the Queen's hands the power to decide "unmeetness", Cartwright's system was not Puritanism at all, for it did not agree with the Puritan theory that the royal prerogative constituted a usurpation of the power of Christ, who ought to reign directly in his Church through the ministry, and not intermediately through a Supreme Governor set over the ministry in matters of Church government and discipline. Yet quite inconsistently Cartwright still held to this Puritan theory, for he said,

"We are so far from unthankfulness to her majesty, that we thereby desire the heap of her felicity, and the establishment of her royal throne among us; which then shall be most sure and unremoved, when our Saviour Christ sitteth wholly and fully, not only in his chair to teach, but also in his throne to rule, not alone in the hearts of everyone by his Spirit, but also generally and in the visible government of his church, by those laws of discipline which he hath described" (1)

Whitgift's dream of a single Church, uniform in doctrine and worship, embracing the whole nation, and under the government of a Christian prince, was a noble ideal, but it, too, was impracticable. So much must depend upon the degree of godliness in the "godly prince". What was to be done if such a prince commanded things which most, or indeed only some, Christians could not reconcile with their consciences? Whitgift himself had faced this very problem in the days of Queen Mary. He had solved it by obeying her just so far as he was obliged to obey her, and then doubtless with

(1) W.iii.315

mental reservations. He commended the same solution to Puritans who demanded liberty to serve God in accordance with their consciences; viz:-

"To be under a law is no taking away of Christian liberty. For the Christian liberty is not licence to do as thou list, but to serve God in newness of mind, and that for love, not for servile fear."(1)

and

"The liberty which God giveth to a man, which no man ought to take from him, or can if he would, is liberty of conscience, not of worldly affairs. In bodily business he is to be governed by magistrates and laws."(2)

All this is in line with Queen Elizabeth's reluctance to put papists to a test of their opinions. If their actions were in accordance with the law, they might think what they liked about the actions, or about anything else. But it is a poor liberty of conscience which does not allow conscience to be the guide of conduct. Law, indeed, is always in danger of becoming a restriction upon the conscience of the individual, and when ecclesiastical law is very detailed, as it was in Queen Elizabeth's time, the danger becomes a reality.

Whitgift's ideal of a national Church co-terminous with the nation could only have been realized if the Queen's demand for uniformity had been confined to a very restricted field, and if the Puritans had been much less certain than they were of their own rectitude. Their age, however, was a time for fighting and suffering for principles, not a time for agreeing to differ or for looking for a formula so vague that all could accept it. Because it was

(1) W.iii.488 (2) W.ii.570 (3) Neale, op.cit.191

such an age, the Queen and Whitgift found it impossible to achieve the uniformity, or even the unity, which they desired to see in the Church.

It is difficult to say whether Cartwright was at his feeblest in his interpretation of the Fathers or in his exposition of Holy Scripture. In the latter case he approached the Bible, not with an open mind seeking to discover what God had said and done, but with a pre-conceived notion of what God ought to have said and done. Even so, it was only by a plentiful and most unconvincing use of his imagination that he was able to find between the lines of Scripture some confirmation of his ideas. Nothing could well exceed the flimsiness of the argument by which he first of all attributed to Jesus the command to govern the Church by seigniories, and then identified those seigniories as "the Church" of Matt.xviii.17. The same judgment may be passed upon his discovery of offices and degrees of the ministry in I Cor.xii.28 and Ephes.iv.11-12. The gifts of God described in the former passage are people who fulfil certain functions for the benefit of the Church, followed by deeds and abilities having the same object. In the latter passage only people are mentioned as the gifts of God to the Church. In neither case ought it to be inferred that these people formed a ministry graded according to their rank, nor yet that they held specific "offices" in the Church. This would have become clear to Cartwright if he had consulted I Cor.xiv.20ff with an open mind. He would then have seen that all the Corinthian Christians might prophesy and that the words "secondly prophets" in I Cor.xii.28 cannot be interpreted as

though they refer to a degree of the ministry separated from the laity by several other degrees. He would also have seen that when this is granted in the case of "prophets", the whole argument for regarding the words "first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers", as an enumeration of the degrees of ministers in the order of their superiority falls to the ground. The enumeration can then be seen to be one of gifts in the order of their value. The list of gifts is repeated in I Cor.xii.29-31, and the Corinthians are bidden to desire the greater of them, a bidding which is itself repeated in I Cor.xiv.1 with respect to the gift of prophecy.

Whitgift was not impeccable in his interpretation of Scripture for, like Cartwright, he was prone to detect ecclesiastical offices in passages where it is not necessary to suppose that any were mentioned. It is rather on the negative side of his attitude towards the exposition of Scripture that his acute and accurate reasoning is so refreshing by comparison with Cartwright's insubstantial mirages. He would not allow scriptural examples to be taken as though they constituted divine precepts. He would not allow doubtful inferences from the Word of God to be treated as though they were explicit commandments of God. Above all, he would not agree that any one particular form of Church government, not even the one that he favoured himself, was so laid down in Scripture that it must be regarded as perpetually binding upon the Church.

Cartwright's idea that the presidency of assemblies of Church officers should be temporary and for one meeting at a time sprang from his dislike of "domination" among ministers. He would have

done well to have extended this dislike so that it covered the relationship between the seigniory and the congregation. For ~~although~~ although Cartwright paid lip-service to the place of the people in the government of the Church, in practice he provided for a very rigorous "domination" of the congregation by the minister and Elders. Once the minister and Elders were appointed, no power to initiate action remained with the laity. They were to be confined to expressing agreement with, or dissent from, any proposed excommunication. It was left to another Puritan to try to find a form of Church government in which the laity should have a more effective voice, and under which there should be a parity of all Christians, and not merely a parity of ministers. In this form of government Christ was to reign through his whole Church, and not merely through a representative portion of it.

SOME ELIZABETHAN CONTROVERSIES
ABOUT
THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY

Part IV

BROWNE v. CARTWRIGHT

Part IV

Browne v. Cartwright

.....

I

In February 1576 Edmund Grindal was confirmed as Archbishop of Canterbury in the place of Matthew Parker who had died in the previous August. Why the Queen appointed Grindal is not clear. He had been an exile in Queen Mary's reign, and although he had spent that period of his life in Strasbourg and not in Geneva, he had shown himself, when Bishop of London, to be indulgent towards, if not in sympathy with, the nonconformists of the Vestiarian controversy. Even the easy-going Parker had complained of Grindal's lax enforcement of the law.⁽¹⁾

As Archbishop of York Grindal had been in the right place. He had been a useful counter-weight to the northern papists,⁽²⁾ and he could claim that his chief contribution in this direction had been the licensing in the Diocese of York of more than forty preachers over and above those he had found there upon his entrance to the See in 1571. He could boast that most of these preachers were graduates, all of them learned and able, and none of the papists or Puritans. In his opinion the loyalty shown by the people of Halifax during the rebellion of 1569 had been due to the continuous preaching of the Gospel which they had enjoyed for several years, and he expected a similar happy result elsewhere from the preachers he had licensed in his time.⁽³⁾ This favourable estimate of his work was

(1) S.G.234 (2) Ibid 273 (3) Parker Society, The Remains of Archbishop Grindal, 380.

borne out by commendations from the Lord President of the North, the Earl of Huntingdon, who was loath to see him go from York, but who realized the need to have a good Archbishop at Canterbury. ⁽¹⁾ Perhaps these considerations led the Privy Council, ever fearful of the papists, to support Grindal's candidature and press it upon the Queen.

In 1567 Grindal remarked,

"You see me wear a cope or a surplice in Paul's. I had rather minister without these things, but for order's sake and obedience to the prince."⁽²⁾

These words reveal a reluctant Anglican who would have felt more at home among the Puritans. Probably his own half-hearted acceptance of the settlement of 1559 accounted for the mildness of Grindal's attitude towards the nonconformists. Strype, indeed, denied ⁽³⁾ that he was lax towards them, but nevertheless recorded an example of such laxity in one of Grindal's first official acts as Archbishop ⁽⁴⁾ of Canterbury. David Thickpeny, the Incumbent of Brighton, an extreme Puritan suspected of being a member of the Family of Love, had been inhibited by the Bishop of Chichester. When the case came before him, Grindal lifted the inhibition. A week later Thickpeny, back in Brighton, was breaking the law again and also breaking undertakings he had given to the Archbishop. Grindal had now to acknowledge his mistake, and arraign the culprit before him a second time. But if Grindal was lenient with Puritans, he could be severe in his treatment of the Queen, as we shall now see.

As early as 1564 in the Diocese of Norwich (elsewhere even as

(1) S.G.284 (2) Remains of Grindal, 211 (3) S.G.447 (4) Ibid 292.

early as the reign of Edward VI) ⁽¹⁾ clergy and laity had met together periodically for "Exercises". Conferences of the same kind had ⁽²⁾ been authorized in Northampton in 1571 by the Bishop of Peterborough, and by 1576 they had been allowed and approved by at least ten other ⁽³⁾ Bishops of the Southern Province, including Grindal.

In essence an "Exercise" consisted of the expounding of a passage of Scripture. This was carried out by a speaker appointed for the purpose, and he was followed by two further speakers appointed to amplify, or if necessary to confute, what he had said. A rota of speakers was made up from the clergy, and sometimes from the laity as well. The laity were customarily admitted to hear the speeches. The Exercises were held either weekly, fortnightly, or monthly; they lasted two hours, were under the chairmanship of a moderator, and were opened and closed with prayer. After the close of each public session the clergy met privately for a further discussion of the subject that had been dealt with in public, and for criticism and admonition of each other's shortcomings in their manner of life. It was claimed, no doubt with justification, that the Exercises formed a valuable means of teaching the laity and the more ignorant of the clergy, and that they encouraged all the clergy to study the Scrip- ⁽⁴⁾ tures and to practise the art of public speaking.

At the beginning of his time at Canterbury Grindal drew up a set of regulations calculated to correct certain abuses which had become common in the conducting of the Exercises. Ignorant clergy, and clergy who could not speak well, were to address only the private

(1) Knappen, op.cit.253 (2) S.G.260 (3) Remains of Grindal 385
(4) S.G.261f.

after-meeting. Laymen were not to be allowed to speak at all. No speaker was to deliver an attack upon any person or upon any estate of the realm, nor was he to inveigh against the Church of England as by law established. Clerks who had been deprived for nonconformity or who, although not deprived, were nonconformists, were not to
(1)
speak.

The nature of these regulations reveals the nature of the abuses they were designed to cure. Puritans had been using the Exercises as an opportunity for spreading their ideas. Inhibited from preaching, and therefore denied the use of the pulpit for purposes of propaganda, they had been at liberty in the Exercises to condemn as much as they pleased the discipline, government, rites, and ceremonies of the Church of England.

By indulging his imagination Grindal was able to find scriptural precedent for the Exercises, and it was from this supposed origin that the alternative title of "Propheesyings" was derived. The "sons of the prophets" mentioned in connection with Samuel and Eli-
(2)
sha were, Grindal believed, disciples of those two prophets, and were being trained by them in "the study and knowledge of the Scrip-
(3)
tures". It did not occur to him that the "sons of the prophets" were prophets in their own right who were leading a communal life.

I Cor.xiv was Grindal's New Testament authority for the "Prophesyings". In St Paul's writings, he held, prophecy did not mean

(2) S.G.327f (2) I Sam.xix.20. II Kings 11.15 (3) Remains of Grindal 384. Grindal would believe, of course, that these prophets would have the Pentateuch available for their study.

prediction. It meant the exposition and interpretation of Scripture.⁽¹⁾ Hence, when St Paul bade the people of Corinth to prophesy, he meant that they should do as Queen Elizabeth's people were doing in the Exercises.

Grindal was on rather safer ground when he said that the Prophesyings

"in effect are all one with the exercises of students of divinity in the universities; saving that the first is done in a tongue understood, to the more edifying of the unlearned hearers."⁽²⁾

But it may be doubted whether the difference of language was the only difference. Discussions which may be suitable for clergy and divinity students are not necessarily suitable for the laity, either in method or in subject-matter, and it is unlikely that the Exercises were often able to provide, as the Universities could, the weight of scholarship needed to avoid the reaching of wrong conclusions.

The Queen was far from agreeing with Grindal about the value of the Exercises. She thought them dangerous in themselves, quite apart from any abuse of them. She considered that they caused the

(1) Remains of Grindal 384. There is not one word in I Cor.xiv to support Grindal's idea of Christian prophecy. The only interpretation spoken of there is the interpretation of "tongues". St Paul did not define the nature and content of prophecy as he understood it except as "revelation" for the "upbuilding and encouragement and consolation" of Christians, (I Cor.xiv.3,30). There is no reason to believe that he thought of prophecy in any other than its Old Testament sense, i.e. as an inspired declaration that the nature of God is such and such, followed by a prediction that because God has this nature, he will act in such and such a way. Any difference between Old Testament prophecy and Christian prophecy would arise from the Christian prophet's deeper insight into the nature of God.

(2) Ibid ~~xxx~~.

laity to neglect their work, that they created faction and dissension among her people, and that they were potential breeding grounds of sedition. Where Grindal could claim the support of some of the Bishops for a reformed version of the Exercises, the Queen could claim that

"these great inconveniences and disorders, grown by reason of these exercises among her people, came not to her Majesty's understanding by particular advertisements from private persons, but from sundry of the bishops, and sundry also of her justices of circuits... who by their several letters... wished that... some order might be had in this matter."(1)

In brief, the Queen ordered Grindal to suppress the Propheesyings. This was bad enough for the Archbishop, but the Queen went even further. She expressed the view that there were too many preachers in her Church, and thought that three or four in each county should suffice. She therefore ordered that the number be reduced, and that instead of sermons the Homilies were to be read to the people. ⁽²⁾ The reason for this extraordinary command was probably that, although inhibition had reduced the number of Puritan preachers, there were still some remaining who were using the pulpit to advance their cause. Sermons would therefore be linked in the Queen's mind with the Exercises as providing opportunity to attack her ecclesiastical prerogative.

This example of the working of the doctrine of the "godly prince" must have hurt Grindal both in his theology and in his self-esteem. He promptly refused to obey the Queen, and offered his resignation.

(3)

In a famous and eloquent letter he pointed out to Elizabeth that it

(1) Remains of Grindal, 471. (2) S.G.329 (3) Remains of Grindal 376ff.

was the commandment of Christ that the Gospel should be preached, the practice of the Apostles to preach often, and the command of St Paul to place presbyters in every town and not three or four to a shire. (1) He agreed that the reading of the Homilies had some use, but thought the method of instruction by means of them too inflexible to suit the needs of all audiences. He reminded the Queen that the Homilies had been provided in the first place to meet a lack of preachers, and not with the intention that their use should continue when the lack had been made good. He emphasized the need for plentiful preaching if the reformed doctrines were to be commended to the people, and pleaded for the retention of the Exercises on the ground of their scriptural origin and their beneficial effect in training the clergy to preach.

Grindal's letter ended with two requests. The first was,

"That you would refer all these ecclesiastical matters which touch religion, or the doctrine and discipline of the church, unto the bishops and divines of your realm." (2)

This was little more than a request that the Queen should use the power conferred upon her by the Act of Supremacy, 1559, to exercise her ecclesiastical jurisdiction through a commission appointed by herself. (3) It advances upon the provisions of the Act only by hinting, as it seems to do, that such a commission should be made up of Bishops and divines, and not of laymen. But in fact the Queen was well within the letter of the law in demanding that the Exercises should cease. The Act of Uniformity, 1559, required her to consult either a commission or the Metropolitan before introducing a new rite or

(1) Tit.1.5. Grindal clearly regarded the presbyters mentioned here as preachers, and not as lay Elders. (2) Remains of Grindal 387
 (3) Gee and Hardy, op.cit.447f.

(1)
ceremony. But the Exercises had been introduced without consulting her, and without her authority, and they constituted a new rite introduced in contravention of a further clause in the Act of Uniformity. (2)
What Grindal was doing, therefore, was inviting the ~~Queen~~ Queen to overlook a breach of her prerogative already committed, and to allow her Bishops to exercise her prerogative for her in the future.

Not even in the matter of limiting the number of preachers could Grindal properly accuse the Queen of acting illegally, for the Acts of Supremacy and of Uniformity conferred the widest powers possible upon her. He could only plead for a relaxing of the exercise of her powers in such a way as to give greater independence to the episcopate, and this was what he did. He begged her to follow the examples of all other godly rulers of all ages in referring ecclesiastical matters to their Bishops for determination. In matters of civil law the Queen acted through her judges; let her apply the same principle to matters of religion, and act through her Bishops. (3)

Fr Philip Hughes considers that Grindal treated the Queen tactlessly in this letter because he translated for her benefit his Latin quotations of Scripture and even his Latin tags. But considering that he was pleading for concessions, Grindal's tactlessness was much worse than that. His second request was, (4)

"That, when you deal in matters of faith and religion, or matters that touch the church of Christ... you would not use to pronounce so resolutely and peremptorily, quasi ex auctoritate, as ye may do in civil and extern matters; but always

(1) Gee and Hardy, op.cit.466 (2) Ibid 460 (3) Remains of Grindal 387 (4) The Reformation in England, vol iii, 185 footnote.

"remember that in God's causes the will of God, and not the will of any earthly creature, is to take place."(1)

There is a hint of St Ambrose in these phrases, a suggestion of the contrast between the Queen's authority in the State and her authority in the Church, which could not have formed welcome reading to her Majesty. But in the very next sentence Grindal wrote there is a strong flavour of Puritanism:-

"It is the antichristian voice of the Pope, Sic volo, sic jubeo; stet pro ratione voluntas."(2)

In the context of the Elizabethan age, this remark can only be regarded as insulting.

Elsewhere in the same letter the Archbishop showed his lack of tact. He compared the cheers which greeted the Queen when she appeared in London, where there had been much preaching, with the rebellion in the North, where sermons had been few and where papistry and ignorance of the Scriptures had consequently lingered on. To this the Queen might well have replied that London was a stronghold of Puritanism, a thing which she suspected of republicanism and which certainly sought to abolish her prerogative, all of which might be attributed to the preaching Grindal had mentioned. Again, it cannot have furthered Grindal's plea for concessions that he should have suggested that dislike of preaching was due to dislike of reformation, or to covetousness, or to lasciviousness. He did not exactly accuse the Queen of being guilty of these sins, but rather of listening to those who were, which was perhaps even worse.

(1) Remains of Grindal 389 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 380 (4) Ibid 381f.

No doubt it relieved Grindal's feelings to write as he did, but having written his letter he should have slept on it and burned it the next morning. In a personal interview with the Queen, after his anger had cooled, he might have been able to reach some compromise with her. Instead, after an interval designed perhaps to give him a chance to change his mind and obey, the Queen suspended him from his functions as Metropolitan and placed him under house arrest. She refused his offer to resign until shortly before his death six years later. She refused to deprive him, for that would have given too much encouragement to the papists. She preferred to leave the Church without a leader for the remainder of the Archbishop's life.

Grindal's disobedience forced the Queen to take direct action, and she herself now ordered the Bishops to take the steps she had ~~ordered Grindal to take~~ enjoined upon Grindal to order them to take. Fr Hughes's comment at this point of his account of the affair is,

"Grindal's heroic stand for conscience found not a single imitator among his brethren."

In fact, despite a royal threat to make an example of any Bishop who refused to obey, the Bishop of Lincoln had to be given a reminder of his duty, while in the Northern Province the Exercises were commenced, or re-commenced, within two years of the order to suppress them. As for Grindal's "heroic stand", he behaved exactly as most of the other Bishops behaved; he suppressed the Exercises within his own Diocese. If he is correctly reported, he had not intended his letter to be taken as a refusal to obey, but had written it because

(1) S.G. 354 (2) Ibid 574 (3) Hughes, op.cit.186 (4) S.A.II.ii.612.
(5) S.G.444.

he was

"moved in conscience to be an humble suitor to her Majesty to be spared from being the special instrument in suppressing the said exercises."(1)

Taken in conjunction with his actions, this appears to mean that although as a Bishop he would obey the Queen within his own Diocese, he would not, as Archbishop, act unconstitutionally and order the other Bishops to obey him in their Dioceses. He was no doubt mindful of the kind of thing that Whitgift had said about the powers of a Metropolitan, i.e. that a Bishop holding this office was not in a position to make the law on his own authority, but only to administer it after making it in consultation with his fellow-Bishops. It was this that he had asked the Queen to do, but he could only ask her to do it as an act of grace; the settlement of 1559 did not require her to do it.
(2)

Perhaps as a result of Grindal's stand the Queen's order to the Bishops over the matter of preaching was much milder than her verbal instructions to him had been, viz:-

"Where there shall not be sufficient able persons for learning in any cures, to preach or instruct their cures, as were requisite, there shall you limit the Curates to read the public Homilies..."(3)

The severest interpretation that can be put upon this directive is

(1) Remains of Grindal, 401 (2) The "Apostolic Canons" were well known to Elizabethan scholars, not, indeed, as genuinely apostolic, but as a 5th century compilation. Canon xxxiv reads "The Bishops of every nation must acknowledge him who is first among them as their head, and do nothing of consequence without his consent... But neither let him (who is the first) do anything without the ~~consent~~ consent of all, for so there will be unanimity..." (See Hammond, Definitions of Faith and Canons of Discipline). Grindal would therefore be well aware that an Archbishop was a constitutional, and not an absolute, ruler in the early Church, and this example would certainly guide him. (3) S.G.575

that non-preaching Incumbents were to be relieved of the duty of providing quarterly sermons by licensed preachers. Little attention was ever paid to the order.

The sorry quarrel between the Queen and her Archbishop could not be kept secret, and so,

"Her Majesty findeth it expedient to have the world understand her actions in this matter; and also to have the archbishop's misdemeanors declared, and to call him to answer to the same... Her Majesty... findeth it expedient to have his submission and acknowledgment of his fault made in places public."(1)

There is no evidence that Grindal ever made a public submission. Had he done so it would have served to discredit Anglicanism still further in the eyes of the Puritans. They placed the faithful and frequent preaching of the Word as the foremost activity of the Church. Preaching, to them, came even before the Sacraments, for while there might be sermon without Sacrament, there could not be Sacrament without sermon. They had always strongly objected to the royal supremacy, however much Cartwright might try to compromise on the matter, and here was a case in which that supremacy was being employed in an attempt to hinder preaching. Even without Grindal's submission, Anglicanism suffered a serious blow to its prestige. As represented by the Bishops, it appeared to be subservient to the Queen. Even Grindal, who might have become a hero in Puritan eyes, was only partially a resister. If he inclined towards the Puritan position in his capacity as Metropolitan, he bowed to the royal will against his own convictions in his capacity as a Diocesan Bishop.

(1) Remains of Grindal, 469.

In these circumstances it is no matter for surprise that Separatism now became a serious element in English religious life. Hitherto, most Puritans had tried to bring about a further reformation of the Church from within the Church, maintaining the unity of that body while seeking to change its polity. Generally speaking, ministers who had been deprived had not set up organizations outside the Church or in rivalry with it. They had lived in the hope and expectation that the truth (as they believed it to be) of their case would eventually convince the Queen, and they had waited in patience for the time of their vindication to arrive. But after the Grindal affair there could be heard a note of despair of ever achieving a further reformation with the Queen's consent. A feeling that it was disgraceful that the Church was unable to reform herself could be detected. The idea that the Church was in bondage began to take shape, and England began to be spoken of as the Egypt of the new Israel. Moderate Puritans who had counselled caution, and who were waiting for the Queen to change her mind and to order the reformation they desired, found themselves blamed for not taking the law into their own hands. Something of this new atmosphere can be felt in the title of a book which appeared in print while Grindal was still alive:-

"A Treatise of Reformation without Tarrying for Any, and of the Wickedness of those Preachers who will not Reform till the Magistrate command or compel them."

II.

Robert Browne was admitted to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge,
(1)
in 1570, and graduated in January 1573. In his

"True and Short Declaration Both of the Gathering and Joining
Together of Certain Persons: And Also of the Lamentable Breach
and Division Which Fell Amongst Them" (2)

he described how, after leaving Cambridge, he taught in a school for three years. As an undergraduate he had discussed with others the abuses he detected in the Church, and had suffered punishment for doing so. Now, as a schoolmaster, he became so zealous a Puritan that he was dismissed from his post. For a while he conducted a private school, but an outbreak of plague drove him back to his father's home in Rutlandshire. He was still interested in the reformation of the Church, however, and after a while he left home again and attached himself as a disciple to the Rector of Dry Drayton, near Cambridge. The Rector, in whose home Browne lived, was Richard Greenham, reputedly an advanced Puritan. Although Browne was not licensed by the Bishop to do so, Greenham allowed him to teach in his parish. Greenham, however, seems to have had some regard for episcopal authority, and Browne became dissatisfied. He considered this authority to be a "spiritual infection", and was (3) surprised to see how it had spread even to the best-reformed places. When, therefore, the Mayor and Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge agreed (4) that he be invited to become a preacher at St Benedic't's Church, he took the opportunity of leaving Greenham, whom he now regarded as only a half-hearted Puritan.

(1) Venn, Alumni Cantabrigiensis, I.i.237. (2) WHB 397ff

(3) Meaning, no doubt, Dry Drayton. (4) Porter, op.cit. 243.

The invitation to Cambridge set Browne a problem. How could he accept it without coming to some extent under episcopal authority? Yet Christ, he argued with himself, had sat among the doctors in the Temple, listening to them and questioning them, but without approving their errors. St Paul had sat in a synagogue awaiting an invitation to address the congregation, but without approving the errors of the Jewish religion. Browne might therefore allow himself to be questioned by the Bishop as to his fitness to be a preacher, just as Christ had answered the questions of the doctors. He might also allow himself to be permitted to preach, as St Paul had done, but he was

"settled not to seek any approving or authorizing of the bishops."

He would swear no oath for them, nor subscribe to any articles. He would accept neither ordination nor licence to preach. Thus when the Bishop's licence (presumably authorizing him as a lay preacher) was delivered to him, Browne refused to accept it, or even to pay for its inscribing. The fee was paid by his brother, and Browne promptly lost the document. When a copy was obtained for him, he put it into the fire. A second copy he kept until it was taken from him by a Justice of the Peace.

(1) Acts xiii.14 (2) Browne did not always express himself clearly, and it is not easy to see here exactly where he drew the line about placing himself under episcopal authority. Perhaps in his words quoted above the emphasis is on the word "seek". The Bishop could find out all he wished to know about Browne, and could either tolerate him or not, as he pleased. Browne, for his part, would preach what he meant to preach, and would do it where and when he himself decided. If the Bishop drove him out for doing this, that would merely be what St Paul had suffered in similar circumstances.

Browne must have felt that his position as a preacher was open to misinterpretation for, as he says, he took every ~~oppor~~ opportunity in his sermons to declare that he depended upon no episcopal authority, and that he occupied the pulpit in Cambridge only so that he might discharge his duty of calling the people of Cambridge to a further reformation which would include the condemnation and abolition of episcopacy. If the people should refuse this further reformation, he would leave them. He would accept no stipend from them, for that would imply that he had a cure of souls, which would, in turn, place him in bondage to the Bishop.

When at last he realized that his call for reformation was having no effect, Browne took it that God had been using him as a witness against Cambridge, and had at the same time been preparing him for another attempt elsewhere. He gave notice that he would cease from preaching at St Bene't's, but before he actually left the city he received a visit from a certain Richard Bancroft (who was later to become Archbishop of Canterbury). Bancroft read over to Browne a letter from the Privy Council, inhibiting him from further preaching. To this Browne replied that if he had had a cure of souls, the letter would not have prevented him from preaching to ~~his~~ his congregation, but as matters stood he had no intention of preaching again in Cambridge anyway, Privy Council or no Privy Council. ⁽¹⁾

Browne said that when he found the people of Cambridge too tolerant of episcopacy and realized that they did not intend to respond

to his call to abolish it, he came to the conclusion

"that the kingdom of God was not to be begun by whole parishes, but rather of the worthiest, were they never so few."(1)

Thus to Browne the Church and the Kingdom of God were the same thing. The Church was the Kingdom of God when it was organized and governed in such a way that Christ could reign in it and govern it. But Christ would not reign in it unless it was arranged according to the rules which he had laid down in the Scriptures. Any body arranged otherwise than in accordance with these rules was not the Kingdom of God, since Christ did not reign in it, and therefore, equally, it was not the Church. Thus there was not, so Browne believed, any Church as yet in England; the Kingdom of God had still "to be begun".

In the conception of the forming of the Kingdom of God from "the worthiest" lies the idea of the "gathered Church". When he formulated this idea in his mind, Browne enunciated to himself the basic principle of Congregationalism. There was as yet no gathered Church except in the person of Browne himself, but he, in thought and in intention, had already passed from disobedience within the Church of England to separation from it. But he was not in his own opinion, as we shall see, a schismatic, for there was as yet no Church from which he could be in schism.

III.

Browne was not the first Separatist in Elizabethan England. Typical of several schismatical congregations was the one which was raided during the progress of a service held at the Plumbers Hall in London in June, 1567.⁽¹⁾ Its leaders were brought before Grindal while he was still Bishop of London, and were accused with absenting themselves from their parish churches and with holding illegal assemblies for prayer, preaching, and sacrament. One of the accused, John Smith, answered,

"So long as we might have the word freely preached, and the sacraments administered without the preferring of idolatrous gear about it, we never assembled together in houses. But when it came to this point, that all our preachers were displaced by your law, that would not subscribe to your apparel and your law, so that we could hear none of them in any church by the space of seven or eight weeks, except Father Coverdale... then we bethought us what were best to do..."⁽²⁾

Another of them indeed, Robert Hawkins, was dissatisfied with the government of the Church of England, and told Grindal,

"You preach Christ to be priest and prophet, but you preach him not to be king, neither will you suffer him to reign with the sceptre of his word in his church alone; but the pope's canon law and the will of the prince must have the first place, and be preferred before the word and ordinance of Christ."⁽³⁾

But, Hawkins aside, the emphasis throughout was upon the ceremonies of the Prayer Book, rather than upon episcopacy and the discipline of the Church of England, as the cause of the schism. Much less was there any idea of a "gathered Church."

In 1569 Grindal took action against another Separatist congregation led by Bonham and Crane,⁽⁴⁾ a congregation which Scott Pearson

(1) S.G.169 (2) Remains of Grindal 203 (3) Ibid 205 (4) Ibid 316ff.

thinks was the ground from which sprang the "Wandsworth Presbytery"
 (1)
 of 1572. Here again there was no idea of "gathering" a Church, and in that respect, if in no other, the disagreement with the Church of England was less than Browne's. Bonham and Crane seem to have carried out an experiment in presbyterian government outside the Church of England, much as a Puritan Rector, equally in defiance of the law, might have done the same within his parish. But although their action has the appearance of separation, there is no reason to suppose that they intended a permanent departure from the Church of England.

Browne's refusal of episcopal ordination is a reminder that behind Cartwright's failure to take ~~priest~~ priest's orders, or to offer to do so when he knew that the failure was putting his Fellowship in jeopardy, there must have been a feeling that episcopal ordination was not to be accepted. Cartwright later allowed, as will appear, that since episcopal ordination was administered in the name of the Church, it could be accepted as a true, if irregular, calling by the Church. But this was a relaxation of the strict logic of his beliefs, and was part and parcel of a softening of his attitude towards the Church of England which came to him as he grew older and as he took fright at Browne's schism. In William Axton, however, we have a case of a Puritan who started out with an attitude more moderate than Cartwright's, and then hardened it into one resembling Browne's so far as ordination by a Bishop was concerned, although even Axton did not, so far as we know, ever agree with the idea of the "gathered Church."

(1) Scott Pearson, Thomas Cartwright, 75ff.

Axton was the Rector of Moreton Corbett in Shropshire. A contemporary account of the proceedings which led up to his deprivation is extant in manuscript in Dr Williams's Library, and extracts from it have been published, with comments, in Dr Peel's edition of "The (1) Second Parte of a Register". Much more clearly than the extracts, (2) the manuscript brings out the ~~xxx~~ violence of Axton's Puritanism, and also his views about the ministry of the Church. He was deprived for nonconformity in such matters as the wearing of the surplice, the use of the sign of the cross at Baptisms, and kneeling at the Communion, but in the course of his examination some facts were elicited from him about the way in which he had been appointed to his benefice, viz:-

"The patron gave the people a free election of their pastor, and after I had continued with the people six weeks or thereabouts and had some experience of them, and they likewise of me... I was chosen with one consent of them all to be their pastor." (3)

Peel's extracts bring out the point that Axton charged the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield (in whose Diocese Moreton Corbett lay and before whom Axton's case was heard) with lacking the substance of a true call to the ministry, in that his fitness for the ministry had not been tried by an assembly of presbyters. Asked about his own ordination, Axton replied,

"I having exercised and expounded the word divers times in an ordinary assembly of half a score preachers, they joining in prayer and being required to speak their conscience in the presence of God, upon such former trial as they had had of me whether they were persuaded that I might become a profitable labourer in the house of God, they all gave their voices ~~and~~

(1) 2P.R.1.68ff (2) Axton did not stop short, for example, of burning the organ in Hodnet parish church (3) Ibid 72.

"and free consent thereunto. After which consent I also received the laying on of hands of the Bishop." (1)

For the next two questions and answers we have to refer to the manuscript, viz:-

Bishop. "But you had not the laying on of hands of all those preachers?"

Axton. "I had their free consent. I wanted (i.e. lacked) the ceremony of the laying on of hands. I had the substance of a lawful calling although I wanted the accident. Wherein I beseech the Lord to be merciful unto me, for the laying on of hands, as it is the Word, is agreeable with the mighty action of ordaining the ministers of God."

Bishop. "Thus you confess your ordination is unperfect, as well as ours?"

Axton. "I will make mine no better than it is, and I beseech God to be merciful to me therein. But mine is unperfect for want of the accident, and yours is unperfect for want of the substance itself."

It is clear from Axton's replies that at the time of his ordination he tolerated the acceptance of the imposition of hands by a Bishop, but by the time of his deprivation he had so changed his opinions that he could no longer agree with anyone who thought that episcopal imposition of hands was an allowable substitute for the carrying out of that ceremony by a presbytery.

The account of Axton's examination before his Bishop ends with a notice of his deprivation, and the remark that he was

"driven thereupon to seek another country."

(3)

Cooper says that Axton went to Holland, but makes no mention of his re-ordination there. Heylyn, however, after stating that Walter Travers had been ordained by the Dutch presbytery at Antwerp, added

(1) 2P.R.71. See also the deposition of Richard Hawgar in Bancroft, "Dangerous Positions and Proceedings", pp.113ff. (2) See p.46f of the 18th cent. transcript of the Elizabethan manuscript. Both the original and the transcript are in Dr Williams's Library.

(3) Athenae Cantabrigiensis, i.326.

that in the Low Countries Travers and Cartwright

"drew over many of the English nation to receive admission to the ministry in a different form from that which was allowed in the Church of England. Some of which following the example of Cartwright himself, renounced the Orders which they had from the hands of the Bishops, and took a new vocation from these presbyters, as Fennor, Arton, etc." (1)

"Fennor" and "Arton" appear to be mis-spellings of the names "Fenner" and "Axton", and we seem to have here evidence that Axton took the step, which one would expect to find him taking, of accepting pres-
(2)
byterian in place of episcopal ordination.

Venn's tabloid biography of Axton supplies the clue to the formation of his earlier and more moderate attitude towards episcopal ordination, viz:-

"Matriculated as a pensioner of Trinity College, 1566. B.A., 1570/71. M.A., 1574. Fellow, 1573.

Cartwright was already a Fellow of Trinity when Axton entered the College, and Whitgift became Master about a year later. Axton must have been in the College when Cartwright lost the Lady Margaret Chair, and later his Fellowship. Axton must have been there while Whitgift was writing the "Answer to the Admonition" and the "Defence of the Answer". He could not, if he had wanted to do so, have got

(1) Heylyn, Aerijs Redivivus, vii.23. 2nd edition, 1672, p.252.

(2) Travers was back in England before Axton was deprived, and could not have "drawn him over" in Holland, although he may have done so in ~~London~~ London. It was rather Travers' example, and possibly also Cartwright's, that Axton followed. But his case was slightly different from theirs. He was in priest's orders; Cartwright was only in deacon's orders and Travers was not in Anglican Orders at all. Axton therefore renounced his priest's orders in favour of presbyterian ordination; Cartwright merely refused to take priest's orders, and Travers, as we shall see, also refused Anglican Orders, but both of them aggravated their refusal by later accepting presbyterian ordination. (3) Alumni Cantabrigiensis, I.i.58.

himself nearer to the centre of the Anglican-Puritan controversy at that period, and he must have known both disputants personally. Up to a point he must have sided with Cartwright, for he need not have submitted himself to the trial of his abilities which he described. On the other hand he felt himself, at that time, able to accept episcopal ordination. What was it that led to the change in his opinions and to the stiffening of his attitude so that he eventually repudiated the ordination he had previously accepted? Venn's biography does not take us beyond 1574, but if it may be supposed that Axton retained his Fellowship at Trinity for some years after that date, and remained in Cambridge during those years, then he may also have known Browne personally, and have been influenced by his determination to accept no episcopal authorization. At anyrate it may be claimed that Axton's change of mind came some time around or after 1576. It coincided roughly, that is to say, with Grindal's troubles, and may well have been caused by them alone without any help from Browne.

Additional Note

Axton cannot be fitted into the picture of the Elizabethan Church without determining approximately the date of his incumbency of Moreton Corbett, and as this has hitherto been uncertain, it is necessary to decide, as accurately as possible, what period it covered.

The "terminus ad quem" of Axton's deprivation is determined by the presence of Dr Bickley, the Archdeacon of Stafford, in the Consistory Court of Lichfield when the deprivation was pronounced. Dr

(1)
Bickley was appointed Bishop of Chichester on 30th January 1586.
(2)
The Consistory Court sat on "22nd November" to hear Axton's case,
so that 22nd November 1585 is the latest possible date for the end
of Axton's tenure of his benefice.

Peel, in his extracts from the report of the hearing of Axton's case, dated the deprivation provisionally in 1570. He did so, it would seem, because in the course of his examination Axton said,

"the papists have continually these twelve years wrought great and dangerous treason against her Majesty..."(3)

On 22nd November 1570 Queen Elizabeth had just completed the twelfth year of her reign. But this date is impossible, for Venn's brief biography shows that Axton was still an undergraduate at Trinity on that date.

(4)
From this wrong date Peel inferred that the Bishop before whom Axton appeared was Thomas Bentham, who held the See of Coventry and Litchfield from 1560 to 1578. But the original account of Axton's trial nowhere refers to the Bishop by his name; only his title is used.

Knappen saw the difficulty of reconciling the date 1570 with Venn's biography of Axton, but was misled by Peel into thinking that Bentham was the Bishop who pronounced the sentence of deprivation. Hence he thinks that the date of deprivation must have been 1573, when many Puritans were deprived following the stabbing of Sir John Hawkins by the insane Peter Birchet.
(5)

Although he multiplies the

(1) S.W.1.464 (2) 2P.R.1.72. The year is not stated. (3) Ibid 68,73.

(4) Peel may have followed Cooper, who also inferred that Bentham was the Bishop in question. See Athenae Cantabrigiensis, 1.326.

(5) Knappen, op.cit.245 footnote.

patron of Moreton Corbett into "rural Shropshire patrons", and has Axton performing the unusual feat of getting himself deprived of his benefice before he had even been instituted to it, Knappen is nearer the mark when he places Axton's admission to Moreton Corbett within the period 1574-1583.⁽¹⁾

The Lichfield Episcopal Register for the Archdeaconry of Salop is wanting for the later years of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and contains no entry relating to Moreton Corbett after the record of an institution in 1563. But the earliest extant register of the parish itself commences with the entries of 1580, and is headed,

"Register etc... Baptisms etc... William Axton, Rector." (2)

At the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and during the first few years of James I, the process of copying the former paper registers into parchment books was being carried out, and the present parish register for Moreton Corbett in the years 1580 to 1605 is a transcript, the paper original, as in most other parishes, having been lost or destroyed. There is therefore no change of handwriting to indicate a change of Incumbent; the extant handwriting up to 1605 is that of the copyist. It appears likely, however, that Axton began a new register when he was instituted to the parish. In a rural parish the entries of many decades could be contained in one register book, and there was no reason why Axton should not have continued to use the book left behind by his predecessor, unless that book could not be found or had not been kept. The pre-1580 register was

(1) Knappen op.cit.259 (2) This information has kindly been supplied by the present Vicar of Shawbury with Moreton Corbett, the Rev. E.R.Evans.

certainly missing when the transcript was made, otherwise the copyist would have begun his work with entries earlier than those of 1580. The inference to be drawn from all this is that Axton's incumbency probably began in 1580.

Inference aside, Axton had not been deprived of his benefice by 1580, and therefore the twelve years of papist treason to which he referred in the Consistory Court cannot be supposed to have begun in 1558 and continued until 1570. Rather, they must be supposed to have started in 1569 with the issue of the papal Bull of excommunication of Queen Elizabeth, or more probably in 1570 when news of the Bull became known in England. This would give 22nd November 1582 as the date of Axton's deprivation.

In 1580 William Overton became Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield. The early years of his episcopate formed a time of great trouble for him. He was beset by lawsuits brought by his Dean and Chapter, by his Chancellor, and by many others. He had to reckon the powerful Earl of Leicester as an enemy, and he was defied by his clergy. The Privy Council found it necessary to intervene in order to bring peace to the Diocese. Thus we find the Bishop saying to Axton at his trial,

"By your rash doings and for you, I have received a great check of the Privy Council... I have had more said unto me of the Privy Council and of her Majesty herself against you... than I have had against any in the land."(1)

In 1582 the Privy Council appointed a Commission to carry out a
(2)
visitation of Overton's Diocese. The chief Visitor was Whitgift, by

this time Bishop of Worcester. Among the things Whitgift was ordered to do was

"to name and appoint ten, or some like number, of the best learned and best affected preachers in that diocese, to join (some of them) in those assistances with the Lord Bishop and his officers..."(1)

Accordingly, we find the Bishop addressing Axton at the opening of his case in the Consistory Court on "22nd November" in this way:-

"You have had heretofore, first, more private conference with myself, and after, more public with two or three preachers..."(2)

In his book "Dangerous Positions" Bancroft quoted a letter which showed that Axton had been present at a meeting of English Puritans and ~~Scottish~~ ^{Scottish} ministers in Oxford in July 1584. This does not necessarily imply that Axton had not at that date been deprived. In the eighteen months between November 1582 and July 1584 he had had ample time to go to Holland, receive presbyterian ordination, administer for a while to an English congregation in the Low Countries, and return home. But the fact of his presence in Oxford in the summer of 1584 is sufficient to reduce the idea that 1582 was the year of his deprivation from a virtual certainty to strong probability.

The date of Axton's ordination cannot be determined. Cartwright's case shows that he could not have retained his Fellowship for more than seven years after taking his M.A. degree unless he were also ordained priest. For Axton this meant that he must be priested by

(1) S.W.1.201 (2) 2P.R.1.73 (3) Bancroft, "Dangerous Positions and Proceedings", 1593, 73f. (4) Ordination "sine titulo" was against the principles of both the English Puritans and the Dutch presbyters. It must therefore be inferred that, if Axton was ordained by a Dutch presbytery as Heylyn says, he was ordained to administer to some definite congregation, probably of English residents in Holland.

1581, or else lose his Fellowship. But by that year he was already at Moreton Corbett and had presumably been priested some while before he went there.

It would be of great interest if it could be known where Axton spent the years ~~xxxx~~ between 1574 and 1580. If it is to be supposed that he spent this time in Cambridge in the enjoyment of his Fellowship, then it is almost certain that ^{he} knew Browne, or at least knew of Browne's absolute rejection of episcopal authority, and was possibly influenced by him. The six months of Browne's unpaid preaching ministry at St Bene't's are usually referred to the year 1579. (1) Shortly after that date Axton appears as an extreme Puritan, although previously he had been more moderate than Cartwright. Perhaps, after all, Browne's call for "further reformation" was not so completely unheeded in Cambridge as he thought. (2)

(1) WHB 404. Not one year as Knappen has it, op.cit.306.

(2) WHB 6. Knappen, op.cit.305. Porter, op.cit.243f.

IV.

When Browne left Cambridge he travelled to Norwich where, as he had heard, there were people "very forward" in reformation. In Norwich he lodged at the house of Robert Harrison, another dispossessed Puritan schoolmaster who was now Master of a Hospital. The two men had already met in Cambridge while Browne was still an undergraduate, and again while Browne was a preacher at St Bene't's. This second meeting came about while Harrison was visiting Greenham at Dry Drayton seeking ~~and~~ advice and help in taking Orders. Browne set about persuading Harrison not to enter the ministry through episcopal ordination. He was never sure whether it was his pleading or some other factor which turned Harrison from his purpose, but it is clear from what he tells us that this second meeting was the starting point of his personal ascendancy over his slightly older future collaborator in schism.

In Norwich Browne completely won Harrison over to the idea that no further reformation was to be hoped for within the Church of England, and thus to the idea of "gathering" a Church. The schism began at Norwich in 1580 when the members of the new congregation performed their first act;

"A covenant was made and their mutual consent was given to hold together." (5)

Under the terms of their covenant the members of the congregation

"gave their consent to join themselves to the Lord in one covenant and fellowship together, and to keep and seek agreement under his laws and government; and therefore did utterly flee and avoid... disorders and wickedness."

(1) WHB 405 (2) Ibid 407 (3) Ibid 407-10 (4) Ibid 6 (5) Ibid 422.

"They agreed of those that should teach them, and watch for the salvation of their souls, whom they allowed and did choose as able and meet for that charge... So they prayed for their watchfulness and diligence, and promised their obedience."

"Likewise an order was agreed on for their meetings together, for their exercises therein... either by all men which had the gift, or by those which had a special charge before others. And of the lawfulness of putting forth questions, to learn the truth."

"It was agreed that any might protest, appeal, complain, exhort, dispute, reprove, etc, as he had occasion, but yet in due order, as was then also declared."

It was agreed "that all should further the kingdom of God in themselves, and especially in their charge and household... or in their friends and companions and whosoever was worthy."

"They particularly agreed of the manner how to watch to disorders and reform abuses, and for assembling the company, for teaching privately, and for warning and rebuking both privately and openly... for gathering and testifying voices in debating matters... for an order of choosing teachers, guides, and relievers when they want, for separating clean from unclean, for receiving any into fellowship... for seeking to other churches to have their help being better reformed, or to bring them to reformation, for taking an order that none contend openly, nor persecute, nor trouble disorderedly, nor bring false doctrine, nor evil cause after once or twice warning or rebuke."

"Last of all was this thing determined, Whether God did call them to leave their country, and to depart out of England."(1)

(1) WHB 422f. The resemblances with Cartwright's system are noticeable. There are teachers, guides, and relievers, just as Cartwright has doctors, lay Elders, and deacons. But these officials ride much more lightly upon the congregation than do Cartwright's. Any member of the congregation who "had the gift" might, it seems, join in the "exercises", at least by asking questions and demanding the solution of his difficulties, and any member might exhort or dispute with the rest in the meetings. Instead of Cartwright's tier of regional, national, and provincial synods above the local congregation, Browne's congregation might, if it chose, seek the help of other congregations. The most noticeable difference is the principle of free association. Instead of being under the authority of a parish Consistory because he lived in that parish, the member of Browne's congregation placed himself ~~voluntarily~~ voluntarily under the authority of the congregation by entering into a covenant with the rest of its members.

It was over this last point that the disillusionment of Browne, the idealist, began. Some of the congregation wished to migrate to Scotland,

"and seemed to be jealous lest their counsel should not take place."(1)

By letter and messenger it was sought to discover how Scotland would receive them. But before a final decision could be reached Browne was arrested. From his prison in London he wrote to his flock objecting to any idea of migration while they could still testify to the truth in England,

"and rather, indeed, would he have it to be a deliverance by the Lord than a cowardly fleeing of their own devising."(2)

He pictured a migration, that is to say, not as a flight from persecution, but as an Exodus from the bondage of a spiritual Egypt, and he wanted to wait until

"the Lord had with strong hand delivered them from thence."(3)

He objected to Scotland as a possible Promised Land because it was too much like England. Its Church was organized upon a parochial basis, and that might involve the Brownists in corrupt association, or put them under the same kind of persecution that they were enduring already. In either case they would be no better off than they were in England. An alternative plan, to migrate to the Channel Islands, where presbyterianism was practised with the Queen's tolerance, was greeted by Browne with pleas for less haste and more deliberation.

(1) WHB 423 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid.

"But at last, when divers of them were again imprisoned, and the rest in great trouble and bondage out of prison, they all agreed and were fully persuaded that the Lord did call them out of England."(1)

The place they chose for their new abode was Middelburg, in Zea-
land, where they arrived late in 1581 or perhaps early in 1582. (2)

V.

Not all the Norwich congregation crossed the North Sea. Persec-
ution had already brought some loss of membership and perhaps, al-
though it is not certain, others held back from the decision to
leave their homes. When it assembled in Middelburg, the "gathered
Church" numbered between 30 and 40 souls. Browne was its Pastor;
Harrison's position was indeterminate; he does not seem to have been
co-Pastor with Browne, and may have fulfilled the minor role of
Teacher. (3)

Browne was the son of a wealthy father and must have enjoyed an
allowance, for he hired a lodging large enough to include a room in
which the congregation could assemble. He also employed a servant.
His flock was less fortunate, and Browne himself recognized the
strain which their hardships placed upon their faithfulness. Reading
between the lines of his account, however, it is not difficult to
see that one of their worst hardships was the domineering disposition
of their Pastor. It was complained of him that he had condemned his
sister-in-law as a reprobate, had falsely accused Harrison of
"notable apparent wickedness", had falsely suspected one of the

(1) WHB 424 (2) Ibid 7 (3) Ibid 422 (4) Scott Pearson, "Thomas Cartwright", 215 (5) WHB 398.

flock of wrongfully pawning a silver spoon, and had slandered Harrison by falsely accusing him of murmuring.⁽¹⁾

Any opposition to Browne would naturally look to Harrison for leadership, and he was urged by the dissidents to admonish the Pastor in private. Browne's retort was to accuse Harrison of listening to unsubstantiated gossip, and so the matter came before a full meeting of the congregation. Browne was condemned at this meeting, and was ordered to keep away from the Church until he confessed his guilt. But instead of submitting to this judgment, he turned the congregation out of his rooms, whereupon a second Church meeting, held elsewhere, deprived him of his pastorate, and appointed Harrison in his place.

When heads had cooled a little, Harrison brought about a reconciliation by which Browne was restored to his pastorate, but again the congregation resisted him when he rebuked Harrison's sister for

"want of love and abhorring the Pastor... and... of judging wrongfully on the Printer."⁽²⁾

A second reconciliation was followed by

"whisperings, backbitings, and murmurings privily... also openly grievous threats, taunts, revilings, and false accusations."⁽³⁾

Browne met this unpleasantness by forbidding his opponents to come to the Church gatherings, or to visit his rooms for any purpose. They, in return, accused him of playing the domestic tyrant over his wife. A third reconciliation was followed almost immediately by the final breach.

Harrison had for some time been sympathetic towards those who

(1) WHB 425f (2) Ibid 427. What fault the printer was supposed to have committed does not appear. (3) Ibid.

wished to return to England, and Browne clearly regarded this wish as the real bone of contention between himself and the majority of his flock, who now accused him of heresy and condemned him as

"worse than the Pope and Antichrist."(1)

Among the false doctrines alleged against Browne was the likening of England to Egypt, and his declaration that it was sinful to purpose to live in England when God had called them away from that land.

"Yea, though the Magistrates give them leave there to dwell as they liked, yet the laws and disorders abiding still the same, they could not there tarry."(2)

Browne seems to mean that England was so defiled by its form of Church government as to contaminate his flock if it returned there, even although the disobedience of his flock to the ecclesiastical law of England were to be tolerated and not punished. He did not deny that he had declared that a return to England would be sinful. What he did indignantly deny was that he had ever taught that one might belong to the true outward Church of God, and at the same time be a worshipper in the Church of England. This had been alleged against him by way of proving that his rigidity on the matter of returning home was inconsistent with an earlier lenience towards the Church of England.
(3)

Another of the "heresies" laid to Browne's account shows that he was aware, and perhaps more aware than any of his followers, of one of the problems which underlie the conception of a "gathered Church", the problem of the second and subsequent generations. The original

(1) WHB 428 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid.

members of the Church may be "gathered" in the sense that they become members by their own free choice and decision, but their children are born into the circle and atmosphere of the Church, and grow up in it. They are not, and cannot be, "gathered" in quite the same sense as their parents were. To what extent, then, can they be said to be members of the Church even in infancy? Browne was accused of saying, and did not deny that he said,

"all the children must not be accounted forthwith to be of the Church, with the parents believing and received to the Church." (1)

But he also said,

"none can be of the people of God, and outwardly so taken, which either did not offer and give up themselves to God and the Church, or were not offered and given up by others." (2)

Browne seems to have meant that the children of Christian parents were not automatically members of the Church by right of birth, but might become so by being dedicated to God by their parents, ~~and~~ an idea which constituted some relaxation of the strict application of the conception of the "gathered Church". Unhappily he did not indicate where his opponents disagreed with him, whether, that is to say, they were less or more strict in this matter than he was.

The accusations of "heresy" divided the congregation ^{finally} ~~forever~~.

"From this time forward R.H. refused all conditions and means of peace. Likewise his partakers did utterly ~~refuse to~~ forsake R.B., and he and they did most grievously despite him." (3)

Browne also complained that the dissidents had robbed him of his servant, stopped the sale of his books, loaded him with their debts, and had tried to thrust him out of his lodging. Harrison's account

of the squabble is brief and less detailed:-

"M.B. hath cast us off, and that with the open manifesting of so many and so notable treacheries as I abhor to tell... I am well able to prove that Cain dealt not so ill with his brother Abel as he hath dealt with me."(1)

Only a minority of the congregation remained loyal to Browne who, after a while, sailed for Scotland, and finally overcame his scruples so far as to return to England.

Although his experiences in Middelburg disillusioned Browne, the process of disillusionment was for the time being confined to the practice, rather than to the theory, of the form of Church government which he had propounded. It was his opinion that if the laws of Christ, as he understood them, had been kept by his congregation, all would have been well.

"First the laws were broken, whereby the Church of Christ should be kept in good order. There fell out questions, offences, and taking of parts, as we know it hath always been and shall come to pass in the Church of God. But for remedy of such things the Lord's ordinance was rejected."(2)

Some of the congregation, he complained,

"made ado secretly, and talked many matters among themselves, but never told them to the pastor, nor asked counsel for them of the Church, by admonishment, doubt, or question in prophecy, before they had troubled the whole Church about them. Hereby the contention grew so far, that some fell from questions to evil speeches and slanders, and from slanders to open defiance and railings."(3)

At one of the meetings of his Church,

before
"because divers things/were disorderly handled, R.B. did then instantly call for an order that things might be rightly debated. As first, that no accusation might be openly brought against him without two or three witnesses, for this, he said, was the word of God, I Tim.5.19, Deut.19.15. But R.H., which

(1) WHB 149 (2) Ibid 424 (3) Ibid.

"before had dealt without witnesses, did thus shift off the matter, that he needed no witnesses to accuse R.B., because the matters could not be denied wherewith he charged him... Such dealing was utterly ungodly."(1)

Even if we accept Browne's estimate of the dissident members of his flock, it is clear that he regarded their offence more as a breach of Church law than as a departure from Christian charity. His faith in procedure, even if it be allowed that the procedure was laid down by Christ, was puerile. No law, divine or human, and certainly no legal procedure, could have kept his congregation in good order in the absence of Christian love. Without charity only the iron discipline of the monastery could have kept his people together, and even that could not have given them peace.

VI.

During part of his exile from England Thomas Cartwright was employed at Middelburg as factor to the Company of Merchant Adventurers. Before the Brownists arrived there, Cartwright had gone to Antwerp to succeed Walter Travers as the Company's Chaplain. When, in 1582, the Merchant Adventurers transferred their headquarters from Antwerp to Middelburg, Cartwright returned to the Dutch town, and found Browne and his congregation already installed there. Browne had written two short works which had been printed in Middelburg, and published as a single volume. These were his "Treatise of Reformation without Tarrying" and "A Book which sheweth the Life and Manners of all True Christians". Cartwright had read these works (1) while he was still at Antwerp, and strongly disapproved of them. It seems unlikely, therefore, that there would be much contact between the two men at Middelburg. But after the splitting up of the Brownist congregation, Harrison approached Cartwright by letter, and asked for a conference which, he hoped, might lead to the fusion of his section of the Brownists with Cartwright's congregation. Cartwright, for his part, agreed to discuss the matter, but receiving no further word from Harrison, he wrote him a letter which, as Browne later (2) declared, was unsealed and open, and copies of which were soon in many hands.

Cartwright's motive in publicizing this letter to Harrison was probably a wish to avoid compromising himself by seeming to condone

(1) Scott Pearson, Thomas Cartwright, p212 (2) C. 49ff.

the Brownist schism, and also a desire to prevent members of his own congregation from being attracted to it. He regarded himself, and was regarded by others, as the minister of an overseas congregation of the Church of England. He had, by this time, come to regard⁽¹⁾ the apparel prescribed for the clergy as sufficiently innocuous to permit of its being worn if there were no other way of avoiding deprivation and the consequent loss of the right to exercise the⁽²⁾ ministry of the Word and Sacraments. No doubt in other matters he was still something of a non-conformist, but he was no separatist. He wanted "further reformation" but he was content to work for it from within the Church of England. Harrison's proposal for the uniting of the two congregations must have contained conditions which were unacceptable to Cartwright, and he would wish it to be known that they were unacceptable, and why. The open letter was his method of justifying to his congregation the reserve with which he had ~~transacted~~ treated Harrison's gesture.

It is not known whether Harrison answered Cartwright's letter, but about five or six weeks after it was written a copy of it fell into Browne's hands, and because he considered that Cartwright had made him out to be an enemy of the good laws of England, of the Church of God in that realm, and of the peace and welfare of that State, he wrote a reply entitled

"An Answer to Master Cartwright His Letter, For Joining with the English Churches."

This work was printed and published in London, probably in 1585, and

(1) Scott Pearson, "Thomas Cartwright", 187 (2) Ibid 149.

it earned its author a term of imprisonment. He was fortunate that he did not go to the scaffold, for in 1583 Copping and Thacker had been executed for distributing copies of his earlier writings. But Browne was a kinsman of Lord Burleigh, and was protected from the extreme penalty. Perhaps his danger sobered him, for this imprisonment marks the turning point of his life. He signed, with mental reservations, a form of submission drawn up by Whitgift,⁽¹⁾ and was released. The next few years were stormy, but he was gradually returning to the Church of England, and in 1591 he was ordained by the Bishop of Peterborough.

VII.

Before passing to the details of his criticism of Cartwright's letter, it will be useful to consider some of Browne's characteristic ideas, especially those which he had no occasion to express against Cartwright.

Over quite a wide field Browne differed not at all from the main body of Puritan opinion. His main, though not his only, quarrel with Cartwright's party was that they realized the need for "further reformation" but would not carry it out upon their own authority.

"They have their tolerations, mitigations, and other trim distinctions, as of things partly lawful and partly unlawful, necessary and less needful, matters of faith and matters besides faith, ordinary and extraordinary, with a number such like. Thus they both please the people, and the bishops also; and so they are praised and maintained by the people, and also suffered of the bishops because, forsooth, they are somewhat conformable." (2)

(1) WHB 507 (2) Ibid 408

In course of time Browne came to regard the Puritans of Cartwright's type as his chief persecutors.

"Though the names of pastors, doctors, and presbyters be lawful, being found in the scriptures, yet a pope or proud popeling may lie hid under the names. Yea, and further, I judge that if the Parliament should establish such names, and those officers according to those names, which seek their own discipline, that then instead of one Pope we should have a thousand, and of some Lord Bishops in name, a thousand Lordly Tyrants in deed.... This I have found by experience to be true.... I have found much more wrong done me by the preachers of discipline, than by any the Bishops, and more Lordly usurping by them than by the other... For once imprisonment by the Bishops, I have been more than thrice imprisoned by the preachers."(1)

His experience may have influenced Browne in his eventual acceptance of episcopal ordination, but his detestation of persecution preceded most of his experience of it, for in the original covenant of the ~~the~~ (2) Norwich congregation, persecution was forbidden; that is to say, no one was to be co-erced in any way except by the pressure of his conscience to worship God.

While he was in Middelburg, Browne wrote,

"There is no end of their pride and cruelty which ascend up and sit in the Magistrate's chair and smite the people with a continual plague, and such of them as have not yet gotten the room do cry for Discipline, Discipline, that is, for a civil forcing, to imprison the people, or otherwise by violence to handle them and beat them, if they will not obey them... Let them know that the Lord's people is of the willing sort."(3)

Also in Middelburg, but representing the opinions he had held while he was still a preacher in Cambridge, he wrote,

"Whereas God commandeth to plant and to build his Church by gathering the worthy and refusing the unworthy... the Bishops ... hook by their contrary laws both papists and careless worldlings, as crooked trees to build the Lord's sanctuary,

(1) WHB 518f (2) See p. 335 (3) WHB 162

"and force the wretched to their worshippings and service, as if dogs might be thrust upon God for sweet sacrifice. Proud forcing is meek building with them, and devotion compelled is their right religion."(1)

This is Browne at his best, but he was far in advance of his time perceiving in ~~persuading~~ that compulsory attendance at worship is likely to produce the very reverse of the ~~sincere~~ sincere worship which God demands. No doubt he sacrificed much by abandoning the ideal of the parish as a worshipping community, but he gained much by emphasizing personal devotion as an essential element in Christian worship.

Part of the climate of political thought in which Browne lived (2) was the Social Contract theory of government, and it played an important part in his teaching; for example,

"Civil Magistrates are persons authorized of God, and received by the consent or choice of the people."(3)

It is to be noticed that Browne says the Magistrate is "authorized", and not "appointed", by God. The appointment of the Magistrate was, for Browne, a joint matter between God and the people, in much the same way that a Pastor was appointed jointly by God and the congregation. Thus the following paragraphs are qualified by the explanation,

"We give these definitions so general that they may be applied also to the civil state",

although they are included in the first instance under the heading of "Agreement and choice by the Church":-

"Agreement of men is the willingness or glad consent both of the governors to rule, and the people or inferiors to obey, for the assurance they have in God of welfare by each other."

"Receiving of (governors) by obedience is a dutifulness in par-

(1) WHB 402 (2) Davies, The Political Ideas of Richard Hooker, 63f.

(3) WHB 335.

"taking to them of our submission or service, because they partake unto us of their authority and guiding."

"Receiving by choice is an agreement or partaking of conditions between governors and inferiors, that so long as the governors have right use of the submission and service of inferiors, and the inferiors also have the right use and welfare of their authority and guiding, they shall hold that communion, or else make a breach thereof when once it shall tend to confusion and destruction."(1)

In these paragraphs Browne is open to the suspicion that he agreed with Goodman in advocating rebellion against a ruler who displeased his people, an ordinary enough idea in the twentieth century, but a startling one in the sixteenth. The suspicion is strengthened by phrases such as,

"For Church governors there must be an agreement of the Church. For civil Magistrates there must be an agreement of the people or commonwealth."(2)

But Browne does not anywhere specifically assert the right to revolt, even though in ecclesiastical matters the assertion was implicit in his whole position. He was certainly no exponent of rule by divine right but, ecclesiastical affairs aside, he recognized to the full the Queen's authority:-

"She may put to death all that deserve it by law, either of the Church or commonwealth, and none may resist her."(3)

Browne's favourite and most-quoted passage of Scripture was Psalm 149.5ff,

"Let the saints exult in glory...
Let the high praise of God be in their mouth...
To bind their kings with chains
And their nobles with fetters of iron...
This honour have all his saints."

This was the passage upon which Browne based the absolute liberty of

(1) WHB 337ff (2) Ibid 334 (3) Ibid 152

the Church to conduct its affairs without controlment by the State, and the passage upon which he rested his call for reformation

"without tarrying". His earliest use of the text was in the following connection:-

"We hold all those teachers and preachers accursed which will not do the ~~any~~ duties of pastors and teachers till the Magistrate do force them thereto. They say, the time is not yet come to build the Lord's house, they must tarry for the Magistrates and Parliaments to do it... Do they not pull down the Head, Christ Jesus, to set up the hand of the Magistrate?... These wicked preachers... say, Behold, we have a Christian Prince, and a mother in Israel; but can (Magistrates) be Christians when they make them to refuse or withstand the government of Christ in his Church, or will not be subject unto it? If they therefore refuse and withstand, how shall they be tarried for? If they be with them there is no tarrying, and if they be against them, they are no Christians."(1)

As a member of the Church the Queen was to be entirely subject to the Church.

"Who knoweth not, that though Magistrates are to keep their civil power above all persons, yet they come under the censure of the Church if they be Christians, and are openly to humble themselves in unfeigned repentance when they have openly and grievously trespassed. They are indeed to keep their royal dignity, yet keeping that they are to abase themselves unto God before the face of the Church."(2)

Because his favourite passage of Scripture granted to all God's "saints" the honour of binding their kings with chains, Browne claimed for individual Christians a wide liberty of action in obedience to their consciences:-

"This freedom have all Christians, that they consider what is lawful and what is profitable, what they may do and what is expedient, and in no case be brought under the power of anything ... For if either Magistrates or other would take that from us, we must not give place by yielding unto them, no, not for an houre, and this liberty is the free using of our callings and gifts, as we see most agreeing to the word of God, and

(1) WHB 153 (2) Ibid 166

"expedient for his glory. Therefore the Magistrate's commandment must not be a rule unto me for this and that duty, but as I see it agree with the word of God. So then it is an abuse of my gift and calling if I cease preaching for the Magistrate, when it is my calling to preach." (1)

The preacher was not, however, in quite so independent a position as this passage indicated. As will appear, he could, in Browne's scheme of Church government, be silenced by his congregation, whose consent he needed for the exercise of his calling by God.

Although Browne thought that reformation should not await the consent of the Magistrate, yet he believed that a Magistrate might enforce reformation upon a reluctant pastor.

"Indeed the Magistrate may force him, but it is his shame to tarry till he be forced." (2)

On this subject Browne was confused, and therefore tended to contradict himself. Thus Magistrates

"may reform the Church and command things expedient for the same. Yet may they do nothing concerning the Church, but only civilly, and as civil Magistrates, that is, they have not that authority over the Church as to be prophets, or priests, or spiritual kings, as they are Magistrates over the same." (3)

Queen Elizabeth herself could hardly have objected to that definition of her authority. But Browne continued,

"Because the Church is in a commonwealth, it is of their (i.e. the Magistrates') charge: that is concerning the outward provision and outward justice, they are to look to it, but to compel religion, to plant Churches by power, and to force a submission to Ecclesiastical government by laws and penalties belongeth not to them... neither yet to the Church." (4)

reformation

How the Queen was to enforce ~~religion~~ without using force, Browne

did not attempt to explain. The Queen's authority in the Church was civil, but she might not proceed by "civil forcing of men" as

(1) WHB 158 (2) Ibid 161 (3) Ibid 164 (4) Ibid (5) Ibid.

she might do in other civil matters. In all this there is a two-fold confusion of thought. Browne would not admit that the authority he allowed to the Magistrate in the Church was ecclesiastical authority, and then, having declared that authority to be civil, he would not admit that it might be supported by civil sanctions. The result is that he does not leave us with any clear idea of the extent of the Magistrate's ecclesiastical authority. The only idea that emerges clearly is that neither the Magistrate nor the Church may use force in the exercise of ecclesiastical authority.

The same dislike of force led Browne, whenever he quoted Psalm cxlix.6, to suppress the fact that in that passage the "saints" are to have not only "the high praises of God in their mouth", but also a two-edged ~~xxxxxxxx~~ sword in their hand". If he had ever been obliged to acknowledge the existence of this difficulty, he would no doubt have interpreted the phrase figuratively. That was how he dealt with the argument that the Kings of Judah had, in their days, reformed the religious practices of their nation.

"How boldly dare they pervert the truth, affirming that some which ought to reform did it not, because they would tarry for Moses or for the Kings of Judah..." Moses and the Kings were not "in that work as civil Magistrates nowadays, but as spiritual guides, representing Christ and his spiritual kingdom... Yea, and the evil kings of Judah, though not in their wickedness, yet in that authority and calling which they should have rightly used, were figures."(1)

The reforms carried out by Hezekiah and Josiah did not, that is to say, provide a precedent for the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of an English monarch. They were types, rather, of the rule of Jesus in his Church.

(1) WHB 163, 165.

Figurative interpretation of this kind was common in Browne's works, and it often led, as might be expected, to the Scriptures expounding Browne instead of Browne the Scriptures. He did not even shrink, when it suited his purpose, from adding his own suppositions and his own phrases to the teaching of the Bible in order to make it mean what he wished it to mean. For example,

"As I may not offer mine own oblation when I remember that a brother hath ought against me, much less may I partake in another man's offering when I have ought against him. Yea, mercy and pity in seeking to reform him is preferred before sacrifice. So that, except he be obstinate and a scorner, I am gently to admonish him, and if he be yet hardened in his sin, I am, as Jude saith, to save him with fear, pulling him out of the fire. What is this fear which should save him, but to make him afraid by sharper rebukes, and refusing to partake with him in the sacraments."(1)

Even when he interpreted a passage of Scripture literally, Browne was prone to interpret it apart from its original context. Thus he used Rom.x.14 to draw a distinction between preaching the Word of God and reading that Word in the Bible, and Rom.x.15 to draw a distinction between preachers and preachers-who-are-sent-by-the-Lord, neither of which distinctions were in St Paul's mind, viz:-

"R.H. said that faith might be bred and first wrought in some, only by reading the scriptures; and R.B. said, No. For though it might be nourished and increased by such reading, yet the first working thereof is by hearing the word preached, as St. Paul saith, Rom:10.14... So then faith is not wrought by reading, neither by preachers, nor by preaching; but by the preaching of those which are sent by the Lord, if his grace in our hearts do work therewithal, for else all preaching and our hearing also is fruitless, as it is written again, John 6.45, that they shall be all taught of God."(2)

These sentences of Browne's, and the manner in which he inter-

(1) WHB 491 (2) Ibid 408f

preted the Scriptures, are reminiscent of something that Hooker said about the continental Anabaptists:-

"That things might again be brought to that ancient integrity which Jesus Christ by his word requireth, they began to control the ministers of the gospel for attributing so much force and virtue unto the scriptures of God read, whereas the truth was, that when the word is said to engender faith in the heart, and to convert the soul of man, or to work any such spiritual divine effect, these speeches are not thereunto appliable as it is read or preached, but as it is ingrafted in us by the power of the Holy Ghost opening the eyes of our understanding, and so revealing the mysteries of God... The Book of God they notwithstanding for the most part so admired, that other disputation against their opinions than only by allegation of Scripture they would not hear; besides it they thought no other writings in the world should be studied... When they and their Bibles were alone together, what strange fantastical opinion soever at any time entered into their heads, their use was to think the Spirit taught it them."(1)

Browne nowhere directly claimed that his peculiar expositions of Scripture were the results of divine inspiration, ~~much~~ but the contrast he saw between preachers and preaching on the one hand, and the preaching of those-who-were-sent-by-the-Lord on the other, suggests that he thought the latter to be endowed with some insight into the mind of God to which the motions of the Spirit in the heart of the hearer would respond. Whatever the quality in such a preacher might be, it was something over and above the Word of God recorded in Scripture, and something, therefore, that could not be experienced by the mere reading of Scripture. Browne did not define this quality; he referred to it as the "gift" which went with the preacher's calling. (2) He may well have felt that only some such gift could lead to the true interpretation of Scripture, but he did not say so. Rather, he leaves the impression that he thought his interpretations of Scrip-

(1) H.Pref.VIII.7 (2) See p.35/

ture to be so obviously right as to need no justification.

Under the term "covenant" Browne extended the political theory of Social Contract to the relationship between man and wife, and to that between master and servant. He also stretched the idea, not very happily, so that it covered the relationship between teacher and scholar. He stretched it still further, and not happily at all, in an attempt to make it describe the relationship of parent with child. He was forced to admit however, that

"this agreement between parents and children is of natural desert and duty between them."(1)

This means that his category had broken down altogether, for natural desert and duty are not subjects of agreement or "covenant". Browne, in fact, was obsessed with the idea of covenant, and tried to force every relationship into its mould, including that between God and the Christian. Thus,

"The Church planted or gathered is a company or number of Christians or believers, which by a willing covenant made with their God, are under the government of God and Christ, and keep his laws in one holy communion."(2)

"The covenant on God's behalf is his agreement or partaking of conditions with us that if we keep his laws, not foraking his government, he will take us for his people, and bless us accordingly."(3)

"The covenant on our behalf, is our agreement and partaking of conditions with God, that he shall be our God so long as we keep under his government, and obey his laws, and no longer."(4)

The covenant-idea in religion is biblical. But in Scripture only
(5)
Jacob presumed to make conditions with God. Elsewhere in the Bible all the conditions are laid down by God for man to obey. In fairness

(1) WHB 342 (2) Ibid 253 (3) Ibid 255 (4) Ibid 257 (5) Gen.xxviii.
20f.

to Browne it should be noticed that he emphasized that it is God's law that Christians are required to keep as the condition of the covenant, but his phraseology is unfortunate. His expression,

"our agreement and partaking of conditions with God", obscures the fact that the conditions are laid down by God and not by man.

Moreover, apart from the case of Jacob, in the Bible the initiative in making covenants is always taken by God. This is especially the case with the New Covenant, sealed by Christ upon the Cross without the agreement of men and in the face of their hostility. In the New Testament, in fact, the idea of a covenant is emptied of all idea of "agreement" or "contract", and has become a term for the love and mercy by which God bestows his blessings upon men without regard to their deserts. No doubt Browne would have agreed with this view of the New Testament, but the sentence,

"he shall be our God so long as we keep under his government, and obey his laws, and no longer",

fails to express the extent of God's mercy.

It is true that Browne tried to guard against over-emphasis of the human part of the covenant by saying,

"His promise to his Church is his sure ~~xxx~~ covenant... whereby it only hath assurance of salvation in Christ."(1)

But Browne leaves the impression that somewhere in the back of his mind he had the idea of a covenant not to commit sin, rather than a covenant for the remission of sin.

This impression receives some re-inforcement from Browne's idea

of the Church as a company of the "saints" gathered apart from the ungodly, of the "worthy" separated from the unworthy. No doubt if he had been challenged to define "worthiness" Browne would have stressed sincere repentance as an important part of it. But why use the term at all for those who, if they were penitent, had a strong sense of their unworthiness? The term was open to misunderstanding, for if the Brownists described themselves as "worthy", others might be pardoned for thinking that they really thought themselves to be people who deserved God's blessings, and people fit to enter into an agreement with God.

Browne, in fact, complained that he was misunderstood and misrepresented over this very matter:-

"Not that we can keep his commandments without all breach or offence, for we are not Donatists as the adversaries slander us, that we should say, we may be without sin... We teach no such doctrine.(1)

He did not deny that gross sins might occur in his own Church. His argument was, that if when gross and notorious sins were committed the Church had no power to deal with them, or refused to deal with them, then that Church ceased to be a Church until it repented and
(2)
set its house in order.

(1) WHB 459ff. Browne seems to be mistaken in thinking that the Donatists taught that men could be without sin. They did not demand any very high standard of conduct as a qualification for membership of the Church except in one matter; apostasy was unforgiveable, and the apostate was excluded for ever from the Church. In some respects Brownism was comparable with Donatism. Each regarded the presence of a known offender in the Church as a contamination of every other ~~member~~ member, and when all members were contaminated, that Church was no Church. Brownism was more rigorous than Donatism since any serious offence, and not only apostasy, was regarded as a contamination which would destroy the "churchness" of the Church. See Greenslade, Schism in the Early Church, 119. (2) WHB 460

It remains to examine Browne's treatment of that "locus classicus" of Puritan teaching, Matt.xviii.17. To him the "Church" in this passage meant the whole body of the members of a single congregation. He allowed for an Eldership, but the Elders were guides of the congregation in the exercise of its powers, not the rulers of the congregation as in Cartwright's theory.

"Therefore is the church called the pillar and ground of truth, I Tim.3.15, and the voice of the whole people, guided by the elders and forwardest, is said to be the voice of God."(1)

Browne's congregationalism was not completely unqualified, for

"A synod is a joining or partaking of the authority of many churches met together in peace, for redress and deciding of matters which cannot well be otherwise taken up."(2)

But the essential independence of each congregation was unimpaired, for recourse to a Synod was voluntary. Synods were

"meetings of sundry churches; which are when the weaker churches seek help of the stronger, for deciding or redressing of matters: or else the stronger look to them for redress."(3)

Browne demanded the dismissal of the Bishops of the Church of England. The Church, he claimed, had a right to dismiss them, and because of their misdeeds ought to dismiss them. In this context he enunciated the following principle of the authority of a majority of the total membership of the Church:-

"The meetings together of many churches, also of every whole church, and of the elders therein, is above the Apostle, above the Prophet, the Evangelist, the Pastor, the Teacher, and every particular Elder. For the joining and partaking of many churches together, and of the authority which many have, must needs be greater and more weighty than the authority of any single person. And this also meant Paul where he saith, I Cor 2.22, We are yours, and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's. So that the Apostle is inferior to the church.."(4)

(1) WHB 399 (2) Ibid 271 (3) Ibid 270 (4) Ibid 399.

VIII.

Harrison's letter to Cartwright is no longer extant, but at least some of its contents can be inferred from Cartwright's reply. As late as 1583, when the two latest of Harrison's three extant works were published, their author was still uncompromisingly hostile towards the Church of England, although he was prepared to admit that there might be individual congregations within the Church of England which could be regarded as true Churches. But it would be unsafe to assume that the views he propounded in 1583 had remained unchanged by the time he approached Cartwright with a view to uniting their two congregations. Harrison died in 1585, and it may well have been his last illness that prevented him from following up the approach he had made to Cartwright. Indeed, the knowledge that his end was near may have been the reason why he approached Cartwright at all, since he would presumably wish to provide for the future of his congregation. In such a position he may have been willing to concede much that could not in other circumstances have been wrung from him. But even so, the conditions he appears to have laid down for the uniting of the two congregations were such as to destroy in Cartwright any hope of a successful outcome of the proposal.

(1) "A Little Treatise upon the first Verse of the 122 Psalm" and "Three Forms of Catechisms", WHB 70-148 (2) Ibid 115 (3) ~~See also Harrison's letter to Thomas Cartwright, 1583, C.49.~~ In what follows it should be noticed that Cartwright speaks of the parish congregations of England sometimes as "churches of Christ" and sometimes as "the assemblies of England". Harrison must have referred to these congregations as "assemblies", denying them, as Browne did, the title of "Church" because they were not, in his opinion, gathered together according to the law of God. Cartwright called these congregations "churches" because to him each parish, and not each Diocese, was a unit of the Church, even though it was not in all respects an independent unit.

One of Harrison's conditions seems to have been that those of Cartwright's flock, which probably meant the whole number of them, who had joined in the worship of the Established Church while they were in England, should make a public expression of repentance for doing so, for Cartwright wrote,

"Your fear is lest in uniting yourselves with such (as have not made a declaration of repentance), you should be unequally yoked, and made fellow-members of some other body than that whereof Christ Jesus is the head."(1)

Instead of admitting that his congregation needed to repent for its association with the Church of England, Cartwright tried to show that "the assemblies of England" were truly Churches of God. This he did by pointing to their faith:-

"By believing that Christ is our Righteousness we are made members of his body, and thereby as lively stones laid upon him as upon a foundation, we grow into one spiritual house with him."(2)

Not only did the assemblies of England profess this faith, but they also showed evidence of the presence of the Spirit, for they displayed apparent signs of sanctification.

"They that have performed unto them the special covenant which the Lord hath made with his churches, of pouring his spirit upon them and putting his word in their mouths, are the churches of God. But such are the assemblies in England... Whereupon also it followeth that he hath put his word in their mouths, considering that the Spirit of God is not given but by the word."
(3)

Browne began his reply to this argument by saying that he had not seen Harrison's letter, but hoped that its condemnations of the assemblies of England had been confined to

"the ordinary abused assemblies of false professors", (4)
and had not been extended to all the assemblies, nor to all who

professed a faith in Christ. Although he realized that Cartwright would not accept it, he thought a distinction should be drawn between those who merely professed their faith in Christ, and those who also carried out their faith in practice, especially in their practice of the government of the Church.

"Why should not they be false professors which do show forth in practice a false profession, and that chiefly in their assemblies? ... The outward profession must chiefly be showed and justified by the lawful using of public assemblies. If they then be so shamefully abused by means of the bishops and their officers, then his (i.e. Cartwright's) proof of the outward profession also falleth to the ground." (1)

Quite in the style of Whitgift, Browne attacked Cartwright's lack of logic, accusing him of "petitio principii":-

"For the question is, whether the assemblies be lawful outward churches, being held according to so corrupt a profession? ... He proveth idem by idem... it is so because it is so." (2)

But Browne himself was doubly guilty of "petitio principii". First, he assumed without proof that the government of the Church of England was unlawful. As this was common ground between Cartwright and himself, the assumption was perhaps permissible in argument between the two men. But Browne went on to assume, what in effect Cartwright denied, that because the outward government was wrong, therefore the inward faith must necessarily be false, viz:-

"By faith which is inward, and the spirit that is inward, (Cartwright) would justify an outward church. Again, by an outward false and corrupt profession, he will justify the inward spirit and faith of professors to be sincere." (3)

(1) WHB 436 (2) Ibid. This is hardly the Browne of "A Treatise upon the 23 of Matthew", a work which Harrison described as "a pattern of all lewd frantic disorder" (WHB 149). The portion of the Treatise which is still extant hardly mentions Matt. xxiii, and consists largely of a satire upon the use of logic and rhetoric in the Church. (3) Ibid 437.

In fact, Cartwright did neither of the things of which Browne accused him. He merely said that, in spite of much that was wrong, there was also much that was right in the Church of England, i.e. its faith and its evident signs of the presence of the Spirit. Browne over-simplified the problem by assuming that because some things were wrong, everything must be wrong. He could see nothing that was not either wholly black or entirely white. The question which he ought to have put to himself was, whether the Church of England, being in some respects corrupt, was so corrupt as to disqualify it from being correctly described as a Church of God.

What Browne described as

"a shameless and blasphemous doctrine" (1)

formed Cartwright's next argument. All Churches, Cartwright maintained, had members who professed the Gospel, but did not believe it truly. Even if the Church of England was worse in this respect than any other, yet the truth of the Church did not consist in the number of the truly faithful.

"For if there were but in every church one truly and undiss-
 emblingly faithful, all the rest holding the faith of our
 Lord Jesus Christ in words only, yet should all those churches
 be unto us as the churches of God." (2)

(1) WHB 437 (2) C.51. The word "faithful" is ambiguous. It may mean "fullof faith". Or it may mean "loyal" or "obedient". To Browne it must have seemed useless to say that a man had faith in Christ unless that man "kept faith" with Christ by his obedience to Christ's commandments. The reality of the inward faith was to be seen in the outward faithfulness of conduct. So with the Church. If the government of the Church did not conform to the pattern supposedly laid down by Christ, that was evidence that there was no real faith in Christ in that Church, no matter what the verbal profession of faith might be. The ambiguity appears in the discussion which follows from this point, Cartwright sometimes meaning by "the faithful" those who trust in Christ, and Browne meaning "those who keep faith with Christ."

Browne considered that this argument placed the faithful Christians above Christ,

"for Master Cartwright doth give them power to loose those on earth whom God doth bind in heaven, and this power Christ never had."(1)

If, that is to say, the faith of the righteous few was sufficient to retain within the Church those whose faith was in word only, and without good works, then why bother to excommunicate such offenders? Offenders were certainly "bound in heaven", yet

"Master Cartwright will give us a contrary power, namely, to reckon all for the church."(2)

Again, Browne argued, if it was legitimate to conclude that the faith of a few was sufficient to retain the faithless many within the Church, then it must be equally legitimate to conclude that the faithlessness of the many was sufficient to make all, faithful and faithless alike, no Church. But, in fact, Browne would have neither of these arguments. Instead,

"As my wickedness condemneth no man but myself, except they partake with me in my wickedness, so my faith justifieth no man, except they hold with me an outward profession according to faith."(3)

In contradiction of the idea that a good Christian profession in other matters could excuse bad practice in the government of the Church, Browne argued by an analogy. St James (1.26) had said that a man who did not refrain his tongue thereby proved that his religion was vain. Similarly therefore,

"to have a filthy polluted profession in public assemblies is to make all other profession filthy and polluted."(4)

(1) WHB 437 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid (4) Ibid 439.

Where Cartwright asserted that the Church of England had the Covenant because she had the Spirit and the Word of God, Browne replied,

"Without shame he abuseth that place in ~~Isa~~ Isaiah 59, for he leaveth out one part of the covenant, which is, that the Lord will come unto Zion and to those that turn from iniquity in Jacob, and with them will he make his covenant."(1)

The presence of the Word, Browne held, did not establish the Covenant so as to create a Church unless the Word ruled that body in which it was present and made it obedient to God.

"One condition and part of the covenant is our upright and good profession... The word is no covenant where the practice thereof is rejected... Therefore when Christ appointeth the Apostles to plant churches... he giveth in charge these three things, as being the chief marks of a planted church; namely, preaching the word, ministration of the sacraments, and reformation of life... Because preaching and baptizing is nothing without amendment of life, he addeth these words, Teaching them to observe and do all things, whatsoever I have commanded you. Therefore, as appeareth in the Acts of the Apostles, was neither the Church nor the covenants of the Church established among any, but where their good and godly profession was showed, and the contrary refused."(2)

It was part of Browne's all-or-nothing mentality that he had no conception of faith as a thing which might grow, bringing with it a gradual amendment of life . Faith, in the sense of trust in God, must be complete from the first, and accompanied by reformation of life "without tarrying":-

"Faith is a conscience of our redemption and happiness in Christ, whereby we wholly yield up ourselves unto him, in all newness of life. So then faith cannot be except we be so renewed that no open gross wickedness be in us; as James teacheth us, that faith without works is dead..."(3)

(1) WHB 439 (2) Ibid 439-441 (3) Ibid 409.

The equivalent in the Church of ~~some~~ amendment of life in the individual was, to Browne, the ability and will to purge herself of unworthy members by means of that process of discipline which he believed that Christ had laid down in the Gospel, and which therefore came under the heading of those things which the Apostles were to teach their converts to observe. It included the right and duty of each congregation to be self-governing directly under Christ, and an obligation to refuse such abominations as the surplice, the Canon Law, and the Book of Common Prayer, all of which, in their different ways, he believed to be against the Word of God. In short, the Church must show its faith in works of Church government and worship, as well as in works of charity and morals. If obedience in these matters was not apparent, then it was clear that there was no faith, and hence no Church.

IX.

It seems that Harrison was ready to agree that where a parish congregation in England had a preacher for its Incumbent, that congregation was a true Church of God. Yet he seems also to have denied that the "assemblies of England", including perhaps Cartwright's own congregation in Middelburg, were true Churches, for the reason that they did not practise the Discipline. Cartwright's words on all this are,

"You confess those assemblies upon whom the Lord hath set the lamp of a preaching ministry are the churches of God, which seemeth to cast down that hill which standeth against our rejoicing whereby you cannot afford us the name of God's churches because we have not the discipline by him appointed."(1)

Two problems were raised by Harrison's attitude. Firstly, ~~ix~~ was the Discipline to be regarded as, in fact, a "sine qua non" of the Church? Here it must be noticed that there was a wider, and also a narrower, sense in which the word "Discipline" was understood in this controversy. In the wider sense Discipline meant the obedience of the Church to the totality of what it was believed that Christ had commanded for the government of his Church, including preaching, the administration of the sacraments, the parity of ministers, and so on. In the narrower sense it meant the "binding" of offenders by admonition, rebuke, or excommunication in the manner supposed to have been prescribed by Jesus, and the corresponding "loosing" of the penitent. The place of Discipline as part of the "esse" of the Church was discussed later in Cartwright's letter, but in its wider meaning it played some part in the discussion of preaching, for,

(1) C.51

according to Cartwright,

"It is a piece of that discipline of our Saviour Christ that there should be certain which should be chosen out of the rest to preach the gospel..."(1)

The second problem arose from the presence in many English parishes of the "dumb", non-preaching, minister. Cartwright deferred until later the question whether a congregation

"might have some glimpse of knowledge by the dumb ministry, or no", (2)

and confined himself at this stage to asking whether a congregation led by a non-preaching minister might not be established in Christ by faith derived from the preaching of a former minister, or from some source other than preaching, or perhaps from preaching carried out in a neighbouring parish. If the lack of a preaching minister disqualified a congregation from being regarded as a Church of God, he argued, then whenever such a minister resigned or died, his congregation would cease to be a Church. If it were admitted that a congregation in such circumstances remained a Church during the vacancy in the benefice, surely it could not follow that it became a synagogue of Satan if a dumb minister was thrust upon it, and as soon as he was ~~instituted~~ instituted? (3)

"Say, therefore, that it is a fault in them to hear such a minister thrust upon them, yet that it is an apostasy from God, and an utter falling away from the gospel, I see not with what great appearance of truth it can be spoken."(4)

When certain Israelites forsook Aaron and adhered to Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, Moses did not cast them out from the Lord's host, said Cartwright. Why then should the members of a congregation under a

(1) C.54 (2) Ibid 51 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid 52.

(1)
dumb minister be regarded as runagates from the Lord?

Cartwright appealed to the consensus of opinion of the reformed Churches of Europe, which all held the Church of England to be a true Church. This argument, he agreed, was not strong enough to conclude the question, but it was sufficient to halt all sudden and hasty judgments to the contrary until the matter had been thoroughly debated. In this, as in other cases of excommunication, the Discipline of Christ required the minority to accept the verdict of the majority. (2)

"If there were but one man worthy to be excommunicate, yet if the greater part of your assembly would not yield consent thereunto, I hold it that the order of the discipline requireth that the rest are to bear the person whom they cannot remove. And therefore although the assemblies of England had deserved, through want of discipline and of a teaching ministry, to be cast out from the account of the churches of God, yet being holden in by the most voices of the churches themselves, they ought to have been so far borne withal, as the communicating with them should not make them guilty of a falling away from the Lord." (3)

Browne's rebuttal of Cartwright's arguments opened with a denial of the proposition that where there was a preaching ministry, there of necessity was the Church. The papists had preachers, but were no Church. Nor would Browne admit that inward faith (for example, in a congregation which had a "dumb" minister") made an outward Church, for,

"a man may believe, and be won to faith, by means of some godly brother, and that before he hath outwardly joined himself to the church; so in God's secret election he is of the church; yet because he hath not the outward profession, (he) cannot be said to be (of) the outward church." (4)

Browne was prepared to agree that a congregation remained a Church

(1) C.52 (2) By declaring the Church of England to be no Church, Harrison was, of course, excommunicating the Church of England.
(3) Ibid 53 (4) WHB 442.

even though for a while it might lack preaching and a preacher, but he dismissed Cartwright's argument about the vacancy in a benefice as trifling to no purpose, for

"neither the word in the preacher's mouth, nor the sacraments, can make an outward church, except they have ~~power~~ power to separate the unworthy."(1)

A temporary lack of preaching would not deprive a congregation of the right to be regarded as a Church because

"we know that even two or three agreeing together in the truth, and separate from wickedness, if none other will join them, even they are an outward and visible church, and have this power of Christ, even to bind men on earth, and to loose them on earth, that they may be bound or loosed in heaven."(2)

The power to bind and to loose was of the "esse" of the Church, but it did not need the presence of a preaching minister to exercise it.

"Without this power of binding... there is no name nor show of the church of Christ remaining... God hath given this power not only to the preachers, but to all the saints of God, as appeareth by that Psalm..."(3)

Because the power belonged to all God's saints,

"We ought jointly to execute this power; but if others will not, or be in bondage that they cannot, join with us, then they are not the church, but the ~~men~~ bondslaves of men."(4)

Browne recognized and distinguished a form of binding and loosing

(1) WHB 443 (2) Ibid 442 (3) Ibid 443. The Psalm, as might be expected, was 149, which Browne here misquoted as follows, "'By the word of God in their mouths, to bind even the kings and nobles of the earth, and to execute upon them his spiritual judgment', and the text followeth, 'that this honour shall be to all his saints'." So as to make the passage applicable to his purpose here, Browne has changed 'the high praises of God' into 'the word of God'. He has added the word 'even', thus extending the binding to others besides kings and nobles, which the Psalm does not do. And he has interpreted the 'chains and iron fetters' to mean 'spiritual judgment'. (4) WHB 444.

which could be exercised by the individual Christian. This was the power of "forsaking".

"This power belongeth to everyone severally to forsake wicked fellowship, and there is a commandment given to everyone, to forsake the unfruitful works of darkness."(1)

To the power of forsaking, first raised at this point in the discussion of Cartwright's letter, Browne returned later. Meanwhile, what of the Church of England and her use of the power of binding and loosing?

"What is a Church without this power we speak of? Yea, what are those assemblies which, instead of it, do hold that anti-christian power of the spiritual courts, or rather are held in bondage by it?"(2)

There followed from Browne the usual Puritan catalogue of complaints against the spiritual courts and the Bishops, the ordination of non-preachers, the commuting of penance by fines, the delays in hearing cases, and so on. But the chief complaint was the very existence of the spiritual courts which, on Browne's assumption, took the place which rightly belonged to the polity established by Christ. Therefore,

"We make not the minister, whether dumb or not dumb, to be the essence, substance, or life, of the outward church, but the keeping of the covenant by the outward discipline and government thereof."(3)

Cartwright's example of the dealings of Moses with Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and their adherents, was not suitable to the purpose for which he employed it, and Browne had no trouble in answering it effectively. It was true, he said, that Moses did not cast the three men out of the congregation of Israel; he withdrew the congregation from them. Was not this a putting apart, a kind of casting out?

(1) WHB 444 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 447

Then Moses destroyed them. Was not this also abputting apart? The next day their adherents died of a plague. Was not this, too, a putting apart?⁽¹⁾

"And these judgments were both an ensample and a figure of the spiritual judging at this day, both by excommunication, and by rebuke and denouncing judgment."⁽²⁾

Browne therefore handed the example of Moses' treatment of the adherents back to Cartwright as an instance of caution and delay in pronouncing excommunication. Delay there had certainly been, said Browne, for there had to be an allowance of time to consider the case, but it had been a delay of one day only before punishment was inflicted.⁽³⁾

As to Cartwright's appeal to the consensus of the reformed Churches of Europe about the Church of England, Browne complained that his opponent was trying to enforce the opinions of those Churches upon men's consciences, that he wanted to use those opinions to shut men's mouths from testifying to the truth about the Church of England, and that he would play into the hands of the papists if he applied the same principle in a different way.⁽⁴⁾ Instead of the consensus of the reformed Churches, Browne appealed to St Paul in I Cor.ii.10-15,

"The spirit of God (in his children) searcheth out all things, even the deep things of God... Yea, it judgeth and knoweth all things that are of God... He which is spiritual discerneth all things; yea, he himself is judged of no man."⁽⁵⁾

From this passage Browne concluded that

"the godly may both freely judge, and give their judgment, even of all assemblies which they know, whether they be the true churches of God."⁽⁶⁾

(1) WHB 450f (2) Ibid 451 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid 453 (5) Ibid 454 (6) Ibid
Browne interpreted St Paul here apart from the context. St Paul was writing about the mystery of God's wisdom as revealed in the

Browne further maintained that Cartwright had done the Churches of Europe an injustice. They judged the Church of England on the fame of the martyrs of Queen Mary's reign. It did not follow that if they knew the state of the Church of England in Queen Elizabeth's reign they would continue their favourable opinion. Englishmen who did know the condition of the Church of England must judge it truly, and act accordingly. (1)

Whatever might be the consensus of the reformed Churches, Browne continued, it was the power and duty of the individual Christian to forsake an institution which he believed to be evil.

"Let not Master Cartwright think much if God do set one man even against a whole country." (2)

Cartwright was not to be surprised at such a thing because there was a scriptural precedent for it. Jeremiah was alone, and was forbidden by God to have fellowship with his compatriots (Jer.xvi.5-8),

"And if it be said ~~by~~ that Jeremiah had a special commandment which we have not, we know that all the commandments of God upon the like occasions belong to us." (3)

Cross of Christ. Where the Spirit dwelt in men, the minds of those men understood this Divine mystery. Cartwright also took this text out of its context when, in his controversy with Whitgift, he used it to justify the enrolment of ignorant men as Seniors in the government of the Church. (1) WHB 454. The continental Churches did know the condition of the Church of England in Queen Elizabeth's time, and adversely criticized it, but they did not deny it the name and status of a Church as Browne did. The Elizabethan settlement left the ~~Church~~ Church of England, anyway, much as the Marian martyrs had fashioned it. (2) Ibid 455. (3) Ibid. This is Browne at perhaps his weakest. Many actions could be justified, that ought not to be justified, on the ground that God commanded them on some particular occasion and that therefore a precedent was established for similar action upon all subsequent similar occasions. This weakness of reasoning was not only Browne's, however. It was a common flaw in the Puritan case and had been displayed by Cartwright in his controversy with Whitgift.

Against Cartwright's argument that the minority must give way to the majority over a question of excommunication, Browne again drew attention to the "power to forsake". There was not one word in Scripture, he claimed, that supported Cartwright's view. On the contrary,

"there is a flat law set down by the Lord; Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil; neither agree in a controversy to decline after many, to overthrow the truth."(1)

He expected that Cartwright would want to put this rule in its context in Exod.xxiii.2, and claim that it applied only to the behaviour of witnesses in a law-suit, and had nothing to do with excommunication. But, Browne insisted, the civil law of the Old Testament was a figure of the Lord's spiritual judgment in his Church, and therefore the rule was to be understood generally, and was to be applied to the exercise of the Church's spiritual jurisdiction. Christians certainly ought not to excommunicate alone. They ought to "tell the Church".

"But what if the rest of the Church will not join us therein? Surely then... we must set ourselves against them all."(2)

Two cases in which St Paul and St Barnabas were involved (Acts xiii.46ff, xix.9) provided Browne with scriptural examples of the "power to forsake". The Jewish synagogues at Antioch and Ephesus, he said, were Churches of God. But when the Apostles preached in them they did not wait for a majority to agree with their preaching. They gathered the disciples whom they had gained and formed Churches apart from the synagogues. And if Cartwright should reply that the Apostles did this because the majority of the members of these syn-

(1) WHB 455 (2) Ibid 456

agogues refused Christ,

"Then belike it is true that one man or a few persons may cast off whole churches for some greater sins or offences."(1)

Anticipating that Cartwright would make the idolatry or apostasy of the majority into exceptions to the general rule that a minority must follow the decisions of the majority, Browne argued that every case of disobedience to God, and not only idolatry or apostasy, should be an exception to the general rule.

"Christ, for all disobedience in refusing any message of God, doth give commandment to cast off whole cities and churches... For if they receive not you, he saith, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or out of that city, shake off the dust of your feet against them."(2)

And if Cartwright should reply that refusing Christ's message was, in the passage to which Browne here referred, an act of apostasy,

"Is not this a message from Christ, when one or a few persons do justly rebuke the congregation for overthrowing the Lord's discipline and treading his sceptre underfoot? And is not his sceptre cast down and his kingdom polluted, when he which is manifestly known and proved to deserve separation cannot be cast out?"(3)

Browne tried to show that the offence of those "houses and cities" against which the Apostles were to shake off the dust of their feet was not, in fact, apostasy. He used the Marcan theory of the Messianic secret to show that belief in Jesus as the Messiah was not

(1) WHB 457 (2) Ibid 458. Matt.x.14f (3) WHB 458. Behind all the foregoing cases in which Browne put arguments into Cartwright's mouth, and then refuted them, there was not only a desire to justify his action in separating his congregation from the Church of England, but also a wish to escape from the conclusion that faith is the sole "esse" of the Church. He was, throughout, pressing the view that faith did not exist unless it was accompanied by "Discipline". His employment of Matt.x.14f for this purpose was not convincing. The message which Christ commanded his Apostles to deliver in that passage was, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand"(x.7). Elsewhere in the Gospels the response that was required to that message was "Repent ye, and believe in the gospel."(Mark 1.15). The message which

required until after Jesus' death and resurrection.

"It was sufficient for that time if they generally believed in the Messiah... and refused him not when he should be preached more clearly." (1)

Those who rejected the Apostles' message while Jesus was still on earth could not therefore be held to have rejected the person of Christ, and consequently could not be held to be guilty of apostasy. Nevertheless, although they were guilty of some offence less serious than apostasy, the dust of the Apostles' feet was to be shaken off against them. How much more, then, were those who committed apostasy to be repudiated, and they included all who would not accept Christ's Discipline. For

"they which refuse his discipline and government do also refuse Christ himself; and so it is the sin of apostasy." (2)

the Apostles were to deliver was concerned, therefore, with inward faith and the disposition of the mind. It was only by adding his own ideas to the Scriptures that Browne was able to bring the refusal of Discipline within the rejection of the Apostles' message, and thereby to claim that the command "shake off the dust of your feet against them" was directed against those who rejected or neglected the Discipline. (1) WHB 458 (2) Ibid.

X.

The main question between Cartwright and Harrison was, what is the irreducible minimum that a Church must have if it is to remain a Church? In more modern terms, what constitutes the "esse" of the Church, and what only its "bene esse"? Cartwright named faith as the sole constituent of the "esse".

"There is the foundation, Christ, whereupon it is necessary that by faith the assemblies be laid... without the which it cannot be his church. Which thing being, whatsoever is either wanting of that which is commanded, or remaining of that which is forbidden, is not able to put that assembly which by faith is laid upon Christ from the right and title of being the Church of Christ."(1)

As scriptural confirmation of his view, Cartwright noted that St Paul in his epistles addressed himself indifferently to "the faithful", to "the saints", and to "the Church" of the places to which he wrote.

Even within the sphere of faith Cartwright noted that there might be defects which would not disqualify a congregation from being a Church of God.

"Whatsoever wanteth unto this (faith), or is more than enough, it wanteth or aboundeth to the disgrace and uncomeliness, or to the hazard of the continuance, and not to the present overthrow, of the church."(2)

On the other hand there were a number of things which belonged to the "bene esse" of the Church, but which, however desirable they might be, were not essential to its existence as a Church.

"Although besides faith in the Son of God there may be many things necessary for every assembly, yet be they necessary to the comely and stable being, and not simply to the being, of the church."(3)

(1) 6.53 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid

Among matters of faith Cartwright included all those things which comprised Discipline in the wider sense of the term. Even Discipline in the narrower sense of the correction of offenders by a parish seignior came within faith. But the Church might still be the Church although there were defects in its faith, and although those defects might imperil its future status as a Church.

As biblical examples of defects of faith, Cartwright mentioned the neglect of circumcision by the Israelites during a period of forty-nine years and, except for one occasion, their failure to observe the Passover during the same period. Yet in spite of these defects the Israelites had not ceased to be the people of God. In Cartwright's own time the "Dutch Churches of High Germany" (i.e. the German Lutheran Churches) lacked the Discipline (in its narrower sense) and the true doctrine of the Eucharist, but they were still accounted to be Churches of God. There were even presbyterian congregations which, while they were permitted to practise the Discipline (in its narrower sense), yet lacked the Sacraments. But these congregations were not, because of this defect, removed from the roll of the Churches as unfit.

 (1) C.53. Here Cartwright was using the term "faith" in the sense of "faithfulness", i.e. trustful obedience to God's commandments, the quality without which "belief" is barren and falls short of "faith". In this sense the object of faith included everything that God had commanded.

(2) C.53f. Cartwright did not specify which congregations he meant. Presbyterianism was permitted in the Channel Islands, but there is no reason to suppose that the Sacraments were not administered there. See Scott Pearson, "Thomas Cartwright", 157ff, 373ff.

Some part of the wider Discipline, Cartwright thought, must remain in an assembly if that body was to continue as a Church of God.

"I grant there can be no church of Christ for that without some part of it there can be no faith in Jesus Christ."(1)

A part of the wider Discipline was the choosing of some to preach that Gospel by which the Churches were gathered, and thus where there was no preaching of the Gospel there could be no visible and apparent Churches. Similarly, it was a part of the wider Discipline that the members of the Church should obey the preachers set over them. Where there was no obedience of this kind, there was no Church.

"But where these two be, although other points want, yea, although there be some defect in these, that neither the ministers do preach in all points as they ought, nor the assemblies in all points obey unto the wholesome doctrine of their teachers, yet do they for the reason above said retain the right of the churches of God."(2)

Cartwright illustrated his meaning by a series of similitudes. A man might be so badly maimed as to be without eyes and limbs, but so long as he had his head and other vital parts he remained a man, although a maimed man. A deformed man remained a man unless he had no head at all, or unless every part of him was so misplaced as to have no natural conjunction with his other parts.

"So it is in the assembly. As long as it holdeth the head, how defective it is otherwise, yet it hath the due and right of the church of God... So likewise if an assembly either hold not the head, which is Christ Jesu, or be nothing else but a confused multitude without any part of that order which the Son of God hath appointed, the same is justly cast out of the accompt of God's church."(3)

All the time after the return of the Jews from Babylon, said Cartwright, Jerusalem was the "city of the great king", although

(1) C.54 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid.

it lacked a wall until Nehemiah built one. A Church without the Discipline (in the narrower sense?) was like a city without a wall. It retained its identity as a city, but it was not protected from its enemies. Such a Church was like a vineyard without a hedge or dyke. It remained a Church, but did not look well, nor was it safe. (1)

It is clear that Cartwright took a generous view of the right to the title of "Church of God". His definition was intended to include all the parish congregations of England within its scope. He did not say so, but it also included Harrison's congregation, and might, by using a little imagination, have been extended to cover even congregations of papists. His attitude was noticeably less rigid than it had been twelve years earlier in his controversy with Whitgift.

Browne began his attack upon this section of Cartwright's letter by misrepresenting his opponent. Cartwright had said, he asserted,

"that faith in Christ is the essence, being, or life of the church; as for discipline it is but accidental, and therefore the church of God may have her being and life, and be named the church of God, without discipline." (2)

In fact, Cartwright had not equated "being" and "life", ~~with the essence~~ ~~text~~ and had not used the term "life" in this context at all. But Browne proceeded to refute by Scripture what he supposed Cartwright's argument had been, viz:-

"Christ is the life of the church; as for faith it is but the hand whereby we take hold of this life; as it is written, he that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life; and he addeth upon it as a trial of faith even our obedience to the Son, and saith, he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." (3)

(1) C.54f (2) WHB 460 (3) Ibid. John 111.36.

From his false premise Browne next accused Cartwright of making a dead Christ, or an idol, into the life of the Church:-

"He putteth asunder the church and the discipline of Christ, and so must needs sunder Christ from his own discipline or government. Now Paul calleth this discipline the power of our Lord Jesus Christ (I Cor.5.4). So if we sever Christ and his power, what is he but a dead Christ? ... Thus while M.C. will have faith in Christ to be the life of the church without discipline, he doth leave Christ himself without life, and as one that is dead, or turned into an Idol."(1)

Browne continued his shadow-boxing by asserting that, if faith were the life of the Church, then children who were not old enough to have faith could not have the life and essence of the Church. But this was not an acceptable conclusion. How then could children have the life of the Church? If Cartwright should say that they had it by the faith of their parents, then he would be wrong, and the Scriptures would be against him.

"For by the promise and the covenant made to the righteous and to their seed are their children reckoned in the church, and not by their faith."(2)

On the position of children in the Church Browne quoted Hab.11.4,

"The just shall live by his faith",

which he interpreted as though it meant that the just should live by his own faith, and not by the faith of another. When Christians were baptized in the faith and profession of another, it was to be under-

(1) WHB 460f (2) Ibid 461. Although Browne distinguished between faith, the inward disposition of trust towards God, and faithfulness, the outward obedience towards God's commandments resulting from the inward disposition of trust, yet when he came to the word "faith" in the Scriptures he tended to interpret it as though it meant "faithfulness", that is to say, as though it was the equivalent of "righteousness". Hence he could say "the faithful are called by Paul the children of promise", and also speak, as here, of "the promise... made to the righteous".

stood

"that we are baptized to hold the same faith and profession when we come to discretion, and not to have our life and salvation by another man's faith when as yet we have not the same faith ourselves."(1)

The expression "live by his faith", Browne claimed, was evidence that faith was not life, but the means to come by life. The infant received the life of the Church by promise and not by faith; the adult received it by faith, but the faith and the life were not there-
(2)
by to be identified.

Having thus separated faith and life, Browne could now pronounce that it was Christ who was the life of the Church, and not faith,
(3)
a conclusion which needed no proof since Cartwright would not have contested it if it had been answered by him.

All Browne's complicated argument to show that Christ was the life of the Church was designed to lead up to the idea that something more than faith, in the sense of inward trust in God, was essential to the being of the Church. If Christ was the life of the Church, under what circumstances could it be said that Christ was no longer in the Church, and that therefore the Church had no life and was no Church?

The title "Christ", said Browne, signified King, Priest, and Prophet. Therefore,

"Christ is made as no Christ unto us except we hold him and join with him as our anointed King, Priest, and Prophet."(4)

But Christ's Discipline and government were a part of his Kingship.

(1) WHB 462 (2) Faith here, presumably, in the sense of faithfulness,
(3) Ibid (4) Ibid

Therefore,

"take away the kingdom and government of Christ, and there can be no joining nor coupling together of the church, no offices nor callings in the church, yea, no face or show, or rather no part, sign, or token of the church... Wherefore is the church and people of God in so many places called the throne of God and the kingdom of God, but only to show that without the discipline and government of Christ therein, it loseth even her essence, ~~in~~ life, and being in Christ."(1)

Christ, that is to say, must be in the Church as King, or not be in it at all. If he was not in the Church, the Church would be without life and being. But if he was in the Church as King, then his Discipline and government must be in the Church, for Christ could not be separated from his Kingship.

Browne made merry with the contradictions in which Cartwright seemed to involve himself by using the term "Discipline" in two senses, and indeed if these two senses are forgotten, then Cartwright does seem at one time to say that Discipline is of the "esse" of the Church, and at another time that it is not. Browne also complimented Cartwright on his wisdom in dividing Discipline into the preaching of the Word and into submission to the preaching. But he asked what other parts of Discipline there might be which did not fall into these two categories, and which therefore were not of the "esse" of the Church. Cartwright, he maintained,

"can show none in the church but either governors or under government: neither can he show any duty in the church, but only the duties of government or of submission and obedience... Wherefore take away both government and oversight, and also obedience and submission, and there can be no other part of discipline remaining."(2)

Browne stated the conclusion to be drawn from this argument in a

(1) WHB 462. (2) Ibid 463

revised version of Cartwright's similitude of a deformed man, viz:-

"Through want of discipline there is no natural conjunction of the parts and members of the church together, so that both the head and vital parts are wanting, and all the other parts are wholly and thoroughly either displaced and perverted, or utterly lost and perished."(1)

Browne enquired next what part of Discipline might be lacking, or what defect might there be in the two parts of Discipline mentioned by Cartwright, and the Church still remain the Church. The thing that Cartwright had so noticeably omitted as essential to the being of the Church was the dealing with offenders by admonition, rebuke, and excommunication, and it was to this matter that Browne now turned. He pointed to the duty enjoined by Christ upon the Christian to forgive "unto seventy times seven". It is characteristic of Browne that he preferred the Lucan version of Christ's saying, in which forgiveness is restricted to the penitent, to the Matthaean version, in which the forgiveness is unconditional. Then he conflated the Lucan version (xvii.4) with Matt.xviii.15ff and produced the following result:-

"Christ giveth no power to forgive if a brother remain wilful in his sin. Yea, if it be but a private sin I am to proceed against him, and am not to cease, till either I have brought him to repentance, or have broken off all fellowship with him as a brother."(2)

Browne used the same conflation a little later in the argument to justify a positive power of withholding forgiveness:-

"Christ hath given power to every Christian to retain the sins of every brother whom he knoweth to trespass against him, and not to forgive him except he see him repent."(3)

(1) WHB 463 (2) Ibid 463f (3) Ibid 465. Browne must surely have forgotten Jesus' prayer for the forgiveness of his executioners, or he would ~~surely~~ not have watered down the merciful provisions of the Gospel in this manner.

Forgiveness, and the refusal of forgiveness, were introduced into^{the} argument so that Browne could ask how, if preaching and obedience to preaching were the only things in the wider Discipline that were essential to the Church, the Church could deal with sin? All that would be left to the Church would be a general condemnation of wrongdoing. But general condemnation was appropriate only to the Church's attitude to those who were outside her membership.

"For there is a particular judging and dealing against any in the church, as by particular rebuke, and pronouncing accursed him that grossly offendeth, and there is a general judging of any without the church."(1)

Browne justified this distinction by pointing out that the opening words of Matt.xviii.15ff were,

"If thy brother sin against thee..."

This showed, he claimed, that the method of dealing with sin laid down by Jesus in this passage was to be followed when a Christian dealt with offences committed by another Christian. It was a different method from the general condemnation of evil which a Christian (2) should use in dealing with the offences of a non-Christian. It was Christ who had laid down this method, and Christ also who had given every Christian power to withhold forgiveness from another Christian until he should see him repent.

"So that if any person want this power, he is not to be counted a Christian... This liberty and power every Christian must hold, or else he is the servant of men and not of Christ. If then a particular Christian cannot want it, how shall the whole church be without it, and yet be named the church of Christ?"(3)

(1) WHB 465 (2) Ibid 464 (3) Ibid 465.

A general condemnation of sinners could not, in Browne's opinion, constitute a "binding" within the meaning of the power given to Christians to "bind and loose".

"If M.C. say that a general rebuke and judging of the wicked is a binding, let him know that the church hath more liberty and right particularly to judge those that are within than generally to judge those that are without. And surely, if it hath not power to judge those that are within, it hath no power of judging at all."(1)

Therefore,

"no part of church discipline can be wanting but the church doth straightway go to ruin thereby. For a confused gathering of all together... (is) no church of God."(2)

Browne now took up, and attempted to answer, Cartwright's examples of Churches which were defective in certain ways, but which yet remained Churches. The Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharistic presence (which he entitled "transubstantiation" instead of "consubstantiation") Browne classed as an error. It was not a heresy

"except they obstinately pursue it with other gross absurdities, as do some heretics, or with sword and bloodshed as do the Papists, and then without question they are not the Church of Christ."(3)

Thus Browne regarded false doctrine as being of minor importance unless it was accompanied by wrong conduct.

The Israelites had not observed the Passover in the wilderness, Browne explained, because they had been commanded not to observe it
(4)

until they reached Canaan. They had omitted to practise circumcision

(1) WHB 466 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 468. It would be interesting to know what "other gross absurdities" Browne had in mind. Perhaps he was thinking of the worship of the outward elements of the Eucharist, which to him would be the sin of idolatry. (4) Browne's authority for this was Exod.xii.25, but he interpreted a command to keep the Passover in Canaan as though it was a prohibition from observing the Passover before Canaan was reached.

because they had been commanded to be ready day and night to follow the cloud and the tabernacle (Num.ix.21). If they had practised (1) circumcision, they could not have been ready to follow at all times.

Cartwright's comparison of the Church without Discipline with Jerusalem before its wall had been rebuilt was turned by Browne into a figure:-

"In the Revelation, the twelve Apostles are called the twelve foundations of the wall of the holy city, and the gates the twelve tribes of Israel, meaning all the number of God's elect... Therefore... seeing the Apostles and all the Saints of God are builded in the walls of the city, how can it be the city of God without the walls? Yea, (Cartwright) neither doeth nor can bring any word of God that the walls should signify discipline only..."(2)

From this it was to be concluded that

"the city Jerusalem was a resemblance and figure of the spiritual Jerusalem and church of God only by the walls and gates of the city..."(3)

Over Cartwright's comparison of the Church with a vineyard, Browne quarrelled with his opponent's use of the term "yard" (which strictly means "an enclosed space"), but added nothing to the force of his own argument by doing so:-

"There can be no yard or court except it have the walls or fence of a yard or court, and so where no yard is, there may be vines growing, but there can be no vineyard. And so where discipline is wanting, there may be some graces of God appearing... and yet no true show nor face of the outward and visible Church of God."(4)

In this conclusion Browne merely begged the question.

(1) Browne was not in a position to explain the omission of the Pass-over and circumcision by reference to the varying ages of the strata of the Old Testament, and had therefore to find what explanation he could. His excuse for the omission of circumcision is very weak. If other difficulties had to be overcome so that the Israelites might be ready to travel, the difficulty caused by circumcision could have been overcome. (2) WHB 469 (3) Ibid 470 (4) Ibid 471.

XI.

The last point in Harrison's letter to receive Cartwright's attention was the "dumb" ministry in relation to the sacraments administered by that ministry. The importance which Browne attached to this subject led him to devote almost half of his "Answer" to the task of refuting what Cartwright had to say about it. And indeed the subject was of great importance. Nobody, except perhaps Queen Elizabeth, regarded the non-preaching ministry as a complete ministry. The Bishops accepted it as defective, but inevitable in the circumstances. But was the defect so grave as to render all the "dumb" minister's other ministrations invalid? Might the sacraments be received from him as true sacraments, or were they to be rejected as counterfeit?

Cartwright opened his case by conceding a good deal to Harrison:-

"I agree with you that their ministry is unlawful and to themselves, without repentance, a certain matter of destruction... to the churches where they be, presently hurtful, and in the end, without remedy, deadly." (1)

But he would not allow that the "dumb" minister was so defective a minister that a thing good in itself might not be taken at his hands. He based this partial tolerance upon the fact that even a non-preaching minister had received the calling of the Church for his office.

"For so much as they are allowed by the churches of God they ought, until remedy may be found of so great disorder, to be heard and received so far as they can give us anything that is of Christ". (2)

Cartwright could not hope to convince Harrison of the truth of this view unless it could be justified by examples from Scripture,

(1) C.55 (2) Ibid.

and of these he provided several. Christ, he said, told his disciples to hear the Scribes in whatever things they taught truly. He would not have done this but for the fact that the Scribes had the calling of their Church to teach. They erred in failing to identify Jesus as the Messiah, and in supposing that the Messiah would be a mere man. They also erred in teaching justification by works. In their way they were as unfit as the dumb ministers, for the minister who taught falsely did no less harm than the minister who taught nothing. Again, the prophets often denounced the Jewish priests for their unfitness, but they never forbade the people to attend the sacrifices offered by those priests. Jesus commanded a leper to show himself to a priest, but he did not tell him to seek out one better instructed or purer in his doctrine than the rest. At the time of Jesus' trial the High Priest held ~~his~~ his office as an annual appointment; he had also obtained his office by simony; both things were illegal, but Jesus had revered the High Priest's office, and had given its occupant an account of his doctrine when ordered to do so. A similar respect for authority, even when authority acted wrongfully, was shown by Jeremiah. When he was forbidden the Temple, he wrote out his sermon and sent Baruch to read it, rather than disobey the decree which
(1)
inhibited him.

Here Cartwright embarked upon what Browne described as one of his "trim distinctions":-

"If any say that it is of the substance of a church minister to be able to teach, and therefore he is no minister that hath

(1) C.55f.

"not that ability, it may be answered that it is of the substance of a good and lawful minister of God, but not simply of a minister, whereunto it is sufficient to have the church calling."(1)

To illustrate this idea Cartwright compared a dumb minister with a Magistrate who was incapable of carrying out his duties. He was still a Magistrate, but not a lawful or sufficient Magistrate.

"As therefore we take him for a magistrate which for the ignorance of his charge may be called an idol magistrate, even so it seemeth that he may be holden for a minister which hath the church's calling, albeit he be not able to do the principal charge of that ministry."(2)

Harrison must have objected against the dumb ministry the words of Hosea (iv.6),

"Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me,"

for Cartwright explained the passage away by asserting that it contained a rule to be followed rather in the election of a minister than in the use to be made of existing ministers.⁽³⁾

Harrison must also have objected that to accept a dumb minister was to join in the impiety of his false ministry, for Cartwright replied,

"If by communicating with him we should make him minister, I grant that a piece of his guilt would stick to our fingers. But when that is not, I see not how by receiving the sacraments of him we partake more unto his wickedness than the son is partaker of his father's murder because he receiveth his father's gift... so much the more there than here, as the father giveth his own things, where the dumb minister doeth only dispense the gifts of the Lord... For even as not able to avoid him I may communicate with a minister that is an adulterer without being partaker of his adultery, even so also I may communicate with a dumb minister, and yet nevertheless be free from his impiety."(4)

(1) C.56 (2) Ibid 56f (3) Ibid 57 (4) Ibid

Browne could certainly not complain that he had been left here without questions to answer. Apart from the examples from Scripture upon which he could exercise his ingenuity, there were questions such as that of the ability of the Church of England to give a "lawful" calling to any minister at all, much less to a non-preacher. Were the sacraments ministered in the Church of England to be regarded as the sacraments of Christ, whether ministered by a preacher or by a non-preacher?. To what extent could it be said that people made a man a minister by accepting his ministrations? If people communicated with an adulterous minister, did they in some manner participate in his sin by condoning it? Cartwright's letter served to express its author's opinions, but at this point it raised many more questions than it attempted to answer.

Cartwright's use of the word "lawful" could hardly have been more unfortunate than it was in this context of the dumb ministry. He seems to have meant that a non-preaching minister could not have had a call from God, since God could not be thought to have called so ill-equipped a man to the ministry. Such a man therefore could not be regarded as a minister of God. In the sight of God he would be an unlawful minister, and he would be an unlawful minister in his own eyes, too, for he would know that he had assumed an office to which he was not called by God. But on the other hand he had received the calling of the Church to ~~his~~ his office, and in that respect he might be considered to be a lawful minister, although not a minister of God.

Cartwright would have done better if he had argued from the out-

set that a dumb minister was a "lawful" minister, although not fully qualified for his work. He could then have pleaded that every minister, however gifted, was insufficient for his task, and from this position he might have argued that there were degrees of "lawfulness", and that no minister could be wholly lawful if the test of his lawfulness were to be the extent of his abilities. By supposing that he knew what kind of man God would call to the ministry, however, Cartwright was forced to agree that a non-preacher must be unlawful in God's sight, and then he had to search for some way in which such a minister could be regarded as lawful. His success in finding a way left him open to Browne's ridicule, viz:-

"His first proof is, they are ministers but no lawful ministers; and they are ministers, though they be Idol ministers. Therefore he concludeth that though they be Idols and unlawful ministers, yet we may hear them and receive the sacraments of them. Yea, he addeth a further distinction, that to us they are ministers of God, but to themselves, or in respect of themselves, they are unlawful ministers."(1)

Browne cut Cartwright's complicated knot of distinctions by asking,

"If... any minister be of God, how shall he be an unlawful minister? Or if he be unlawful, how shall he be of God?"(2)

The only use that Browne had for non-preaching ministers was

"that we let them alone... and have nothing to do with their guiding and ministry. For Christ did gather his disciples apart from the Pharisees' disciples, so that the Pharisees were to have no charge nor oversight on Christ's disciples. This appeareth in very many places of the Evangelists."(3)

(1) WHB 471f (2) Ibid 473 (3) Ibid. What actually appears in the Gospels is that Jesus and his disciples were less rigid in the observance of the Sabbath and in fasting than the Pharisees, but Jesus did not gather his disciples in such a way as to form a schism outside the Jewish Church, even though his actions made a division within that Church. He did not even withdraw his disciples entirely from pharisaic instruction, but bade them pay attention to the Scribes, most of whom were Pharisees, when they had anything true to say.

Browne now shifted the ground of his argument from the ministry to the sacraments. Earlier in his letter he had dealt with Cartwright's assertion that the Church of England must be supposed to have the covenant of God since she had the sacraments, which were the seals of that covenant.⁽¹⁾ Browne had retorted that without Discipline the Church of England could not be within the covenant, since she did not keep the covenant. Therefore her sacraments must be supposed to be counterfeit seals.⁽²⁾ Now he enquired what good things of Christ a "dumb" minister could dispense, and he could find only the sacraments and the reading of the "common service". But

"their sacraments are stolen and counterfeit badges... Their stunted form of service, devised by the Bishops from the Mass-book can never be proved to be incense made by fire from the Altar of the Lord."⁽³⁾

This, however, was no legitimate objection to the "dumb" minister as such. It was an objection to the entire ministry of the Church of England, preachers and non-preachers alike. Browne was therefore arguing off the point ~~by~~ failing to make a distinction between sacraments administered by preachers and those administered by non-preachers. He returned to his point again when he declared that Cartwright

"knoweth that it is no part nor duty of the ministry to read a consecration of the sacraments, neither to minister the sacraments without preaching, and much less without the power and ability to preach."⁽⁴⁾

Browne's "Scripture" for this conclusion comprised Deut.xxxiii.10, Eccles.v.1, Matt.xxviii.19, and Acts ii.42. The first and the two last of these passages do no more than mention teaching and sacra-

(1) C.52 (2) WHB 452f (3) Ibid 474 (4) Ibid 479.

ment (or sacrifice) within the same verse. Eccles.v.1 reads,

"Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God; for to draw nigh to hear is better than to give the sacrifice of fools: for they know not that they do evil."(1)

None of these passages separately, nor all of them jointly, by any means established Browne's case, unless it is to be supposed that "to give the sacrifice of fools" is to "do evil". But that is by no means certainly the interpretation to be put upon the passage in question.

Browne thought it useless to argue that because the Scribes might be heard when they preached the truth, a dumb minister might also be heard when he read the services. It was lawful for a Scribe to teach the truth, but unlawful to be a non-preaching minister. The correct statement of the case should therefore be:-

"If the Scribes and Pharisees were to be heard because they preached truth, then are these dumb ministers not to be heard, because they are no preachers."(2)

As to the calling by which an unpreaching minister was authorized, and which Cartwright had declared to be a calling of the Church, Browne propounded several questions:-

"Whether our dumb ministers have as good a calling as the Scribes and Pharisees had. Whether the Bishops and their officers that call ministers are to be counted the Church. Whether, if the Church should appoint and receive a dumb minister, he had thereby any whit more authority, or were any the whit the rather to be received."(3)

Browne answered the first of these questions by reference to

(1) WHB 479 (2) Ibid 475. This is a misrepresentation of Cartwright's argument. He had not said, and did not mean, that the Scribes were to be heard because they taught the truth, but when they taught the truth (and presumably not at other times). Equally, he argued, the dumb minister might be heard when he had some good thing to offer, but not otherwise. (3) Ibid 476.

ment (or sacrifice) within the same verse. Eccles.v.1 reads,

"Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God; for to draw nigh to hear is better than to give the sacrifice of fools: for they know not that they do evil."(1)

None of these passages separately, nor all of them jointly, by any means established Browne's case, unless it is to be supposed that "to give the sacrifice of fools" is to "do evil". But that is by no means certainly the interpretation to be put upon the passage in question.

Browne thought it useless to argue that because the Scribes might be heard when they preached the truth, a dumb minister might also be heard when he read the services. It was lawful for a Scribe to teach the truth, but unlawful to be a non-preaching minister. The correct statement of the case should therefore be:-

"If the Scribes and Pharisees were to be heard because they preached truth, then are these dumb ministers not to be heard, because they are no preachers."(2)

As to the calling by which an unpreaching minister was authorized, and which Cartwright had declared to be a calling of the Church, Browne propounded several questions:-

"Whether our dumb ministers have as good a calling as the Scribes and Pharisees had. Whether the Bishops and their officers that call ministers are to be counted the Church. Whether, if the Church should appoint and receive a dumb minister, he had thereby any whit more authority, or were any the whit the rather to be received."(3)

Browne answered the first of these questions by reference to

(1) WHB 479 (2) Ibid 475. This is a misrepresentation of Cartwright's argument. He had not said, and did not mean, that the Scribes were to be heard because they taught the truth, but when they taught the truth (and presumably not at other times). Equally, he argued, the dumb minister might be heard when he had some good thing to offer, but not otherwise. (3) Ibid 476.

Deut.xxxiii.10 and the example of the Jewish Church, arguing thus:-

"In the Church and assemblies of the Jews there could be no such dumb ministry suffered as an ordinary office and calling. For herein consisted their ministry, To teach Jacob the judgments of God, and Israel his laws, to put incense before his face, and the burnt offering upon the altar."(1)

Browne assumed that this passage placed the whole functions of the ministry in single persons, and did not allot one function to one kind of minister and another function to another kind. The result he obtained from his assumption was:-

"And so the dumb minister can have no office nor calling in the Church, seeing there is no such ministry, nor part of ministry, as to be a reading minister."(2)

Cartwright had agreed with Harrison that the dumb ministry was
(3)
"thrust upon the Church" by the Bishops, that is to say, that the laity had no part in the ordination of non-preachers. This being so, how, Browne now asked, could their calling be rightly ~~ex~~ described as a calling of the Church?

"If, in the act of choosing, the authority of the Church is not to be regarded when it (i.e. the act of choosing) shamefully abuseth her authority, then also in the wickedness and sin that is wrought by the choise it is less to be regarded."(4)

This defect, Browne added, was a defect in the preaching, as well as in the non-preaching, ministers of the Church of England, and was, of itself, an abuse sufficient to deny to that Church the status of "Church of God". Thus, speaking of Jesus' command to "shake off the dust from your feet" (Luke ix.5), Browne said:-

(1) WHB 476 (2) Ibid (3) C.52 (4) WHB 477. Browne meant that if the authority of the Church was not behind the choice of the minister, then it could not be behind the exercise of his ministry, and could not be called upon, as Cartwright had called upon it, to justify the acceptance of his ministry.

"Christ and his Apostles could not thrust, no, not lawful ministers upon any congregation. Neither could he command any congregation of Church to receive unlawful ministers, and take them for their guides. Yet by Master Cartwright's saying, we may receive such, and if any such be thrust upon us we must account their ministry to be sanctified for the Church's sake which calleth them. Surely if the Church do usurp and challenge such a power of ruling and such a holiness in sanctifying which Christ never had, it becometh the Church of Antichrist, and quite overthroweth the kingdom and priesthood of Christ."(1)

Describing them as "fopperies... not worth the answering" (but which nevertheless he answered) and as "ungodly subtleties", Browne next took up Cartwright's comparison of a dumb minister with an incompetent Magistrate, and also his assertion that ability to teach was of the substance of a lawful minister, though not of a minister simply. On the former point, Browne declared that the comparison did not hold good because the discipline of the State was unlike the discipline of the Church. Heathen and idolatrous Kings might be lawful monarchs, but that principle did not apply in the Church.

"For if any be a wretched liver or an idolater he can neither be minister nor lawful minister in the Church; yea, he is no part nor member of the Church."(2)

On the second point Browne quoted Rom.iv.15,

"Where no law is, there is no transgression",

and expounded St Paul in the following way:-

"He meaneth that because there is a law, therefore the breach of that law is the essence and substance of sin and transgression. The law, saith he, is it that causeth wrath; for it maketh sin to be sin."(3)

From this starting point Browne argued that, since whatever is against the law of God has the being and essence of sin, then the lawfulness of anything is the being, the essence, and the substance

(1) WHB 478 (2) Ibid 480 (3) Ibid 481

(1)

of that thing. From this he concluded that

"the lawfulness of a minister and of his ministration is the essence and substance of a minister and his ministration." (2)

Therefore an unlawful minister (i.e. one who could not preach) was no minister.

Some strange interpretations marked Browne's efforts to explain away Cartwright's scriptural examples. He would not allow, for instance, that the Scribes had taught any false doctrine, and he denied especially that they had taught justification by works. What they had taught was justification by ceremonies, not justification by good moral actions. Their observance of the Day of Atonement showed that they realized the need of forgiveness. Their ceremonies had foreshadowed Christ, and had been valid until they were made obsolete by Christ's sacrifice. The error of the Scribes had been their failure to recognize the one true sacrifice. It was only after that sacrifice had been offered that the Church had had to be separated from them. (3) The "heavy burden" which they had laid upon the shoulders of others was not the Law, but the burden of tithes which they, being priests and Levites, collected for their own benefit. (4)

(1) WHB 481. This result by no means follows from Browne's premise. (2) Ibid. From his premise Browne ought to have argued that the lawfulness of a thing is the essence of its righteousness, and not that it is the essence of the thing itself. He might then have argued that lawfulness is the essence of the righteousness of a minister, i.e. of a righteous minister. From this position he could have argued the unlawfulness of an unrighteous minister, and then have declared that a Christian should not communicate with an unlawful minister. But this, perhaps, would have brought him too near to Cartwright's "trim distinction"; it would certainly have failed to satisfy his desire to show that an unlawful minister was no minister at all. (3) Browne had earlier argued that Christ separated his disciples from the Scribes and Pharisees, see p. 391. Here he contradicts his earlier statement. (4) WHB 484f.

Against Cartwright's statement that the Old Testament prophets had never forbidden the people of God to join in the sacrifices offered by the priests they had denounced, Browne pointed to the many occasions in the Old Testament when the people had been warned against touching any unclean thing. With these warnings he coupled, among other passages, Ezek.xxii.26:-

"Her priests... have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and the common, neither (have they caused men to) discern between the unclean and the clean."

Out of this conjunction of scriptural passages Browne deduced that

"it is a flat commandment even to all the people not to touch those polluted sacrifices of the priests."(1)

Where Cartwright argued that Christ had bidden a leper show himself to a priest and offer his oblation, Browne replied,

"No marvel though Christ bade the man show himself to the High Priest. For before the High Priests became open persecutors there was ~~was~~ lawful communion to be had with them."(2)

Even after the High Priests became persecutors, Browne continued, it was possible for the Apostles to join in the sacrifices offered by Jewish priests in the Temple (Acts xxi.24ff). This was because a great many of the priests had become Christians (Acts vi.7). It was possible for the Apostles to choose a priest who was lawful, and to join with him in sacrifice. If this practice of the Apostles were used to justify communicating with an unlawful priest,

"we answer, that neither the Apostles and brethren did communicate with the wicked Jews and persecuting priests, neither also was the leprous man commanded to communicate in that manner... And therefore, no doubt of it, the Apostles made choice of the priests."(3)

(1) WHB 488 (2) Ibid 502 (3) Ibid 495

Cartwright had used the prophet Jeremiah as an example of submission to authority even when authority was misused. The way in which he described Jeremiah's case showed that he thought the prophet had been inhibited from preaching in the Temple, and had obeyed the inhibition. Browne, who had never shown this kind of obedience himself, could not allow that it was permissible without giving away his entire case, and so he must get rid of this example somehow.

Cartwright's idea of the reason why Jeremiah ceased to preach in the Temple turned upon the meaning of the phrase וְאֵין אֵין in Jer. xxxvi.5. In the English Versions this is translated "I am shut up; I cannot go into the house of the Lord", and Cartwright took this to mean that Jeremiah had been forbidden to go into the Temple. Browne translated the passage as "I am locked up in prison; I cannot go, etc". For this interpretation he has the support of no less a person than Gesenius.⁽¹⁾ If Jeremiah was physically unable to go to the Temple, then his action in sending Baruch in his place could be interpreted as an act of defiance rather than of obedience, and that suited Browne's purpose entirely. The Revised Standard Version translates the passage in question as "I am debarred from going, etc", and this is in line with Skinner's note:-

"It is clear from the narrative that imprisonment... is not indicated; and we seem reduced to the alternative between some Levitical defilement contracted by the prophet, and an interdict imposed on him by the Temple authorities..."⁽²⁾

Browne was well aware of the context of this passage. After Baruch had deputized for Jeremiah in the Temple, both men were advised

(1) Gesenius, Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon (tr. Tregelles), dcxlviii.
 (2) Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, 237.

to hide themselves from the King's wrath (Jer.xxxvi.19), a thing Jeremiah could not have done if he had been in prison. Browne saw the difficulty, and brought his ingenuity into play:-

"When Jeremie was shut up there were of the princes which took his part. For by their means no doubt, did Jeremie get out of the prison court, and so hid himself with Baruch."(1)

When Browne said there was "no doubt" about anything, there was usually a great deal of doubt. Here the only doubt that remains is whether Cartwright's interpretation is correct. The passage under consideration contains no hint of the reason why Jeremiah felt himself debarred from entering the Temple, and no argument can be based upon the inference that he had been forbidden to do so.

Browne's ingenuity was deployed to the full when he dealt with the defects which Cartwright had alleged in the High Priest at the time of Christ's trial. First, to show that a man might lawfully be High Priest while his predecessor was still alive, he pointed out that Eleazar was made High Priest before Aaron's death (Num.xx.26), and Zadok during the lifetime of the deposed Abiathar (I Kings ii.35). From these cases he gathered that

"necessities and just occasions did oftentimes make change of the ceremonial laws, and yet no corruption nor abuse came thereby."(2)

In the cases of Annas and Caiaphas, whom Cartwright had accused of illegally holding the High-Priesthood as an annual office, Browne said,

"For answer, I say that the priesthood was not made a yearly office, but that by course every year two priests did execute the office. And this seemed to be tolerable by the Law, seeing

(1) WHB 500 (2) Ibid 501.

"that if one priest should be sick, or letted by some greater occasions, the other might be in his stead."(1)

On the charge that Caiaphas had obtained his office by simony, Browne declared that if money was paid to the Romans, it was not a bribe, ~~but~~ but might have been taxation. If it was a bribe, then it was secret and unknown to the people, who were therefore right in accepting Caiaphas as a man lawfully called to his office. (2)

To Cartwright's statement that the congregation did not make the minister, Browne returned a flat denial. Would there be Magistrates, he asked, if there were no subjects, or masters if there were no servants? In the case of "dumb" ministers,

"the parishioners, receiving them for their ministers, and taking them to be called to that office by the Church... and yielding themselves to be their flock and charge, I say, those parishioners together with the devil and his officers do make them ministers."(3)

Finally, Cartwright's comparison of a worshipper receiving the sacraments from a dumb minister with a man receiving a gift from his murderous father, was pronounced by Browne to be vain. Such sacraments were not the dumb minister's, nor were they the Lord's. They were the polluted pledges of a wicked communion. To the dumb minister, as to the adulterous minister, the principle was to be applied,

"We may not receive gold of a thief to justify his thievery."(4)

(1) WHB 501. Browne's guesswork was wasted. St John's remark that Caiaphas was High Priest "that year" (xi.51) does not imply an annual office, but that Caiaphas was High Priest in that significant year in which Christ was crucified. Annas had been deposed by the Romans, but was treated by the Jews with the courtesy due to the High Priest. (2) Ibid 502. Browne was referring to the Puritan theory that the Church could take action only against known offences, and not against secret hypocritical conduct. But if Caiaphas was guilty of simony the offence was not secret; it was well enough known to pass into tradition. (3) Ibid 505 (4) Ibid 506.

XI.

The views expressed by Browne in his controversy with Cartwright are better left over for consideration until some notice has been taken of his encounter with Bredwell. Meanwhile, Cartwright's side of the affair is worthy of attention.

The Cartwright who penned the open letter to Harrison in 1584 was in many ways a different personality from the Cartwright who had been in controversy with Whitgift eleven years earlier. Some of the change was due, no doubt, to the fact that he was dealing with a very different man. In Cartwright's eyes Harrison had been over-zealous, but he was a brother-Puritan. He was also a companion in adversity for he, too, had gone into exile to escape persecution for his opinions. He was a much younger man than Cartwright, and had approached him respectfully as a suppliant. His request must be refused, but it could be refused with courtesy and paternal gentleness.

Whitgift, on the other hand, must have seemed to Cartwright to be a personal enemy. He had been the chief instrument in the ruination of his career. He was only some two years older than Cartwright, but throughout their time in Cambridge he had been Cartwright's academic superior. He was the persecutor, not the persecuted. In his "Reply" Cartwright's animosity against Whitgift appears time after time. If Whitgift could be humiliated, Cartwright was going to be the man to do it. Indeed, in his efforts to make Whitgift look foolish by proving him wrong Cartwright sometimes badly overreached himself, involving himself in preposterous arguments and

committing himself to untenable propositions.

But not all the change in Cartwright was due to the difference of the persons with whom he was dealing, nor even to the mellowing effect of time upon a hurt and angry man. There is a pronounced difference of doctrine which can be seen most clearly in his attitude to the "dumb" clergy of the Church of England. In 1573 these men, according to Cartwright, were no ministers at all. In 1584 they were ministers in some sense of the term, and it was therefore permissible to receive the sacraments at their hands. In his "Reply" Cartwright had applied Hos.iv.6 to the non-preachers:-

"They stand for that, and make show of that, which they are not; and, admit you them as often as you will, the Lord pronounceth that they shall be no ministers to him, which have no knowledge."(1)

In his letter to Harrison he made use of the same passage, and again with reference to the "dumb dogs":-

"He may be holden for a minister which hath the Church's calling, albeit he be not able to do the principal charge of that ministry. Neither doth the place of the prophet Hosea which sayeth, Because they have refused knowledge they shall be no priests unto him, stand against this, the prophet rather giving a rule to follow in the election or disposition of them, than sheweth how far they may be used."(2)

True, Cartwright felt it necessary to resort to hair-splitting distinctions about ministers of God and ministers simply, and about lawful ministers and unlawful ministers, in order to find a place for the non-preachers, but find a place he did, where he had not found any in 1573.

Cartwright's change of opinion over an even more important matter

(1)
 than the dumb ministry was pointed out by Bancroft in 1593. The Discipline, in the sense of the correction of wrong-doers by a seignior, which had been classed in the "Reply" along with the Word and Sacraments as one of the essential marks of the Church, had become in the letter to Harrison no more than a part of the Church's "bene esse", a thing comparable with a wall around a city. Indeed, it may be wondered whether Cartwright did not resort to his two-fold definition of Discipline with the deliberate intention of covering himself against the criticism that his teaching was variable and therefore undependable. Certainly by defining Discipline in two ways he was able to go on asserting that in one sense it was essential to the Church without having to continue to assert that it was essential in its other sense.

Again, in the matter of the calling of ministers, Cartwright's opinion had changed. In his earlier life he had virtually refused to accept episcopal ordination to the priesthood. By 1584 he was ready to argue that those who were episcopally ordained, even though they might be "dumb", had the calling of the Church and were therefore to be accepted for any good thing, such as the sacraments, that they might have to offer. Holding this view, he does not seem to have had any good reason left for refusing episcopal ordination any longer, except that to have done so would have seemed much too clear a denial of his previous opinions.

The change in Cartwright began long before he wrote his open

(1) "A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline", 447f.

letter to Harrison. As early as 1577 he was disagreeing with a group of Puritan ministers (which included Field and Wilcox) about the cope, the surplice, the sign of the cross, and other of the ceremonies and ornaments of the Church of England. These things Cartwright declared to be "indifferent" and "of nature in our own power". The preaching of the Gospel was not "indifferent"; to those who were called to it, it was "necessary", and must not be abandoned because of differences about the "adiaphora". The ministers rebuked him for this opinion which, they maintained, contradicted the position he had taken up in the "Reply", and they asked him not to make his new ideas public. Their rebuke was mild, they said, because they expected that further reflection would bring him back to the truth. (1)

In 1593 Bancroft had rather different expectations of Cartwright and his associates:-

"Master Cartwright, with the rest of his chief adherents, might certainly do God and the Church great service, if without standing any longer upon the maintenance of their own credits, they would be content to confess their former oversights in laying down those false principles whereupon the new heretics do build, and acknowledge the truth, viz, that the present government of the Church of England is both holy and apostolical, and that the reformation already made... is such a reformation... as every good Christian ought to praise God for it, from the bottom of his heart: and not only to allow of it, but to maintain and defend it, both with his goods and life. Master Cartwright began well in his epistle against Harrison: but he should do better if he would so continue and proceed forward. One extremity is best discerned by the other. Barrow's folly may teach him wisdom. The consequence do often show the grossness of the antecedent. And many learned men have been brought by the importunity of such kind of adversaries to see their own mistakings, and so to grow unto a far better moderation." (2)

(1) Scott Pearson, "Thomas Cartwright", 149ff (2) Bancroft, "A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline", 435f.

The expectations of 1593, like those of 1577, were disappointed. For the rest of his days Cartwright remained in about the position he had reached when he wrote to Harrison. He still believed in his proposals for the further reformation of the Church of England, and he worked to bring them about. But he refused to go into schism for them, and he was careful to disown the idea that the lack of the things he wished to bring about amounted to the "unchurching" of the Church of England.

There were probably two main factors which caused this change in Cartwright's outlook, the first being his abhorrence of schism. He could see that the things he had propounded in his "Reply" were tending in that direction. In his answers to the "Interrogatories" put to him by the High Commission in 1590 he disclaimed all responsibility for Brownism, and declared that he had never himself done any schismatical, or even unconstitutional, act in furtherance of his
(1)
proposals. But he could not shut his eyes to the fact that the ministers who wrote to him in 1577 had all been deprived for holding and acting upon the views he had put forward in 1573, nor could he fail to see that schism might very likely arise from the midst of such a body of able and determined men. Nor could he be unaware that schismatics like Greenwood were

"verily persuaded that they hold almost nothing but what Cartwright and his scholars have taught them"(2)

And so, as much as he could without denying his plans for further reformation altogether, he tried to guard against the dangers of

(1) C. 23f (2) Bancroft, "A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline"
430.

separation, even to the extent of providing in his Will that his funeral was to be so conducted that it did not violate "the peace
(1)
of the Church."

The second main factor in shaping the new Cartwright was undoubtedly Whitgift. From 1573 to 1577 Cartwright must have been closely studying the "Defence of the Answer to the Admonition" as he prepared his own "Second Reply" and "The Rest of the Second Reply". Cartwright would not have admitted, even to himself, that whatever its faults, Whitgift's work was unanswerable in its chief conclusions, but he could not escape from being influenced by the force of those conclusions. The result was a much more scholarly and rational attitude towards the Church of England as settled in 1559. True, Cartwright's employment of Scripture was still apt to be strained. Out of a brief remark in Hosea he manufactured a general law, applied it to the "dumb" ministry, and then decided that it was applicable only to the election of a "dumb" minister, and not to the use that might be made of his ministry. But, cases of this kind aside, the atmosphere of his letter to Harrison displays much sounder reasoning than can be found in his "Reply". Reason, however, seems to have returned to him gradually; one stage of the process was noticeable in 1577, and a later stage in 1584.

(1) Scott Pearson, "Thomas Cartwright", 482.