

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

Part V.

Bredwell v. Browne.

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. 1950

I.

No sooner had Browne signed, on 7th October 1585, the submission to the laws ecclesiastical of England prepared for him by Archbishop Whitgift, than he began to have regrets for doing so. Later, he explained that he had taken the terms of the submission with mental reservations, ⁽¹⁾ but this may be no more than an attempt to justify his variability in the sight of other, and more constant, separatists, such as Barrow and Greenwood. In his explanation Browne shows that as soon as he returned to his home near Stamford he absented himself from the services in his parish church, ⁽²⁾ for which offence, six months after his submission, he was in trouble with the Bishop of Peterborough. ⁽³⁾ Whatever punishment he received cannot have been heavy, however, for in November 1586 he was appointed schoolmaster ⁽⁴⁾ in the parish of "Toolyes Church" (i.e. St Olave's), Southwark.

In Southwark, Browne's impulses towards schism took hold of him again. He heard sermons in the parish church, but

"how doth he hear? As a censor to judge, not as a brother to learn; as the spider goeth likewise to the flower, but not to gather honey as the bee; and thus the Devil also may be said to communicate in the word with us." ⁽⁵⁾

During the whole of his time in Southwark Browne never once received the Holy Communion in St Olave's Church, and when the exhortations of the Churchwardens had failed to persuade him to mend his ways, and it seemed likely that the law would be used against him, Browne, acting on legal advice, evaded the process by removing his abode to the next parish. ⁽⁶⁾

(1) WHB 507f. B.123. (2) B.123 (3) WHB 7 (4) Ibid. B.132 (5) B.135
(6) B.132, 134f.

Browne's activities were not confined to Southwark. On at least one occasion he preached in a private house near Ludgate during the time of Divine Service in the parish church, and he also brought about a withdrawal of some of the parishioners of "Dertford" from their Church, railing against Edmonds, the Lecturer of that parish, when he warned these people of the evils of schism.

His inconsistent conduct over his submission seemed to Browne's opponents to be evidence of his wickedness. His friends excused him on the ground that he was mad. His writings suggest rather that he was a badly puzzled man who had neither the ability nor the learning to deal satisfactorily with the problems he had set himself to solve.

Among Browne's opponents in London was Stephen Bredwell, a "student in Phisicke". Bredwell had published, in 1586,

"A Detection of Ed. Glover's heretical confection."

In this work, Bredwell said,

"I charged Glover of holding this heresy; that those that have put on Christ have power and strength to abstain from sin, and that a man is not justified, but condemned, all the while he is subject to sin against his will."(5)

Bredwell did not accuse Browne of this heresy, but he believed that Glover had fallen into his error by pushing to their logical conclusion the principles upon which Browne had based his separation, principles which, Bredwell believed, involved the idea of the justification of the Church by works.

"From this manner of justifying or condemning the Church by works, Glover turned to the justification of particular Christians by works. How thin the shears were that went between the two, let all sound Christians judge."(6)

(1) Dartford, or Deptford? (2) B.139f (3) B.97 (4) WHB 509
 (5) B.64 (6) B.72.

Because of this similarity of doctrine, and because Glover, like Browne, was a separatist, Bredwell coupled the two together at the end of his "Detection" in a brief

"Admonition to the followers of Glover and Browne."(1)

Bredwell's writings show that he was a Puritan of the Cartwright school, for while he defended the Church of England as a true Church, he considered her lack of government by presbyteries to be a defect. Indeed, it seems possible that Bredwell was in some sort the official representative of the London Puritans for the refutation of Browne. The evidence for this idea lies in the identity of a mysterious person to whom Browne referred several times as "F". For example,

"The hypocrisy of railing F, and Bredwell, with their partners."⁽²⁾

"F" was apparently a divine and, since he was closely associated with Bredwell, a Puritan divine, for Browne told Bredwell,

"Thou teachest F. thy fogging physic, and he teacheth thee his lying divinity."(3)

To be mentioned in Elizabethan literature by one's initials rather than by one's full name was a mark of fame, not of a desire to preserve anonymity.⁽⁴⁾ "F" was therefore probably a well-known Puritan minister. He was joined with another well-known Puritan in a reference which Browne made to a conference he had had with

"M.F. and M.E(dmundes)"(5)

This "Master Edmonds" was evidently the Lecturer at "Dertford" already noticed, and since the conference to which Browne referred seems to

(1) WHB 509 (2) B.114 (3) Ibid (4) Thomas Cartwright was commonly referred to as "T.C.", and no-one was in any doubt about the owner of those initials (5) WHB 509.

have been concerned with Browne's activities in the London neighbourhood, it may be presumed that "F", like Edmonds, was a minister in or near London. In short it is probable, although not certain, that "M.F." stands for "Master Field", i.e. John Field, joint-author of the "Admonition to the Parliament" and later the very capable organizer of the Puritan Classical movement.

By 1586 Field, who had been a preacher at St Mary's, Aldermary, had been suspended by Whitgift. ⁽¹⁾ No doubt he would then be sheltered and provided for by wealthy sympathisers among the London merchants, a body of men who were always ready to help Puritans in trouble. Accordingly we find Browne referring to the hypocrisy of "F" and Bredwell and others as

"hidden in rich men's houses."⁽²⁾

Field died in March 1588, and the dedicatory epistle to Bredwell's second book ("The Rasing of the Foundations of Brownism"), in which two of the above quotations from Browne were reproduced, was dated 12th June, ⁽³⁾ the year of publication being 1588. ⁽⁴⁾ But Bredwell was quoting from a work which Browne had written some while before 12th June 1588 in reply to Bredwell's "Detection", and therefore almost certainly before Field's death.

There is extant a Puritan survey of the London clergy made about 1586. ⁽⁵⁾ It was compiled after the inhibition of Walter Travers in that year, and Field is included in it as though already suspended but still alive. This survey must have been drawn up at much the same

 (1) 2P.R.ii.262. (2) B.114 (3) B.93 verso (4) B.endleaf.

(5) 2P.R.ii.180ff.

time that Browne was making his derogatory remarks about "F". The only other person in the survey to whom the initial might apply was one Foster, the assistant curate of St Bride's, Fleet Street, surely too obscure an individual to have been honoured in this manner.

If, then, it can be taken that "F" and John Field were one and the same person, Bredwell's books have an added importance. They represent not merely the opinions of an otherwise unknown layman, but at least the "lying divinity" of one of the leaders of Cartwrightian Puritanism, and possibly even the officially-inspired re-action of the moderate Puritan party to Separatism, and that party's defence of Cartwright's position as it had been expressed in the open letter to Harrison which Browne had attacked.

II.

One of the Londoners whom Browne persuaded to separate from the Church of England was a poor "seelie" woman of the parish of St Olave, Silver Street, whose initials were "W.F." For her act of schism she was excommunicated, a punishment which worried her not at all. Noticing in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer that she might call upon the Bishop of the Diocese or the Pastor of her parish to resolve her doubts about the Church of England, she wrote to her Rector, setting out two of those doubts and demanding an answer in

(1) i.e. unlearned, incapable of reasoning correctly. (2) Not a "young man" as Knappen has it, op.cit. 309 footnote. (3) B.139. Not to be confused with St Olave's, Southwark. (4) B.11. In this case the initials seem to have been used to keep the lady's name out of the discussion, and not because she was well-known. (5) B.139 (6) B.1. In fact, the Preface mentions only the Bishop.

writing. How her letter came into Bredwell's hands to be answered does not appear. He was himself a parishioner of St Olave's, and the Rector may have passed the letter on to him because he was known as an opponent of separatism. On the other hand Browne, who replied to Bredwell's answer, thought he was replying to the Rector, and it may have been that W.F. was so "seelie" that she mistook Bredwell for the Rector, and was thus the cause of Browne's mistake.

Bredwell composed a second answer, this time to Browne's reply. It drew from Browne a document which Bredwell described as a "Raging Libell" and of which Browne made and circulated some copies in manuscript. By this time Browne had recognized his opponent, and the "Raging Libell" was as much a reply to the Admonition in Bredwell's "Detection" as it was to anything else.

Bredwell took up his pen a third time and wrote a "Defence of the Admonition to the followers of Browne". This he published along with W.F.'s letter to the Rector, his own reply to her, and his reply to Browne. The title he gave to the composite volume was "The Rasing of the Foundations of Brownisme".

Unfortunately Bredwell did not reproduce, except in an occasional quotation or paraphrase, either Browne's first reply or the "Raging Libell", and these works are no longer extant. Bredwell also quoted from Browne's "Treatise upon the 23 of Matthew". But, more important for present purposes, he devoted a section of the "Defence" to the refutation of

"that brainless Answer to Master Cartwright's Letter".

(1) B.3, 16 (2) B.132 (3) B.61 (4) See WHB 510ff where, however, not all of Bredwell's quotations of Browne are reproduced.
 (5) B.11

III.

On the verso of the title-page of "The Rasing" Bredwell printed the eight chief conclusions of his book, conclusions which show the relevance of his work to the controversy between Cartwright and Browne. They are

- (i) No man ought to depart from the Communion for any open unworthy ones resorting unto it.
- (ii) A faithful Christian may keep himself free from the pollution of the known wicked at the Sacrament, and yet not separate. And how.
- (iii) Open notorious offenders, not separated from a congregation of Christ, do not thereupon unsanctify the same, so as to make it no Church of Christ.
- (iv) It may be a true Church of God that hath in it divers corruptions, both in doctrine and practice.
- (v) The Church of England is not more unsound than divers undoubted Churches have been, from which no separation was counselled.
- (vi) No man ought to separate himself from the Church of England for the defects and corruptions that are therein.
- (vii) By faith only visible Churches have their account and being in Christ.
- (viii) Discipline is not of the essence or being of a Church.

Bredwell's introductory epistle to his readers shows that the Anglican party was classing the Cartwrightians with the Brownists, and blaming the former as much as the latter for the Brownist schism. This was an accusation which Bredwell resented, and he declared,

"There is as much difference betwixt those whom they, in their bitterness, would match together, as is between that child that in tender affection reproveth and laboureth the reforming of his mother... and him that under pretence of her uncomely behaviour should pluck out her bowels and forsake her."(1)

One of the objects of his book was to show the injustice of this matching together. But Bredwell did not hesitate to match Browne with two other Separatists, Barrow and Greenwood, who were then in prison, and who were later to be put to death for their opinions. At the same time, Bredwell was compelled to recognize that this matching

(1) B. 91 verso.

was not complete. To Barrow and Greenwood Browne was

"a coward, one that shrinketh in the wetting."(1)

Browne, for his part, thought Barrow and Greenwood over-eager. All three were alike, however, in that none of them would join, member-like, with the Church of England in the Word and Sacraments. (2)

In the course of comparing and contrasting Browne with Barrow and Greenwood, Bredwell showed that the two latter

"deny faith to come necessarily by the word of God, and say, It may be begotten without any promise of the word. Being demanded, What faith doth believe, they answer, God, without any consideration of his word and promise. Likewise, being asked how they came by their faith, it seemeth they answered, As it pleased God, namely, by his Spirit."(3)

Moreover, they

"deny that our preachers do preach the word, or that they do or can beget faith. They say... that there is no communion to be had with them in spiritual graces."(4)

All this is reminiscent of the conversation which Browne had with Harrison at Norwich, as Browne reported it in his "True and Short Declaration", and of the position which he had adopted at that time. (5) But he had, Bredwell said, refuted that same position in Barrow and Greenwood in

"a writing that came from Browne's hand in this matter."(6)

This work must have been Browne's "Treatise against one Barowe", known otherwise only through a brief quotation from it in Bancroft's famous sermon at Paul's Cross on 9th February 1589. (7)

In this work against Barrow, as Bredwell shows, Browne said,

"That our preachers do preach the word, and that they do, or can, beget faith."(8)

(1) B.A1 recto. (2) Ibid (3) Ibid verso (4) Ibid (5) WHB 407ff
(6) B.A1 verso marg. (7) WHB 515 (8) B.A1 verso.

He distinguished between

"the better and worser sort of our preachers."(1)

He proved

"our preachers to have a calling, because they bring the word: that they preach the word, because they beget faith... In him and in themselves (i.e. in Browne, Barrow and Greenwood) they have done it... The knowledge of reformation and discovery of Church corruptions came first to them by their preaching."
(2)

He spoke of Barrow and Greenwood as

"joining with us (i.e. the Church of England) in the common graces, but not as in one body and covenant of the Church."(3)

He made a "copious catalogue" of the true doctrine and good fruit of the (Puritan) preachers, and used the argument of the Scribes sitting in Moses' chair to prove that

"wicked men may preach God's word, and being in such office, charge, and calling, ought to be heard."(4)

Browne's book against Barrow was written during his period of wavering between the Church of England and separation, and at a moment when he had temporarily tired of schism. Bredwell believed that he could be confuted quite easily, if Barrow and Greenwood cared to do it, by quoting his own earlier writings against him. The two prisoners, indeed, seem to have had the same experience with Browne as Browne had had with Cartwright. Having learned their lesson well, and having put precept into practice, their teacher turned against them for taking him at his word.

(5)

(1) B.A2 recto (2) Ibid (3) Ibid (4) Ibid (5) Ibid.

IV.

W.F., being urged to go to Church, pointed to St Paul's words,

"Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom.xiv.23),

and asked whether this did not mean that, having conscientious doubts about the Church of England, she would be/^{committing}~~committing~~ sin if she joined in its worship.

"Set down your proofs in writing", she demanded, "by evident scriptures out of the word of God, that I may examine them by other scriptures, and use no sophistical reasons, nor vain philosophy, for I am forewarned by the Holy Ghost, that we be not deceived by such."(1)

The lady had clearly made up her mind to be difficult to convince!

Of her doubts about the Church of England, W.F. mentioned only two, the lack of scriptural government and discipline, and the pollution of the Lord's Supper caused by that lack. (2) In detail, she complained that instead of the disciplinary procedure laid down in Matt. xviii.15ff, the Bishop or his deputy excommunicated offenders without previous admonition to repentance, and often "resolved" the excommunicate without evidence of repentance upon payment of a fine. At the Lord's Supper, she said, anyone of 16 or 18 years of age and upwards was obliged by law to communicate, be he proud, covetous, drunken, a defrauder, an oppressor, or a blasphemer. By God's law, she maintained, the communicants ought to be sanctified people, a communion of saints, and therefore worthy receivers of the sacrament. (3) The rest ought to be rejected until they repented.

Bredwell agreed that the law did not permit faults to be redressed as fully as could be wished, but he denied that it forbade

(1) B.1 (2) Ibid (3) B.2.

notorious sinners to be excluded from the Holy Communion. The law intended a worthiness in communicants, and made provision for the censuring and debarring of the unworthy. These penalties were already used although, Bredwell allowed, they would be more effectively used if there were an Eldership. (1)

The mere presence of an unworthy person at the Communion, Bredwell thought, could not of itself rob the worthy communicants of the benefit of the sacrament, for Jesus would not then have allowed Judas to be present at the Last Supper. If it was the knowledge (2) that an unworthy person was communicating that robbed the worthy communicant of the benefit of the sacrament, the rest, who had not that knowledge, would not be robbed. But, in fact, the knowledge that a wicked person was communicating could not harm the faithful receiver of the sacrament, for

"The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon himself." (Ezek. xviii.20)

The lack of an Eldership in the Church of England, Bredwell agreed, prevented all the procedure laid down in Matt.xviii.15ff from being put into operation, but it did not prevent a particular Christian from performing his part of that procedure. The individual Christian could discharge his conscience by admonishing the wicked, (3) and thus showing his hatred of the sin.

Again, the Holy Communion was a spiritual action in which the wicked took no part, although bodily present. The faithful were incorporated into Christ at the communion only with the rest of the faithful.

(1) B.3 (2) B.4 (3) B.5.

"The rest may be said to be at the communion, yet are none of the communion, according as St Paul saith, They eat and drink their own damnation."(1)

Where, in the New Testament, Christians were forbidden to eat and drink with the wicked, the reference was to social relationships, and not to eating and drinking at the Lord's Supper. (2)

The Church was the Body of Christ, continued Bredwell, and each member received life from the head so long as it remained united with the body. If a sound member cut itself off from the body because another member was broken or diseased, the sound member would be conspiring against the whole body, instead of strengthening it against the disease. If the unity of the body were taken away, the body would thereby be destroyed. If the sound members remained in the body, the unsound members might recover, but even if they did not recover, the body would still live, although it would be maimed. (3)

When St Paul asked the Corinthians,

"Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?"

(I Cor.v.6)

he was urging them to excommunicate the incestuous member; he was not urging them to leave the Church. The metaphor of leaven was not to

(1) B.5f (2) B.6f. Bredwell was here expressing Calvin's, and therefore the usual Puritan, view of how I Cor.v.11, for example, should be understood. He did not mean that the New Testament did not command excommunication of the wicked, but that where eating and drinking with the wicked was forbidden, this applied to the additional punishment of social ostracism (Calvin, Inst.IV.xii.5). Browne probably regarded social ostracism as a form of persecution, and therefore as a thing to be abhorred. At anyrate, he did not accept Calvin's interpretation. The prohibition of eating and drinking with the wicked meant, to him, a command not to partake of the Lord's Supper with the wicked. See WHB 441, "There is an eating with wretches in the world, or in worldly meetings and feasting, ~~which is forbidden~~ which is forbidden in the Church meetings". (3) B.7

be pressed too far. Natural leaven affected the whole mass of the meal into which it was put,

"But it is not of such necessity that in a whole congregation all become unsanctified for some. Let the Church at Corinth be an example hereof. If the whole congregation had been infected, and so unsanctified, through the remaining of that wicked man amongst them, would the Apostle (think you) have still entitled them, The Church of God, and, Sanctified ones in Christ Jesus?"(1)

St Paul used the metaphor of leaven, Bredwell concluded, to indicate a tendency, not a necessary effect.

"As the remaining with the godly tendeth to the reforming of the wicked: so the remaining with the wicked tendeth to the deforming of the godly. Yet doth neither of both fall out alway necessarily, especially upon a whole company or congregation."(2)

V.

In the foregoing answer of Bredwell to W.F., Browne discovered a number of "heresies". These he attacked in his first reply, and Bredwell dealt with his ~~attacks~~ attacks in his second answer.

Bredwell's first "heresy" was that, in holding that the discipline exercised by the Church of England went some way towards a satisfactory regulation of the Church's life even though there was no Eldership, he separated discipline from Eldership. Browne held that
(3)
the one could not exist without the other.

But Browne must also have been dissatisfied with the Cartwrightian idea of Eldership, for Bredwell gathered from his reply that

"by Elders we mean Aldermen, as that we seek no other but by civil power and authority to force the unruly."(4)

(1) B.8f (2) B.9 (3) B.13 (4) Ibid.

What Browne meant by this comparison of Elders with Aldermen can be illustrated from his extant works. On 31st December 1588 he wrote in his "Answer to Mr Flower's Letter",

"Then doth the Church degenerate from Christ, when such usurping Elders or aldermen shall ambitiously, furiously, and as Lordly Tyrants, bring in subjection unto them the Magistrates and people, and make men's consciences slavishly to yield unto the bondage they shall lay upon them."(1)

It was not, however, only the usurped power of civil "forcing" which Browne would have taken away from the Eldership. He would have abolished both the name and office of Elder, even though they were scriptural. His reason for wishing to abolish them was that they were used to establish an authority over others, as though the authority belonged to the title and office of Elder, rather than to the gift with which God had endowed those whom he wished to exercise the function of Eldership. Thus, as quoted by Bancroft in the sermon at Paul's Cross to which reference has already been made, Browne said

"Whereas you charge us in denying Christ in his offices... it shall appear by your presbytery or eldermen, that indeed you are and will be the aldermen even to pull the most ancient of all, Christ Jesus himself by the beard: yea and seek not only to shake him by the locks of the hair out of his offices, but also all his ancients under him, I mean the lawful magistrates and ministers, which have lawful authority from him. Wherefore not we but you rather seek the glistering blase of great names: and if once you might get up the names of Elders and Presbyters, what mischief cruelty and pride would not stream from that name,..? For every busy fool, the more busy he were in discrediting others, and seeking mastership among the people, the better elder he should be judged. Yea and this new name of an

(1) WHB 520 (2) Browne did not mean that Elders used civil "forcing" directly, but his personal experience was that both in Scotland and England most of his imprisonments had been procured by the Elders or by those who would like to be Elders if they were given the chance. See WHB 519 (3) Ibid 518.

"elder given him, were even as a sacrament of grace, and would seal up all his knavery: that whatsoever filthiness dropped from him, yet the skirt of his ancient's gown should cover it." (1)

Browne recognized that there was a true function of Eldership, and declared that this function belonged to the Church as a whole, and to Christ who was Elder over the Church:-

"That the Church of Christ cannot be without a pastorship or eldership it is evident, because the Church itself is that most grave and ancient elder, whereof Christ is the Elder and pastor, being called the ancient of Days, and the chief shepherd and pastor of the flock."(2)

Individuals might also have and exercise the true function of Eldership:-

"Seeing an elder is nothing else in the scripture but any person of special wisdom and honesty, lawfully allowed and called in the Church to counsel, teach, and give advice, without any forcing, it must needs follow that there are many such elders in our Churches, or at leastwise may be, without any such titles or popish usurping as they seek for. Wherefore, if in any Church neighbours can wisely and godly take up matters, end controversies, and redress disorders without any injury to other officers, and if some have special direction by authority to deal in such manner, they are no doubt lawful elders before God and man, and yet have no name of presbyters and elders."(3)

Thus Browne could agree with Bredwell that the office of Elder, in the Cartwrightian sense, was not necessary to the being of the Church (indeed, it was most undesirable), but he could not agree that the true function of Eldership might be lacking, and the Church remain the Church. In this sense of the term "Eldership", discipline could not exist without Eldership. It might exist without the title of "Elder" being employed for those who exercised the function, but not without the function itself.

(1) WHB 515 (2) Ibid 520 (3) Ibid 520f.

To return to Bredwell's second answer, another "heresy" which Browne found in his opponent was that he insisted so much upon the election of Elders that without election there could be no Eldership. The laws of England did not permit the election of Elders. The Cartwrightian solution to this difficulty was to do without Elders. Browne thought this insistence upon election superstitious and

"considering the times, (supposed) that an agreement were better than a choice."(1)

His solution was,

"That the forward of every parish put forward themselves by visiting, counselling, withdrawing, comforting, etc, to perform the business."(2)

Having regard, that is to say, to the prohibition of the electing of Elders, Browne thought that individual Christians should assume the duties of Elders (in his sense of those duties), and the rest should tacitly agree to accept their leadership without formally electing them to office.

Bredwell believed that this solution involved an admission that the form of Church government was variable. Such an admission would play into the hands of the enemies of the Discipline, who themselves taught that the government of the Church might vary with the
(3) times. It would breed confusion if anyone might govern merely because he wished to do so. Consideration of the times could justify no-one in assuming office in the Church without a lawful calling.
(4)

The plea that, if men put themselves forward to execute discipline, God would receive praise for provoking and calling them, rather than

(1) B.13 (2) Ibid (3) No doubt Bredwell was thinking of Whitgift and his writings against Cartwright. (4) Ibid.

men for choosing them, was "Browne's Anarchy". Since the greater praise of God must always be sought, then by this argument Browne's method must always be used, and the order of ordaining Church officers by election, as laid down in Scripture, could not be the best method. There could not, anyway, be an agreement to obey where those who were to be obeyed had not been chosen. If Christians were to obey those who put themselves forward of their own inward motions and feelings, then it must be recognized that those motions and feelings, of themselves, constituted a sufficient calling, and a binding of the consciences of others. For how could anyone walk in faith without authentic warrant to his conscience?

Browne seems to have argued, further, that the title "Elder" and the appointing of Elders by election were superstitious

"seeing they are made mockeries and matters of persecution." (4) For the same reasons both the title and the method of appointment were changeable.

Bredwell did not insist upon the use of the title "Elder", but he emphasized that election was the way laid down in Scripture for the

 (1) B.13f (2) B.13 (3) B.14. Bredwell's argument is difficult to follow at this point. He seems to mean that the election of an Elder constituted an agreement to obey him, and was also a sufficient warrant to the conscience to justify obedience, since it was election by the Church. Obedience to a duly appointed officer of the Church was therefore a "walking in faith." ~~(5) Ibid.~~ (4) Ibid. Here again the argument is difficult to follow. Browne seems to mean that the title and office of Elder had been used and perverted to a persecuting end, and therefore they must be changed and not reformed. Their superstition lay in their outwardness and formality, which were not concerned with the inward gift of eldership.

appointment of Elders, and was the way to avoid confusion. It was therefore the unchangeable way.

Another reason which Browne had for thinking the election of Elders to be superstitious was that it

"is to make in force the Popish sacrament of orders."(1)

This remark implied, said Bredwell, that the ordinances of God upheld the lewd and brainsick imaginations of men. By making the remark Browne had made a solemn calling by the Church to the ministry unnecessary. Indeed, he had actually said of those whom he expected to put themselves forward in the capacity of Elders that

"the obedience of the worthy unto them is a calling by man, and the agreement of the wisest is a choosing."(2)

On the subject of communicating with the known wicked at the Holy Communion, Bredwell considered that Browne had mistaken his meaning. Browne had thought he had said that the Church as a whole should not cleanse itself of evil-doers. What Bredwell had meant was that

"a particular member ought to admonish, and at length to tell the Church, but not to withdraw himself though the Church should not separate the unworthy one."(4)

Browne had asserted dogmatically and without argument that to know and communicate with the unworthy was sin. Bredwell agreed that, without the process of admonition, joining with the unworthy in receiving the Holy Communion would constitute approval of the unworthy

(1) B.14. Since the process of election conferred authority to act as an Elder upon the person elected, Browne compared it with the sacrament of orders, which purported to confer the gifts of the Spirit upon the ordinand. But to Browne both the gifts and the authority to use them came direct from God. To Bredwell it was "lewd and brainsick imagination" to suppose that God bestowed the gifts of the Spirit through ordination, but that was no reason for abandoning the right use of an outward calling to the offices of the Church.
(2) B.15 (3) B.15ff (4) B.18.

(1)
 one, and would amount to calling evil good. But he had not advocated joining in the Communion with the unworthy without using the processes of discipline so far as those processes could be used by a private person.

"If I approve him for a sound member neither in the sight of God, nor to his own conscience, neither in the knowledge and judgment of the Church, then can it in no way be said that I approve him."(2)

Once a private member had done his duty in this way, Bredwell thought, the over-riding consideration must be the unity of the Church.

"I hold myself bound to keep the unity of that living body (whereof I am a member) even with some inconvenience of sickness and unsound parts... If you yet insist, urging me with the outward action of communicating, I answer, I do that not as a thing of mine own head, or which I might at my choice refrain, but as a duty necessarily enjoined me of God by his providence through my being and placing there, and justly required of me by the Church or spiritual body through the same enforcing law of the coherence and being together of the parts and members, which is the express ordinance of God."(3)

Bredwell was not disposed to deny that there was an outward joining with the wicked in the sacramental sign, even though there was no inward joining in faith. In such a case there must, necessarily, be a joining in the outward signs of grace, but that did not preclude an inward division. A minister might know that one of the communicants was an unworthy recipient, and in that sense be divided from him inwardly. But that would not constitute

(4)
 "a warrant to withhold the signs, if most voices have held him in (i.e. the communicant in the Church), for that can he not do of himself... He reacheth him the sign, not as he is worthy or unworthy, but as he is yet undivided from them."(5)

In support of his contention that the presence of evil-doers at the Holy Communion destroyed the validity of the sacrament for all who were present and knew of their evil, Browne quoted I Cor.xi.20,

"When therefore ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat the Lord's Supper."

Bredwell replied,

"We think a learned divine should not be ignorant that this is a kind of excessive negation very usual in the Scriptures, and is therefore here, like as in all other such places, to be restrained with due regards of circumstances."(1)

St Paul was not, in the passage quoted by Browne, either saying that the Corinthians had violated the essential form of the institution of the Lord's Supper, nor accusing all the Corinthians of misbehaviour in their conduct at the Supper. On the contrary, Bredwell believed that only the guilty were blamed, for the Apostle had also said,

"I hear that divisions exist among you... There must needs be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." I Cor.xi.18f.

There could be no doubt that the guilty Corinthians had partaken of the Lord's Supper, for St Paul had told them that they had eaten and drunk unworthily to their own condemnation, yet some among the communicants were approved. In the light of this remark of St Paul's it could not be argued that the Supper celebrated at Corinth was invalid, and therefore not the Lord's Supper.

Bredwell would not agree that even the unworthiness of a minister was sufficient cause for withdrawal from a Church. In this

(1) B.24 (2) B.25 (3) B.28

connection he dealt with the case of ~~Hophni~~ Hophni and Phinehas, the sons of Eli, which Browne had brought forward in his "Answer to Master Cartwright."⁽¹⁾ The Bible gave no justification for Browne's idea that the better sort of the people of Israel stayed away from the sacrifices at Shiloh because of the wickedness of Eli's sons. Where the Scripture said,

"The people abhorred the offering of the Lord because of the sin of the young men", (I Sam.ii.17)

it was not meant that the people were right in their abhorrence of the offering. The point of the remark was that the sin of the two priests was all the greater because they made the people sin in staying away from the offering. Elkanah and Hannah were among those who did not sin by staying away. It was idle of Browne to argue that Eli, and not his sons, had offered Elkanah's sacrifice. Hophni and Phinehas were named in I Sam.i.3 as the priests at Shiloh, and

"that old Eli laboured not in those days in the business of the sacrifices, it seemeth very probable, in that he was not able, being about ninety years old."(2)

It must therefore be concluded that the better sort of people, as represented by Elkanah and Hannah, did not separate themselves from the ministry of Hophni and Phinehas.

Bredwell now turned to I Cor.v.9-13, on the interpretation of which passage Browne had, in his "Answer to Master Cartwright", contradicted Calvin.⁽³⁾ It was upon this place, and upon some others in Scripture to the like effect, that Browne based his idea that a private Christian might abandon a Church which had known evil-doers

(1) WHB 489f (2) B.34 (3) WHB 441.

among its members. In this passage St Paul said,

"I wrote unto you in my epistle to have no company with fornicators; not altogether with the fornicators of this world... for then must ye needs go out of the world; But now I write unto you not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother be a fornicator... with such a one no, not to eat... Do ye not judge them that are within, whereas them that are without, God judgeth?"

Browne supposed that this passage prohibited eating at the Lord's Table with erring Christians, but Bredwell pointed out how St Paul had distinguished between Christians and non-Christians. The latter were too numerous in St Paul's time to be avoided completely, and in any case it was not a Christian's duty to judge them. As to Christians, St Paul had summed up their social relationships here ~~x~~ in the action of eating together,

"which is always a very notable mark and fruit of familiarity." (1)
If, as Browne thought, St Paul had meant eating at the Lord's Table, and not social eating,

"what needed he to have excepted those that were out of the Church, and no brethren, with whom the Church neither had, nor might have, companying at the Lord's Table. Yea, how absurdly had he reasoned in saying thus (For then you must go out of the world) as though he should say; if you altogether debar the wicked that are without the Church from company at the Lord's Table, then you may as well get out of the world, for you cannot live in it." (2)

Browne could not, therefore, claim that this passage supported his contention that a worthy Christian should withdraw from an unworthy Church.

Another opinion of Browne's was that

(1) B.38 (2) Ibid.

"the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a sacrament of order, or orderly communion; order or orderly communion is the very form, matter, manner or essence and nature thereof."(1)

The presence of an unworthy communicant would cause, according to Browne, disorder and disorderly communion, and would therefore destroy the nature of the sacrament.

For this idea Bredwell had no place at all. The matter of the Holy Communion was bread and wine; the form was the consecration and distribution of the matter.

"Orderly communicating is a fruit or effect of government, and a beautiful ornament to the sacrament, but nothing either of matter and form, and therefore not of the essence of the sacrament."(2)

Regarding the duty of unity laid upon Christians by the Scriptures, Browne argued in the following manner:-

"What places enforce an outward uniting in the sacrament with the members of Christ's body only, the same enforce a dividing or refraining in the sacraments from those that outwardly are manifest to be no members of his body. But all these places enforce such an outward uniting with members only. Therefore they enforce a refraining and dividing in the sacrament from open wretches, which are known to be no members."(3)

Bredwell agreed with this proposition so long as it was taken that it laid a duty upon the Church as a whole to expel notorious evil-doers from the Lord's Table. But if Browne meant, as he certainly did, that a duty of separation was laid upon individual Christians, then Bredwell disagreed. For

"if the members of a Church or spiritual body have no further promise of life and continuance in Christ, than as they (like members of a natural body) continue in the unity of the same Church or spiritual body, then it followeth necessarily that what members soever separate themselves from their spiritual body or Church, the same do separate themselves from the life of Christ thereby."(4)

(1) B.42 (2) Ibid (3) B.43 (4) B.43f.

Browne gave some strange twists to the metaphor of the body:-

"As every particular member of a body may shake off the rotten, and yet not forsake the body, so may every particular member of a Church... As the members of a natural body refuse to use the service of the rotten ones, so ought the members of a spiritual body to refuse to communicate in the sacraments with such."(1)

When he wrote these sentences Browne thought he was addressing the Rector of St Olave's. (2) If he had realized that he was dealing with a "student of physic" he might have been more wary. As it was, he received the reply he had merited, viz:-

"To clear his eyes, it may be, God shall make this a medicine when he shall give him to meditate that it is quite contrary to his ordinance in the natural body for the whole members to forsake their places, or to refuse to nourish themselves in the unity of their body, because of some rotten ones that do endanger them... Whereas (Browne) esteemeth that every member of a natural body withholdeth and keepeth away blood and nourishment from the rotten, it is manifest that he is as ignorant in natural things as in divine. For blood cometh plentifully enough to rotten members, so long as they are unseparated, only it nourisheth them not as of old, but is perverted by them to the increase of their rottenness. Let him follow this 'vein' no longer, if he have any wit in his head."(3)

One of the reasons Browne gave in rebuttal of the accusation that he was guilty of schism was to declare that a particular congregation was not the whole Church. One might therefore withdraw from a particular congregation without separating from the Church as a whole. To this plea Bredwell replied,

"Every particular Church, touching the knitting together of the members, and partaking with Christ the head through the bodily unity, is in the same sort to be considered as the whole Church, and we can no more forsake a particular Church, and yet be of the whole, than can a finger forsake his hand, and yet be of the body."(4)

(1) B.44f (2) B.132 (3) B.45 (4) B.46. What Bredwell had in mind when he spoke of the "whole Church" will appear later.

Browne must have disregarded the warning to W.F. not to misuse St Paul's metaphor of leaven, for Bredwell found it necessary to say,

"As in divers places the scripture speaketh of leaven in the ill part, so our Saviour Christ propoundeth a similitude by the same in the good part. Which if you will apply and urge as far forth as you have done this... you must say that where faith and regeneration by the Gospel is once begun, there do all become faithful and renewed, even as of three pecks of meal, all become leavened. Which if you do say, all the world will cry shame of you."(1)

By over-stressing the metaphor, Bredwell declared, Browne had misinterpreted St Paul, who by leavening did not mean disannulling, but corrupting, the Church.

Among Browne's statements about the Church was the following:-

"As sweet water, intermingled with poison, is poisoned and turned into the nature of poison; so the notorious wicked openly mingled in one outward Church with the righteous, or the righteous with them, they become one wicked crew together, even all of them poisoned and infected together."(2)

A statement as sweeping as this, Bredwell considered, should surely have been supported with examples from Scripture showing cases where the Spirit had disavowed Churches because of the presence of evil-doers. Since Browne had given no examples, Bredwell provided one to the opposite effect. At the birth of Jesus God dwelt in the Jewish Church at Jerusalem, and accepted its worship. That Church contained corrupt Scribes, superstitious Pharisees, and epicurean Sadducees. But it also contained Simeon, Zacharias, Mary, Anna, and Elizabeth. Were these all one wicked crew together? (3)

Having thus exposed the errors of Browne's reasoning, Bredwell concluded with the following advice to Browne's followers,

(1) B. 52 (2) B.53f (3) B.54f.

"If his teeth would serve him no better for to eat his meat than his Logic doth to discuss a question rightly, you must feed him with spoon-meat, or that which is minced, if you mean to keep him long alive."(1)

VI.

It was in his "Defence of the Admonition to the followers of Browne", which comprised rather more than a half of "The Rasing of the Foundations of Brownism"⁽²⁾, that Bredwell developed his argument against regarding Discipline as of the "esse" of the Church, and in doing so referred frequently to Browne's "Answer to Master Cartwright". Two passing references to this subject in the earlier part of "The Rasing" may, however, be conveniently noticed here before passing on to the main portion of Bredwell's refutation.

It has already been seen that Bredwell suspected Browne of teaching justification by works, in that he held a Church to have fallen out of the covenant, and to be no Church, if it would not or could not separate the unworthy from its midst at the Holy Communion. This suspicion was expressed increasingly as a certainty as Bredwell continued with his second answer. For example,

"If (Browne) hold that obedience and holy life are causes of our justification, and whereby we enjoy the covenant of life, and not tokens or fruits only, his case is worse than that he can truly enjoy the name of a Christian."(3)

Closely related to this remark was Bredwell's idea that Browne must take his choice between two positions. He could hold that a Christian might, for good cause, separate himself from the Church while it still remained the Church. But Browne did not hold this

view; he agreed that to separate from the Church was to commit schism. His alternative was to hold that a Church ceased to have the covenant of a Church if it failed in any necessary point of practice. Without the covenant it ceased to be a Church, and those who separated themselves from it were not therefore committing schism. This was Browne's position, but in holding it, Bredwell declared, he implied that the covenant was held by works, and that was the highway to popery. (1)

In his "Defence", after noticing that Discipline was a thing which belonged to the Church and which could not exist as an abstraction apart from the Church, Bredwell sought for examples of Churches mentioned in Scripture as existing before they had Discipline. The three thousand converts in Acts ii.41f, for example,

"continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." (2)

Here was a Church, but there was no mention of Discipline in it.

The rest of the Acts of the Apostles showed cases of Churches founded by the Apostles, and in being, before ever they were provided with Elders to exercise Discipline. The same might be said of the Church in Crete; it was in being as a Church before Titus was left there to appoint Elders. (3)

In his "Answer to Master Cartwright" Browne had applied the term "counterfeit" to the Sacraments of the Church of England. (4) In his "Raging Libell" he seems to have given this term a wider application,

(1) B.44 (2) B.74 (3) B.75. Strictly speaking this was no argument against Browne, for he held that there might be Discipline without formally appointed Elders. (4) WAB 452, 474.

for Bredwell quoted him as saying,

"They that hold the power, authority, and government of Christ not to be of the essence of the Church, do feign a counterfeit Christ and a counterfeit Church."(1)

Bredwell invited his readers to observe that Browne here equated "government" with "authority", and he also asked them to consider that the word "government" had a twofold meaning:-

"The word 'government', that it may bear the same sense with the word 'authority' (wherewith it is coupled as a synonym), must be taken for the office of government, and not as it is used sometime for the action of government."(2)

Bredwell further asked his readers to consider the twofold meaning of the word "power":-

"The word 'power' may be used in a double sense. One when it is understood for 'might, strength, or efficacious force', which is that the Greek word δύναμις expresseth... The other is when the word 'power' meaneth nothing else but 'authority, jurisdiction, or government'. Here the word is... ἐξουσία and therefore signifieth not the force and might of Christ... but his authority or office of government."(3)

The δύναμις of Christ, as in I Cor.v.4 and elsewhere in the New Testament was, according to Bredwell, his divine essence which he had by eternal generation from the Father. The ἐξουσία of Christ, as in Matt.xxviii.18, was his authority or office of government. Now,

"there are proper accidents of things which cannot be separated from them, and yet are not of their essence. For example, heat cannot be separated from the fire, nor moving from the sun, yet are neither of these properties any part of their essence."(4)

(1) B.78 (2) Ibid. (3) Ibid. This hard and fast distinction between δύναμις and ἐξουσία cannot be maintained. The latter is sometimes used in the sense which Bredwell allots to the former.
(4) B.79. Bredwell is suggesting here that δύναμις is of the essence of Christ and ἐξουσία an inseparable accident.

In the same way, the kingdom and priesthood of the Son of God, which were his offices, were inseparable from the Son of God, but yet were no parts of his essence. They were his inseparable accidents. Those people, therefore, who denied that the kingdom and priesthood of Christ were parts of his essence were neither despoiling him of those offices, nor feigning a counterfeit Christ and a counterfeit Church.

"If a thing may truly be removed from the essence, and nevertheless necessarily admitted in the Subject, how followeth it that they that deny the kingly power and authority of Christ to be of the essence of the Church, do therefore make or feign a Church that is without it?"(1)

Bredwell now asked, what were the essential causes of a true Church of God? Earlier in "The Rasing" he had stated that matter and form were alone essential to the being of the Church, the matter being composed of Christ the head corner-stone, and a people to be laid on him as living stones, while the form comprised the coming of the people to Christ, and their being laid on him by faith. Under the metaphors of the uniting of a body with its head, and of the

(1) B.79. As a defender of Cartwright, Bredwell was committed to the view that Christ could not reign as King in his Church unless the Church were furnished with the kind of government which Christ had appointed in Scripture. But equally he wanted to avoid the conclusion that if the kingship of Christ was lacking, Christ himself must be lacking. In his "Answer to Master Cartwright" (WHB 461) Browne had argued that Christ deprived of his kingly office was an incomplete Christ, and therefore a counterfeit Christ. A Church unable to exercise Christ's kingly office was the Church of a counterfeit ~~Christ~~ Christ, and therefore a counterfeit Church. Bredwell's argument does not seem to be a true answer to Browne, for if Christ's kingship is an inseparable accident, it is impossible to have Christ without having his kingship, and if Christ is lacking, then his essence is also lacking, and his *Substantia* along with his essence.

(2) B.47.

uniting of branches with their vine, Bredwell now re-stated this idea of the essential matter and form of the Church, and continued:-

"This unition is by two means, the one eternal, the other serving but for this life. The eternal unition is by the Holy Ghost, whereby we are flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone... This is peculiar and proper to the Catholic Church (which is the whole company of the elect of God) and doth not pertain to the members of a particular Church as they are only considered members of any particular Church, but as they are also in that regard members of the Catholic."(1)

Thus Bredwell identified the ~~external~~ Catholic Church, not with the world-wide visible Church of which particular Churches were parts, but with the invisible Church of the elect who were known only to God. In this Church the essential form was the unity between God and the elect brought about by the Spirit.

As for the visible Church,

"the temporal unition... is by faith... Faith is as the engrafting of the branches into the stock, whereby they are upholden whilst that by the sap and spirit of life proceeding therefrom, they be grown and established."(2)

Faith united men with Christ, and this unity was the essential form of particular and visible Churches. But, unlike God, man could ~~not~~ not judge the heart and tell the difference between sincere faith and feigned faith. Men must therefore accept the verbal profession of faith as making the unity which was essential.⁽³⁾

"Thus then, if matter and form be the essential causes whereof anything consisteth, and whereby the being of anything is acknowledged, I hope we have here with Ma(ster) C(artwright) found out and proved the essential causes of a Church."(4)

Browne's idea that Christ, and not faith, was the life and essence of the Church implied, Bredwell thought, the idea that faith had no

(1) B.80 (2) B.81 (3) Ibid (4) B.83.

connection with Christ in this matter, and that Christ could be considered as head of the Church without faith in him being considered at the same time. But faith was not to be thought of as an abstraction; it must always be considered in its relationship to its object. In a Christian and scriptural context "faith" must always be taken to mean "faith-in-Christ"⁽¹⁾. It was in this sense that "faith" was said to be the life and essence of the Church.

Bredwell now took up Browne's objection that children, being incapable of faith, would be left outside the life and ~~essence~~ essence of the Church if faith were to be regarded as that essence. He said,

"Infants of parents that be within the covenant are not to be accounted without all faith... For if they be elect, then have they the Spirit, and so faith in power, ability, and inclination, though not in outward profession or action. Like as also at the same time they cannot be denied to have reason (inasmuch as they have a reasonable soul) although it be but potentially... If they be not elect, and so have not the anointing of the Spirit, nor therefore any faith in the sight of God, yet receive they so much from the faith of their parents as to be by it accepted of the visible Church for a holy seed and partakers of the promises, because they, judging but as men, have no cause at all to doubt thereof."⁽²⁾

Thus Bredwell disclaimed all idea that children were saved, or lived in the sight of God, by the faith of their parents. He asked only that, on the ground of their parents' faith, they should be accepted by men as within the covenant and the visible Church.

The fact that the exercise of the Discipline was denied to the Church of England, Bredwell declared, must not be taken, as Browne took it, to mean that all Christ's power, authority, and government was denied to her. Only that part that was administered by Elders

(1) B.84 (2) B.84f.

was lacking. The administration of Christ's government was partly proper, partly communicated. Christ exercised his proper authority in person. It was to be seen in nature in those acts of providence which appeared to be a judging of the wicked or a succouring of the faithful, and it was to be seen in the Church in the making effective in the soul to salvation or condemnation of the preaching of the Word.

Christ's communicated government was exercised by members of ~~particular~~ particular Churches, guided by the laws and canons of Scripture. It consisted of the using of the Word and Sacraments, and also of, but not only of, the direction of the Church, i.e. of Discipline. (1)

"Therefore, where the reader findeth in Browne's writings Discipline and Christ's government matched together as though they were synonyms... there let him smell out this his sophistry, and reject the lewd seducer so offering it. And though he pretend the place to the Corinthians to approve his phrase, saying, Paul calleth this Discipline the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, believe him not. For the Apostle speaketh not there of Christ's power as it is taken for his authority and office of government, but for his divine might, strength, and efficacious power, by which he is with his Church to the end of the world."(2)

It seemed to Bredwell that Browne's teaching tended either to tie down Christ's power to the Discipline, or else to confuse the Discipline with that power,

"as if the discipline being removed from the Church, forthwith the word should be without Christ's power to bind and loose, to remit or retain men's sins. Which is not so much to extol the worthy discipline (as he pretended) as it is either to clog and chain up Christ's divine power thereunto: or else to make discipline the divine force and efficacious power of Christ himself, which is his essence."(3)

The Discipline was one kind of the authority of Christ, but not all

(1) B.87f. I Cor.v.4. WHB 461 (2) B.88 (3) B.89

of it, nor even the principal part of it. Christ could use the Discipline as a chariot for his Word to ride upon, but the simple preaching of the Word was Christ's usual weapon. The Word might stand without the Discipline, but not the Discipline without the Word.

One of Bredwell's tasks in defending Cartwright's Letter had perforce to be the clearing up of some of the contradictions which Browne had manufactured out of Cartwright's phrases. One of these was that

"without discipline there may be a Church, and without discipline there can be no Church."(2)

This arose, as Bredwell noticed, out of Cartwright's use of the term "discipline" in two senses, where Browne used it only in the sense of "correction of faults". Bredwell therefore ammended Browne's misinterpretation of Cartwright so that it read,

"without some discipline there may be a Church... Without all discipline there can be no Church."(3)

Bredwell reminded his readers that he had said, at the beginning of his "Defence", that Discipline could not be regarded as a thing in itself. It was Discipline-of-the-Church, and could not exist without the Church. But Browne had made the gathering of the Church a part of Discipline. How, Bredwell asked, could the process of gathering be put into operation by the Church before the Church was in existence to exercise that part of her Discipline? Quite obviously, gathering could not be a part of Church Discipline

(1) B.90 (2) B.91. WHB 463 (3) B.91 (4) B.74 (5) WHB 464 (6) B.93

Browne's use of the word "worthy" now fell to be considered.

Bredwell asked,

"Why doth he say, the Church must be gathered of the worthy, and not rather, of believers, according to the usual speech of the scriptures?"(1)

His answer to his own question was that Browne dared not use the term "believers", for if he did he would refute his own argument against Cartwright. The term "worthy" had been borrowed, Bredwell thought, from Matt.x.11, where, however, Christ had bidden the Twelve to lodge with the worthy, not to gather them into a Church.

Browne held that every Christian had, as a Christian, the liberty and power to forgive or retain sins. If he had not this right, he was a servant of man, and not of Christ. Further, if a Church lacked this power, it could not remain a Church, any more than a man could remain a Christian without it.

Ever ready to detect in Browne the doctrine of justification by works, Bredwell argued here that it was easier for an individual Christian to perform his part of the Discipline than for a Church to do its part; easier, because an individual was less subject than a Church to contrary judgments. This was shown by the fact

(1) B.94 (2) Browne no doubt avoided the use of the term "believers" because it seemed to him inadequate to convey his idea of what Christians should be like. Ideally they should be sinless. As this was not possible, they should at least make such a serious attempt to lead a godly life that they abstained from the gross outward sins. He knew that men could not discern the inward sins, which were known only to God (WHB 506), and therefore the classification of "worthy" and "unworthy" paid no regard to those sins. Even where gross sins were committed, sincere repentance might re-establish the offender as "worthy", so that the term did not in either case mean "sinless". (3) B:94 (4) WHB 465. If a Christian obeyed a human command to refrain from using the power bestowed on him by Christ, he would become a servant of the man who commanded him, and not of Christ, and hence he would no longer be a Christian.

that, even in Churches which lacked the Discipline, there were often individual Christians who were zealous in rebuking vice. But if Browne wished to argue that this rebuking was of the essence of being a Christian, he must realize that it was then a work which he was making a part of that essence and, by Browne's own inference, a work also that was a part of the essence of the Church. (1)

Browne had stated that every individual Christian was a king and a priest unto God. (2) With this Bredwell agreed, but to what end, he asked, were Christians to be called kings? Surely not, as Browne had it, that they might hold the sceptre of God's Word, and judge offenders. If they were kings for no other purpose than that, they were men espying notes in other people's eyes.

"The most immediate, near, and principal end (except God's glory, which is the principal end of all ends) of Christians being kings unto God, is to mortify our own affections and evil lusts, and to subdue sin in ourselves." (3)

Bredwell now reviewed some/ ^{of} ~~mg~~ the terms used by St Paul to describe Christians. If the Apostle had regarded the Discipline as the essence of a Christian, he would not have called Timothy and Titus his "sons in the faith" when he wanted to indicate their status in Christ. He would rather have called them "his sons in the Discipline and judging of offenders." (4)

The titles by which St Paul addressed the Churches to which he wrote ("saints" and "faithful") were synonyms, and St Paul meant nothing higher by "saints" than he did by "faithful". The Apostle addressed the Corinthians as "saints" in his second epistle to them,

but if these Corinthians were different from the "faithful" at Corinth, and St Paul was therefore addressing some, but not all, of the Corinthian Christians, then his readers had no means of discovering where the distinction lay, nor of deciding to whom the epistle was addressed. Similarly, in I Cor.1.2 St Paul conjoined the "saints" at Corinth with those elsewhere who

"call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ",

showing that there was no distinction in his mind between the two.

All this, Bredwell claimed,

"confuteth the error of Browne imagining the word "saints" to imply actual holiness, and not the profession of faith whereby (and that only) every one that holdeth it are (in all human judgment) esteemed to stand under the sweet harbour of Christ's imputation."(1)

To Browne's question, how those who showed forth a wicked profession could be called "saints",⁽²⁾ Bredwell replied,

"The Apostle called the Church of Corinth 'saints'... in regard of their present standing in the faith of Christ, who not only taketh away the imputation of our sins... but also by daily degrees carrieth us finally to the ~~the~~ top of inherent perfection. For the hope whereof... all the members of a Church are to be reckoned saints and sanctified ~~a~~ ones in Christ."(3)

In his "Raging Libell" Browne must have quoted I John ii.19,

"They went out from us, but they were not of us."

It seems that he used this text in such a way as to make it mean that the unworthy could not be members of the Church. Bredwell corrected the error by pointing out that the offenders St John had had in mind were not guilty of moral misconduct, but were apostates from the Catholic faith. In saying "they were not of us" the

Apostle meant

"they were not of the Catholic Church, which is the number of the elect."(1)

St John did not mean that before their secession these apostates had not been members of a particular visible Church.

It was in connection with this immediately foregoing point in the controversy that Bredwell defined what he meant by a particular visible Church:-

"Being a convenient number of such as do in one uniform, agreed course of the outward joint worship of God, profess that righteousness which is by the faith of Jesus Christ, (a particular Church) consisteth both of the elect and reprobate, unfeigned and counterfeit Christians, being therefore resembled by that net cast into the sea, that gathereth all kinds of things. And so (as touching the eye of man) all are to be accounted members of that Church which join together thus in one profession. And if open offences break out in any, then appeareth diseased or rotting members, but yet members till they be separated."(2)

Browne had maintained against Cartwright that it was not by a neglect on their part that the Israelites omitted to observe the Passover and to practise circumcision while they were in the wilderness. They had been commanded to keep the Passover only in Canaan, and the practice of circumcision would have been inconsistent with the commandment always to be ready for travel and battle. (3)

In rebuttal of this argument, Bredwell pointed to Exod.xii.14, 16, and 42, where the Israelites were commanded to keep the Passover

 (1) B.101f (2) B.103. Bredwell's interpretation of the parable of the net has been common since before the time of Cyprian. The very similar parable of the Tares was interpreted in the same way by Callistus, c.220. (Greenslade, Schism in the Early Church, 112, 114). These two parables are "parables of the Kingdom" and depend, for Bredwell's interpretation, upon the identification of the Kingdom of God with the Church. This identification is no longer possible. C.H.Dodd (The Parables of the Kingdom, 187ff), for example, regards the sorting of the good from the bad in the parable of the net as the varying reaction of his hearers to the preaching of Jesus.

(3) B. 103f WHB. 468f.

in every generation. True, they were to keep it in Canaan, but that did not preclude them from keeping it in the wilderness. Equally, whatever difficulty might have been experienced in practising circumcision in the wilderness must also have been a difficulty at Gilgal, when the neglect of former years was made good. If circumcision had been administered, as it should have been, at the age of eight days, no difficulty such as Browne had invented would have been experienced, either in the wilderness or elsewhere. Both the Passover and the rite of circumcision had been neglected, as Cartwright had said, and yet the neglect had not disqualified Israel from being the Church of God. In the same way, those Churches which Cartwright had mentioned as lacking the Lord's Supper although they had the Discipline, were still to be accounted Churches, even though the lack of one of the Sacraments was worse than the lack of Discipline.

Bredwell thought Browne "more than childish" in citing the Psalms as evidence, because they praised the city of Jerusalem in terms of its wall and gates, that there could be no city without a wall.

"Every Grammar boy could have told him it to be a trope of synecdoche; a part for the whole."(4)

Browne would have done better to have defined a city in terms of its laws and polity, rather than by its walls, for a city entirely dismantled might yet remain a city.

"When as therefore a number of men may meet together to associate themselves by certain laws and agreements amongst themselves, without having a wall, it is evident that a city may be without a wall."(5)

Browne might also have allowed himself to be taught by the Lord who had said,

"Jerusalem shall be inhabited without a wall." (Zech.ii.4)

As for the metaphor of the vineyard, what, Bredwell asked, did Browne suppose that God had meant in Isa.v.5. when he said that after the hedge had been taken away Israel's enemies would tread down the vineyard. Was it not the vineyard that was to be trodden down?

(1) B.110

VII.

To the Anglican who is accustomed to declare at the Eucharist that he does not approach the altar trusting in his own righteousness, and that he is unworthy even to gather up the crumbs beneath the Lord's Table, there is something strange and objectionable in Browne's description of himself or any other communicant as "worthy". But this should not be allowed to prevent him from realizing that he is himself also accustomed to profess his belief in the holiness of the Church to which he belongs, and therefore, in some sense or other, in his own holiness. What is being expressed in both cases, of course, is an ideal rather than a reality.

There were two ideals of the Church which were in conflict with each other in the controversies which troubled the Elizabethan Church. The first of these was the ideal of "catholicity" in the primary meaning of that word, "all-embracing". Since all men are the creatures of God, and since Christ died for all, it is the aim of the Church to bring all within her membership. The second ideal is that the Church should be holy like her Lord. She is the Bride of Christ and the Body of Christ, and like her Spouse and her Head she should be sinless, both in her corporate life and in her members considered as individuals.

But in a sinful world these are ideals of the Church; they are not, and cannot be, realities. The Church does not embrace all mankind, nor is she sinless. Moreover, in a sinful world the two ideals are prone to conflict with each other. The Church's standard of holiness cannot be raised without demanding at the same time a

raising of the personal holiness of her members, and this tends towards the exclusion of those who fail to reach the standard. In the reverse direction, the more the Church tries to be "catholic", the more she tends to include among her members those whose personal life falls below the average standard of holiness.

In the Elizabethan era Anglicanism, as represented for example by Whitgift, emphasized the "catholic" aspect of the Church. The ideal was a single Church which had every Englishman within its ranks. The Church was the nation on its religious side, and Whitgift could see no difference between the Christian Church and the Christian ~~State~~ State. But this is not to say that Elizabethan Anglicanism altogether disregarded the ideal of holiness. Bredwell pointed out to Browne that the canon law intended a holiness in all communicants. If he meant that it demanded an achieved holiness, he was wrong, but he was right if he meant that it demanded the holiness of sincere repentance and of earnest determination to do better. The whole penitential system of the canon law was directed to this end. The emphasis, however, was upon "catholicity". The Church was the Church of England, not the Church in England.

The Puritans of Cartwright's school of thought similarly laid emphasis upon the "catholicity" of the Church, although they did so in a way slightly different from Whitgift's. They thought of the Church more in terms of the parish than of the nation, but thought of each parish congregation as containing every resident within the parish. Indeed, in common with the Anglicans, they pressed the ideal

of "catholicity" to the point of thrusting the duties of membership of the Church upon the unwilling. Cartwright and his followers, however, placed rather more emphasis upon the holiness of the Church than Anglicans were wont to do. The Church in her corporate life must be obedient to a form of government which, it was believed, Christ had defined in considerable detail for her. In the personal life of Christians sin was to be treated seriously and corrected severely. It was realized that there was much human sin that was known only to the sinner and to God, but where it was apparent to other men besides the sinner himself it must not be allowed to lower the standard and cause the ideal of absolute holiness to be lost to the sight.

Browne tried to resolve the conflict between the two ideals by adhering to that of holiness and leaving aside that of "catholicity". It would be unjust to him to say that abandoned the latter ideal altogether. He would no doubt have been a very happy man if all had agreed with him and had joined with him in an effort to bring about a very high standard of Christian conduct, but since that could not be so, he preferred holiness to large numbers. Hence the idea of the Church gathered from the "worthy".

The great force of the idea of a "gathered" Church lies in the circumstance that, ideals aside, every Church is "gathered". The Apostolic Church was gathered from among the Jews and the heathen. The modern Anglican priest gathers the remnant of those who have been baptized in infancy, and presents them for confirmation. The alternative to "gathering" is, in practice, compulsion. This

Browne saw clearly to be undesirable, not merely because it was cruel, but because it was likely to result in an insincere travesty of service to God. Browne was therefore an opponent of "forcing". But Browne did not believe that the Church was powerless. Rightly preached by someone commissioned by God for the purpose, or pronounced by the Church in the processes of Discipline, the Word of God was a power upon earth to bind and to loose as effective as it was for the same purposes in heaven. It was the only power the Church needed. It could save and it could condemn. It exerted its pressure upon the conscience, and not upon the body, and where the conscience yielded to the pressure, it produced holiness of life. Apart from this form of compulsion, Browne would acknowledge only a voluntary response to God as having any value. Here Browne was surely right; mere outwardness in religion can hardly be classed as holiness.

One of the dangers which besets any attempt to bring about a growth in the holiness of Christians by means of Church Discipline is that the gross and obvious sins are thereby made to seem more serious than the inward sins of the human spirit which, in fact, are no less "deadly". This is because only the known sins can be made subject to Discipline; the rest remain a secret between the sinner and God. But Browne's teaching was not the only one to be open to this criticism. Cartwright's was also open to it, and so was the Discipline of the canon law. The only remedies are either to abandon Church Discipline altogether, which appears to be the method most used in modern times, or to recognize the danger and

guard against it by careful instruction.

It was a defect of Browne's presentation of his case that he left the impression that the results to be obtained from the Church's exercise of Discipline were of less importance than the method by which those results were reached. He recognized no other system of Discipline as allowable, or even as effective, but only the system supposedly laid down by Christ in the Gospels. It was over this point that Bredwell defended the canon law, pointing out that the intention of that law was to produce some degree of holiness in communicants, and its partial success. We do not know what Browne replied to this argument, but it can be inferred from the rest of his teaching that he would have denied that anything the canon law might achieve could be acceptable to God, or could deserve to be designated "holiness". Since we have not Browne's answer available, however, it would be unjust to press this too strongly against him.

Browne achieved something of real value when he rescued from near-oblivion the idea of the total membership of the Church as the corporate agent of God in the world, and gave adequate expression to this idea in his form of Church government. It was not that Browne conceived the idea of the "priesthood of the laity", as though the laity might be considered apart from the ministry; he taught rather the priesthood of the whole Church, layman and minister together. Cartwright had the same idea, but failed to give it adequate expression. He confined the laity to the election of officers and to authorizing or prohibiting the more important proposals of those

officers, where Browne admitted every Church member to the counsels of the Church and to a full participation in the exercise of her authority. For Whitgift the authority of the Church was summed up in the authority of the "godly prince". The laity were to play a purely passive role; the ministry received its calling from God, but where, when, and how it was to exercise that calling, or if it was to exercise it at all, was to be decided by the Queen. Nor was the Queen the representative of the Church; she was rather the representative of God ruling the Church by divine right. In her government of the Church she ought to consult the ministry and be guided by its advice, but she was under no necessity to consult the laity.

It was, in fact, the kingship rather than the priesthood of the Church that Browne emphasized, for he stressed the right of the Church to rule her own life even more than he stressed the duty of offering up spiritual sacrifices to God. But he conferred this royal status also upon the individual Christian, and in doing so was not entirely consistent with his teaching about the authority of the Church as a whole. An individual might decide when a Church was not a Church, and might legitimately desert it when his decision was adverse. But on the other hand the Church was over any particular Christian, over any particular officer, and even over an Apostle. If, by saying that the Church was over an Apostle, Browne meant that the Church, as represented by the whole number of the Apostles, was "over" any single one of the Apostles, little can be said against his idea. But if he meant that the Churches founded by, for example,

St Paul, were "over" that Apostle, then he is wrong. There is a sense in which the Church must always be under the Apostles and be directed by their teaching, and this applies to individual Apostles as much as to the whole number of them. The Churches to which St Paul wrote were clearly expected to be subject to his doctrine and guidance, as his epistles show. Here Browne placed too much stress upon the authority of the whole Church. Elsewhere, in treating each Christian as a king in his own right and in isolation from the royal status of his fellow-Christians, Browne over-stressed his individualism. Is the royal priesthood of the Church nothing more than the pooled status of her individual members, or are the members kings and priests in so far as they share the status which belongs to the Church as a whole, but which they do not possess as individuals in isolation from the Church? Browne's individualism would leave each Christian as a Church in himself, with power to unchurch any other Christian or group of Christians.

Browne felt that the contamination caused by the presence of evil in the Church was so serious that it out-weighed any good there might be. Thus if a Church were partly disobedient in its "outward profession", if, that is to say, a part of its polity did not conform to the polity supposedly laid down by Christ, then that disobedience was sufficient to destroy the virtue of any obedience shown in the remaining parts of the "outward profession". Thus the Church of England was no Church, and could contain no good thing, because she was disobedient to Christ in her methods of Discipline.

In the same manner, the presence of a known evil-doer at the Communion was sufficient to destroy the validity of that sacrament and, if the Church refused or neglected to expel him, sufficient to ~~make~~ make that Church no Church.

The idea of communicated defilement is prominent in the ceremonial law of the Old Testament, but it is not a characteristic of the Gospel. One of the Jewish complaints most frequently made against Jesus was that he was an associate of publicans and sinners, i.e. of the unclean, but the implication of the Gospel narratives is that he was not contaminated by this association, nor yet by physical contact with the leprous, who were another type of the "unclean". St Paul, it is true, demanded the separation of the incestuous member from the Corinthian Church, but, as Bredwell suggested, it is one thing to do this because there is a danger that such a man might corrupt the rest, and quite another thing to do it on the ground that immediately, inevitably, and automatically, he had corrupted the rest. In this case Browne took the example of St Paul's conduct in one set of circumstances and made out of it a general rule covering all circumstances. But St Paul was dealing with a Church whose members had only recently been converted from the low standards of ^{paganism} ~~paganism~~, and who were in danger of being corrupted by the presence of the wrong-doer. There was no reason to suppose that he would have made the same demand for the separation of the offender from a congregation well able to resist any bad influence such a man might exert. Browne, by making his general rule, quite disregarded the possibility that a congregation might exist in which there would be very little danger

of corruption by the continued presence of such a person, and in which it might be right to retain him for his own benefit.

Browne's use of the Scriptures was unsatisfactory. In the interests of his ideas he suppressed, as we have noticed, a portion of Psalm cxlix, and in a way quite the opposite of the Apostle's clear meaning interpreted St Paul's injunction to shun the company of a Christian who was a fornicator. He misunderstood an incident in Jeremiah's career, and out of his misunderstanding created a precedent from which a divine law of general application was to be inferred. He also manufactured, without warrant of Scripture, figures of the spiritual government of Christ out of the Kings of Judah. But perhaps his worst misuse of Scripture was the way in which he applied Christ's command in Matt.v.24,

"If therefore thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."

Browne supposed that he had not only to do this duty himself, but also to see to it that others did the same. If anyone offended against him, that person must not offer a gift to God until he had first begged Browne's pardon. Moreover, Browne must not forgive him until he had expressed his repentance, and must not join in the offering because it would be an offering of a kind which God had forbidden. Browne must, however, be merciful; he must, if he could, make the offender repent. To do this he must put him through the various stages of the Discipline, private admonition, rebuke before witnesses, and finally "telling the Church". If the offender still

did not repent he ought to be excommunicated, but if the Church refused to excommunicate him, or had not the power to do so, then Browne was at liberty to forsake that Church, for it had proved itself to be no Church. But on no account must Browne join in worship with one whom he knew to be unrepentant.

In this way Browne brought private offences under the Discipline, where Cartwright had been content to confine its application to offences which were public knowledge. It does not seem to have occurred to him that he could short-circuit the whole matter merely by obeying the commandment to forgive his enemies.

There appears to have been a development in Browne's ideas about Eldership. So far as can be judged from his somewhat muddled account of the foundation of his congregation at Norwich in 1580 and its subsequent behaviour at Middelburg, the "guides" that were appointed never had the authority over the congregation that Cartwright gave to the Elders. By 1588 Browne seems to have thought that there was no need to have "guides" or Elders in any formal sense at all, even though the title and office were scriptural. Eldership was a function of the Church as a whole, and any Church member might exercise it informally by virtue of his membership. It was unnecessary to insist upon the election of Elders; all that was needed was that the Church should accept the work of those who exercised the function. Consistency must not be sought in Browne, for he was engaged in special pleading, but here he seems clearly to have provided for something which he would in 1580 have described as a "corrupt ~~mk~~ outward profession."

Bredwell had not a great deal that was new to add to what Cartwright had already said about Brownism, all the more so because his purpose was to defend Cartwright rather than to open up fresh ground for controversy. He did, however, introduce the identification of the Catholic Church with the invisible Church of the elect, thus revealing that he had little idea of the visible Church as a single world-wide society. Instead, he saw the visible Church as a number of parish congregations, each of them a Church in its own right. No doubt he would think of them, as Cartwright did, as federated together under synods and councils, but basically he was, like Browne, a congregationalist, even though his congregationalism was parochial and not "gathered".

Bredwell made considerable play with St Paul's metaphor of the body as a description of the Church, and it is noticeable that he reached a Cyprian-like conclusion from his use of this metaphor. Outside of Christ's body, there could, he thought, be no life from Christ. For Bredwell the parish congregations of the Church of England comprised the Body of Christ, and we have here, without question, the reason why he and Cartwright and other of the more moderate Puritans resisted the temptation to go into separation. The Elizabethans had no long or wide experience of schism, or Bredwell's conclusion might have been different; he might have given a wider interpretation to the idea of the body of Christ if he had seen the life of Christ at work outside, as well as within, the Church of England.

Bredwell's advice to W.F. on how to discharge her conscience of

the responsibility of seeming to condone sin if she communicated with people whom she knew to be sinners was grotesque. He would have had her survey those who were to join with her in the Holy Communion and pick out those in whom she discovered a fault. To these she was to make it plain, if necessary before witnesses, that she disapproved of them. If all the communicants behaved in the same manner, then each celebration of the Lord's Supper must have been preceded by a bout of mutual recrimination, and only when that was ended would the communicants feel that it was safe for them to receive the sacrament of unity. It seems that Bredwell did not consider the example of a good life and a refusal to imitate the sins of others a sufficient rebuke to the wicked, nor yet an adequate testimony to that detestation of evil which a Christian admittedly ought to display. But Bredwell hit a relevant nail upon the head when he told Browne that the chief reason for being given the status of a king was that a Christian might, under Christ, rule his own life, and not that he might engage himself in the task of espying motes in other people's eyes. This was something which needed to be said many times in Puritan circles for, if Bredwell is to be believed, there were many Puritans behaving as he advised W.F. to behave.

SOME ELIZABETHAN CONTROVERSIES

ABOUT

THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY.

Part VI.

Hooker v. Travers and others,

Whitgift intervening.

Part VI.

Hooker v. Travers and others,
Whitgift intervening.

I.

In John Whitgift Queen Elizabeth found at last an Archbishop to her liking. He was convinced of the rightness of the settlement of 1559, and was determined to uphold it. He was persuaded of the divine right of godly princes to exercise supreme authority in causes ecclesiastical, and was ready to defend that authority against any who might challenge it. He was a disciplinarian (in the non-Puritan meaning of the word), and had no qualms about imposing his will upon others. He feared only God and the Queen, and in earthly matters, so long as he had the Queen's support, he would dare all. He received that support, and the Queen, on her part, received his loyal service.

Whitgift's task when he was translated to Canterbury might have driven a less stout-hearted man to despair. His difficulties were summed up, rather inadequately, by Strype in these words:-

"Now (under the former Archbishop's suspension and neglect at Court) the courtiers and honourable personages took their opportunities to get their friends and their creatures whom they pleased, into places and preferments in the Church; which ought to have gone through the Archbishop's hands, or by his advice, and the persons to have been such as should have had his approbation for learning and affection to the established order. Whereas many of these who were preferred, were such as little cared for episcopacy, and the divine service settled by law; and so the sectaries by this means got strength. And many of them were planted, not only in his province, but in his own diocese of Kent... And he had great application of gentlemen to him in their behalf; that he would connive at them in their

"non-compliances with the laws of the land. But when our Archbishop (Whitgift) came in place, the courtiers and gentry found their power in dispensing benefices shortened; which created him divers great enemies, when he hindered their sway, as formerly. Whereupon they, with others, linked themselves against him, and gave him many thwarts at the Council Board, now at the beginning of his government." (1)

If Grindal had had the Queen's ear he might have been able to prevent, for example, so unsuitable an appointment as that of William Overton to the See of Coventry and Lichfield. To obtain the appointment Overton paid one person 1000 marks, and promised another £20 p.a. (2) for life. Burghley complained that Overton had

"made seventy ministers in one day for money: some tailors, some shoemakers and others craftsmen. I am sure the greatest part of them are not worthy to keep horses." (3)

As soon as he was installed in his See, Overton tried to finance his episcopate by means of forced loans from the Dean and Chapter of his Cathedral, and became involved in a bitter quarrel with them when they resisted his demands. (4) Not the least of Whitgift's difficulties arose from the presence of such men in high office in the Church. He had not only to deal with rebellious Puritans, but also to remove, so far as he could, the disgrace brought upon the Anglican cause by ignorant, worldly, and sometimes bad-living clergy.

In his efforts to discipline the Puritan clergy, Whitgift came into conflict with the Privy Council. Some of the Councillors were themselves Puritans for theological reasons. Others hoped to benefit financially if Puritanism triumphed, for then the Bishops might be

(1) S.W.i.226 (2) Neale, Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1584 - 1601, 229f. A mark was worth 13/4d. (3) Ibid 71 (4) S.W.i.201ff. Burghley's complaints about Overton were somewhat hypocritical, for Overton was one of his own creatures, see S.A. III.ii.209f.

disendowed, and if that happened there would be pickings for those in power. Taking it as a whole, the Council was anxious to placate the Puritans for political reasons, for they formed a useful counterweight to any papist fifth column which might appear if some foreign ruler took up the challenge in the Pope's Bull of 1569, and tried to dethrone Queen Elizabeth. This fear of crypto-papist treason was shared by Parliament, and probably by a large proportion of the English people. It led to the clamour to have Mary Queen of Scots, the papist heir to the throne, executed. It led to the formation of the "Bond of Association", a secret society pledged to defend Elizabeth against any attempt to assassinate her or, if such an attempt should succeed, to destroy in turn the heir to the throne who would benefit from the assassination (i.e. Mary Queen of Scots) and to prevent the accession of anyone (i.e. James VI of Scotland) who might be heir-presumptive after the death of such a beneficiary. To this illegal and unconstitutional action even Burghley committed himself. (1) The same fear led ~~xxx~~ to the persecution of papists as papists and without discrimination between their religion and their politics. To be a papist came to mean that one was taken, ipso facto, for a traitor, and there were some who suffered a traitor's death without deserving it. In the face of all this fear that Elizabeth might become the victim of a popish plot it must have seemed absurd to the Council to alienate the Puritans, the very men who had the most reason to dislike papists and all their ways.

(1) Neale, Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1584-1601, 16ff.

To her Council and Parliament the Queen must have seemed most careless of the danger which lay in her papist subjects, although she was fully aware of the danger from outside her kingdom. For years she protected Mary, the very focus of treason, and finally yielded to the demand for her execution only after much hesitation and upon irrefutable proof of her guilt. Within her kingdom Elizabeth saw Puritanism as a greater threat than papistry to her authority. She foresaw that if in ecclesiastical matters she were controlled by the Church, the time would not be long before she was controlled in civil affairs, even more than she already was, by Parliament, and that would be the end of her personal rule. The example of Scotland showed her that if the Puritan clergy had the power to control her they would certainly use it, and therefore her hostility was directed against them rather than against the papists. Moreover, she did not believe that there was much danger of a papist fifth-column emerging. She thought that in the face of a threatened invasion by a foreign power her papist subjects would be loyal to her, and she had no wish to drive them too hard and so make traitors of them.

When the test came, Elizabeth was found to be right, and her government wrong. The Armada arrived in the Channel and the English papists were proved to be just as anxious to repel it as the English protestants. The Queen had read the minds of her subjects aright. Papist traitors there were, and even would-be assassins, but of any considerable fifth-column there was no sign at all.

(1) Bancroft, Dangerous Positions and Proceedings, 20ff.

In the process of disciplining the Puritans it was Elizabeth's task to shield her Archbishop from interference by Parliament, and she played her part without fail. The story of her conflict is a long one. Time after time she had either to stop the discussion of religion, or else to veto the Bills that arose from discussion when she was too late to stop it. The constitutional aspect of this struggle does not concern us here except in so far as there was a doctrinal question wrapped up in it. Parliament was the one and only assembly in the land in which the voice of the laity might be heard for the redress of grievances, but to seek the redress of religious grievances in Parliament was unconstitutional. Was the Queen's voice, even though that voice was supreme in the government of the Church, to be the sole expression of the will of the laity in matters of religion? The Queen believed it was, and for her lifetime she had her way. But her victory was not to become a permanent feature of the constitution.

There were certainly religious grievances in plenty for Parliament to discuss, for when Whitgift went to Canterbury in 1583 the Puritan Classical Movement was at the height of its powers under its able organizer, John Field. Members of the Parliaments of 1584 and 1586 were subjected to intensive lobbying by ardent Puritans who were in a position to point out that Whitgift was harrying and dragooning zealous and god-fearing ministers, while he barely molested the papists at all and scarcely seemed to notice the insufficiency, and sometimes the immorality, of the "dumb dogs".

(1) Neale tells the story in full in his "Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1584-1601".

Among the weapons prepared by Field and his associates was a survey of the clergy of many of the Dioceses, complete with comments upon the life and ability of each individual Incumbent. The survey was drawn up in tabular form for easy reference, and was circulated among the members of Parliament. ⁽¹⁾ Even after deducting a handsome discount for Puritan exaggeration and malice, the survey shows a shameful residue. But the implied antithesis between the injured innocence of the Puritan and the unpunished guilt of the Anglican is not convincing. Whatever the wickedness of the Anglican, it was no excuse for the lawlessness of the Puritan, nor any reason why gross ~~mis~~ disobedience should be tolerated. Nevertheless, Puritan propaganda found many sympathetic ears in the lower House, and brought that House into open defiance of the Queen's command not to deal in matters of religion. ⁽²⁾

The Privy Council was in a better condition to interfere with the Archbishop than Parliament could hope to be, and in 1584 it actually conducted its own survey of the clergy in parts of Essex. As a result of this investigation the Council wrote to Whitgift and the Bishop of London demanding that their "enormities" against the Puritan clergy be stopped. ⁽³⁾ Earlier in the same year (February 1584) Whitgift had been called before the Privy Council to answer for his treatment of the Puritans of Kent and Suffolk. Politely but firmly he declined to appear, pleading that he was answerable for his actions only to the Queen. ⁽⁴⁾

(1) 2P.R.ii.88-184. Neale, Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1584-1601, 61 (2) Ibid 82 etc. (3) S.W.i.329f (4) Ibid 250ff.

In August 1584 Whitgift was involved in a personal quarrel with Lord Burghley over the Puritans. The Archbishop was told that his methods were

"Too much savouring of the Romish Inquisition" and "not a charitable way." (1)

Later in the same month Burghley accused him of breaking a promise not to proceed as he had been doing, of acting in that way only so as to vindicate his writings against Cartwright, of wilfulness in refusing to alter his methods, and of revenging himself upon Burghley by treating Burghley's proteges with additional severity merely because they were his proteges.

Whitgift was not unmoved by these attacks, for they seemed to mark the end of his friendship with Burghley, but he was not to be influenced so far as to agree to alter his methods with the Puritans. In his reply he said,

"I have taken upon me the defence of the religion and rites of this Church; the execution of the laws concerning the same; the appeasing of the sects and schisms therein; the reduction of the ministers thereof to uniformity and due obedience. Herein I intend to be constant: which also my place, my person, my duty, the laws, her Majesty, and the goodness of the cause requireth of me: and wherein your Lordship and others (all things considered) ought, as I take it, to assist and help me... And if my friends forsake me, I trust God will not; nor her Majesty; who have laid the charge upon me, and are able to protect me: upon whom only I will depend... I am determind to my duty and conscience without fear. Neither will I therein desire further defence of any of my friends, than justice and law will yield unto me... In these public actions, I see no cause why I should seek friends, seeing they, to whom the care of the commonwealth is committed, ought therein to join with me." (2)

In course of time Whitgift's strength won him the respect of many of his contemporaries. Strype quoted a letter from the Earl of Leicester in which the Archbishop was thanked for his kindly reception of Cartwright upon the latter's return from the Netherlands in 1585. A similar letter of thanks followed upon Whitgift's merciful treatment of Fenn, another Puritan. In the former case, if not in the latter, Leicester's tone was, as Strype pointed out, tactful rather than sincere, for it was hoped to obtain a preaching licence for Cartwright. But the fact that Leicester tried to coax the licence out of Whitgift, instead of bullying it out of him as he would have tried to do with others, indicates that he knew the Archbishop not to be a man to be trifled with. (1)

A mere two months after their quarrel, Burghley, while charging some of the Bishops with worldliness, was careful to exempt Whitgift from the accusation, adding (according to Strype's paraphrase),

"Notwithstanding he had varied in his poor opinion from his Grace, in that by his order certain simple men had been rather sought by inquisition to be found offenders, than upon their facts condemned. Yet he affirmed that he did not, for all this, differ from his Grace in amity and love: but that he revered his learning and integrity; and wished that the spirit of gentleness might win, rather than severity." (2)

With their quarrel thus healed, Burghley had the Archbishop sworn a Privy Councillor in 1585, surely a mark of confidence in him. In this position Whitgift was able to deal at once, and face to face, with the most powerful critics of the Bishops and of himself. He could appear now before the Councillors, not as a defendant, but as an equal. (3) In course of time he had a following, and even a party,

(1) S.W.1.429f (2) Ibid 338 (3) Ibid 471.

(1)

in the House of Commons.

The first five years of Whitgift's primacy formed the critical period of his leadership of the Church of England; after that time had passed, circumstances worked in his favour. In 1588 both John Field, Puritanism's most able organizer, and the Earl of Leicester, its most influential ~~ex~~ supporter, died. In the same year the Armada failed of its purpose, and it was no longer politically expedient to placate the Puritans. Again, towards the end of the first five years the witty but scurrilous Marprelate tracts did more harm than good to the Puritan cause. As a result of these tracts a thorough investigation was made into Puritan activities, with the result that the Classical Movement was uncovered and many of its leading members, Cartwright among them, arrested and charged both with complicity in the publication of the tracts and with disobedience to the laws ecclesiastical in general. While they were in prison they were embarrassed by three crazy conspirators, Copinger, Hacket, and Arthington, who hatched a plot to establish Puritanism by force. Their fellow-Puritans gave them no support, but that did not prevent the three men from proclaiming Hacket as Messiah redivivus, come to reform the Church of England.

All these events either weakened or discredited the Puritan cause. Perhaps, too, the English people were growing tired of the protracted controversy and wanted to settle down quietly to benefit from the arrangements made for their religious life by their Queen. Whatever the reasons for the decline of interest in Puritanism, when a further

(1) Neale, Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1584-1601, 227 etc.

five years had passed, Whitgift's battle was virtually won. In 1593 Parliament, which had so often upheld the Puritans, passed an Act against them. If they resorted to conventicles, or absented themselves from Church, or questioned the Queen's supremacy in the Church, they were to forfeit their goods and abjure the realm, and if they returned without permission to do so, they were to be treated as felons. A similar Act against papists was somewhat less severe. The wealthy among them were to remain within five miles of their homes; only the poor were to abjure the realm. True, the Act against the Puritans was more likely to affect the Brownists and Barrowists than the Cartwrightians, but it struck at the Classical Movement, whose meetings might be taken as conventicles, and to that extent was aimed even at the moderates. Ten years earlier it would have been unthinkable that the House of Commons should have passed such an Act.

No more thankless task ever fell to man's lot than Whitgift's, and his manner of performing it has earned him the dislike of many modern historians who have been too prone to regard him as hard-hearted, narrow-minded, bigoted, and ruthless. The latest to take up this attitude is Professor J.E. Neale, to whom Whitgift appears as "dour, with a streak of donnish arrogance", "a merciless persecutor", filled with "self-righteous, humourless obstinacy", "scorning his opponents as young, ignorant, and few", "a proud prelate". Whitgift's methods of obtaining conformity, Neale thinks, "alienate our sympathies"; they amounted to ~~the~~ "tyranny". And,

(1) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 492 (2) Ibid 498 (3) Neale, Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1584-1601, 281-294 (4) Ibid, 23, 219, 237, etc.

"probably only Archbishop Laud bears equal responsibility for the bitter hatred that remained so long attached to the name of bishop in the heart of Puritan England."(1)

Sympathy for the under-dog should not be allowed to deny justice to the top-dog. It may be conceded that Whitgift's actions did nothing to improve the relations between Anglicans and Puritans, but that does not mean that those actions were the cause of the hatred of episcopacy and the Bishops. The hatred was there when Whitgift was an unknown Fellow of Trinity, and was apparent in the Admonition of 1572. It pre-dated the accession of Queen Elizabeth and was directed, not without reason, against Bonner, the Marian Bishop of London. It was part and parcel of something much wider than itself, a fear and hatred of Rome and all its ways. It may be granted that Whitgift was dour and humourless, but the rest of Neale's accusations against him lose much of their point when it is remembered that he was at war. He saw the issues in simple terms of survival or annihilation. For nearly a quarter of a century the settlement of 1559 had been slowly dying. He was fighting to bring it back to life. If Anglicanism was to be preserved at all it must be preserved in his lifetime, and it could only be preserved by the destruction of Puritanism. Whitgift knew that he must either act as he did act, or do nothing at all and allow Puritanism to succeed. Probably only Queen Elizabeth deserves equal gratitude that the Church of England has retained the Book of Common Prayer and, in broad outline, still keeps the ancient forms of worship and govern-

(1) Neale, Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1584-1601, p.23

(2) Whitgift's writings are not enlivened by humour, and when Cartwright wrote anything a little lightheartedly, Whitgift rebuked him for jesting. (3) S.W.iii.114

ment which make her recognizably the successor of the Church of primitive and mediaeval times.

In his warfare Whitgift did not hesitate to use the weapons that lay to his hand. In 1584 he rejected a petition from the House of Commons to reform the Church along Puritan lines. Among the delegates of the House who presented the petition was Robert Beale, a Clerk to the Privy Council and an ardent Puritan. Some while later Beale wrote to the Archbishop,

"I remember that when as in the last session of Parliament, the Lower House pressed a reformation of sundry disorders yet remaining in the Church, your Lordship... in general charged the whole House with such malapertness, as though it become them not to deal with their betters... But when things cannot be answered in learning, nor justified by law, then is it common wont to charge men with malapertness, as though the Spirit of God and all learning consisted only in some few, and appertained nothing unto any others, which must be led as buffels by respect of persons, and not the verity of God's truth, as was the custom in Popery."(1)

Whitgift certainly does not seem to have been tactful on this occasion, but the time for treating Puritanism with learning and discussion had passed, and he was employing authority. As the constitution then stood the Commons were indeed "malapert" in dealing with matters of religion, and Whitgift was entitled to regard its intervention as an interference with his and the Queen's authority.

When Burghley accused him of handling the Puritans with too much severity, Whitgift replied,

"Not severity, but lenity hath bred this schism in the Church, as it hath done otherwise many other abuses; which I trust in time to redress. But the accusation of severity is the least thing I fear: if I be able to answer to the contrary fault, I shall find myself well apaid. The same severity (is that)

(1) S.W.iii.9lf.

"wherewith I kept Trinity College, and my late diocese of Wigorn, in good order. And for these divisions do I now also use it: though it is my hap, in this place, to be more partially judged of than I was there, as much more subject to that uncharitable company, who say, With our tongues we will prevail, Who is Lord over us? I would they were as well known to your Lordship as they are to me."(1)

The clue to Whitgift's severity lies in the final sentence of this quotation. He had found the Puritans to be impatient of compromise and impervious to reason, nor was he alone in this opinion of them. Hooker also found that they held to their views as though no other views could possibly be held, and bade them

"Think ye are men, deem it not impossible for you to err."(2)

This mentality of doctrinaire idealism was reflected in the Puritan impatience for reforms which must necessarily take years to achieve, and in the impracticability of many of their suggested measures for reforming the Church.

Of Puritan impracticability, Neale has provided a striking example. In 1584, under Puritan pressure, Parliament passed a Bill (which the Queen vetoed) to secure the better observance of one of the clauses of the Subscription (Thirty-nine Articles) Act, ~~1571~~ 1571. This clause required that no Deacon might be priested (and therefore might not retain a benefice with cure of souls)

"unless he be able to answer and render to the ordinary an account of his faith in Latin according to the said Articles, or have special gift and ability to be a preacher."(3)

This provision had become a dead letter, but the new Bill tried to revive it and also to extend it so that the trial of a minister's ability was to be made before a jury of twelve laymen. For

(1) S.W.1.340 (2) H.Pref.ix.1 (3) Gee and Hardy, op.cit.480.

"such as desire to be admitted to any benefice, not being qualified according to 13 Elizabeth," (1)

the punishment was to be a fine of £20, imprisonment for a year, and disablement for ever from holding a benefice. Mere failure in the examination, that is to say, was to be heavily penalized. When it was pointed out that the enforcement of the Act of 1571, quite apart from the new Bill, would lead to the deprivation of some two thousand Incumbents, whose parishes would then be without the sacraments and Christian burial, it was suggested that the Inns of Court might supply some men to take their places. This was a variant of the Puritan delusion that the Universities were teeming with young men anxiously awaiting invitations to staff the parishes of England. Some of the absurdity of the Bill was removed when it was pointed out that it was not meant to work retrospectively against those already beneficed, but even so one wonders how many astute young lawyers there were who would have been ready to risk a heavy fine and a term of imprisonment for failing in an examination, when the reward of success might well be a benefice worth no more than £8 per annum. Legal studies do not usually encourage recklessness of that kind! There was much indeed to be put right in the ministry, and not least its insufficiency of learning, but there were no short cuts that could usefully be taken. The Puritans had no practical suggestions to offer. From them there came only impatient denunciation of things as they were, and wild schemes, such as this Bill, which could only have turned bad into worse.

(1) Neale, Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1584-1601, 78.

Circumstances obliged Whitgift to handle the Puritans severely, but sometimes he was able, and willing, to combine conciliation with co-ercion. Both elements of his methods are to be seen in the eleven articles which the Archbishop, in consultation with his Bishops, drew up in the first weeks of his primacy, and which were then used in an effort to restore order in the Dioceses. In these articles some of the things about which the Puritans had complained were remedied. Ordination 'sine titulo' was no longer to be practised; the minimum qualification laid down in 1571 for admission to a benefice (i.e. an account in Latin of the contents of the 39 Articles) was extended to include a knowledge of the portions of Scripture upon which each Article was based. A Bishop who ordained anyone against these two provisions was to be forbidden to ordain again for two years. Commutation of penance by fines was greatly reduced, and even where it was allowed the offender was to make an open declaration of repentance in Church, either in person or through the minister.⁽¹⁾

When these articles were presented to the Queen in December 1584 for her approval, they had been expanded by the inclusion of a provision that excommunication might be pronounced only by a Bishop or a priest, and by another provision which restrained pluralities to those who were Masters of Arts, or of higher degree, and who were also preachers. Even so, a pluralist must reside on each of his benefices for a part of each year, and the benefices were not to be more than 30 miles apart if they were not within the same county.⁽²⁾

(1) Gee and Hardy, op.cit.481f (2) S.W.1.364ff, iii.130ff.

In December 1586 Convocation took steps to improve the learning of the inferior clergy. Since 1570 Nowell's Catechism had been the official text-book for

"such ecclesiastical ministers... as have not yet the perfect knowledge either of religion or of the Latin speech," (1)

and for whom Thomas Norton had translated it into English, although there is little sign that it had been much used for this purpose. Now, every non-preacher, if beneficed and below the degree of M.A. or LL.B., must read a chapter of the Bible each day and write a summary of its contents. He must also, once a week, do the same with one of the sermons in Bullinger's "Decades". Once a quarter he was to show his written work to a licensed preacher appointed to supervise him. Neglect of this study was to be punished by censure. The non-preacher was also to instruct the children of his parish in the (shorter) Catechism, and if in time he became reasonably competent at this work, he was to do the same for the adults. He was to continue in this way until such time as he should be fit to be tolerated, or even licensed, as a preacher. Beneficed Masters of Arts and Bachelors of Laws, if not already preachers, were given six months in which to qualify for, and obtain, a preaching licence. Otherwise they must submit to the same course of tuition as those with lesser degrees. Every preacher must preach at least twelve sermons a year, eight of them in his own parish. A double-beneficed preacher must deliver at least eight sermons a year in each of his benefices. Non-preaching Incumbents must provide sermons at least

(1) Nowell's Catechism, Parker Society edn, 108. Dixon, op.cit. V.349. W.i.336ff.

quarterly in their Churches, and must pay the preacher by providing him and his horse with a meal and his parish with a locum tenens (1) during his absence.

It is not difficult to detect the hand of Whitgift in these regulations. The scheme was sensible and practicable, offering inducements to effort and capable of producing, in time, a marked improvement where improvement was most needed. Because it was felt to be a satisfactory scheme of education, a final provision was the prohibition of all other exercises, public or private, and so an end was made, at least in theory, of the "prophesyings" in whatever shape or form they had survived.

The conciliatory side of Whitgift's activities was not confined to meeting, so far as they could be met, the legitimate complaints of the Puritans. His kindly treatment of Cartwright and Fenn has already been noticed. In December 1583 he spent three days at Lambeth Palace with a delegation of Puritan ministers from the Diocese of Chichester, patiently discovering for them interpretations which they might lawfully put upon disputed points in the Book of Common Prayer, and thus conform. By the third evening he had succeeded in his purpose, but one of the delegation, Underdowne, instead of spending that day with Whitgift, had been at Court. Underdowne denied that he had said anything compromising during his absence from Lambeth, but rumours spread about the Court that Whitgift had yielded to the delegation and was allowing its members to conform with qualifications and reservations. The Queen was naturally

 (1) S.W.iii.194ff

disturbed at what must have appeared to be the defection of her ally, and Whitgift, angered by the misrepresentation of his intentions, cancelled the licences he had promised to issue to the delegation. ⁽¹⁾ This incident, coming very early in his primacy, taught him not to trust the Puritans. Conciliation had been treated as surrender, if not by Underdowne then by some high personage at the Court. The experience made the Archbishop wary about using such friendly gestures in the future. He could not afford to run the risk of losing the Queen's confidence.

Whitgift was not, then, quite the hard, ruthless, tyrannical persecutor that he is so often supposed to have been. He was determined to end disorder in the Church, and to enforce the law. He was opposed by men of equal determination, and there could be no peace between the two sides unless one or the other gave way. There is no reason to blame Whitgift for faults which his opponents had in at least as great measure, nor to grudge him the partial victory he was able to win.

The co-ercive items in Whitgift's articles of 1584 began by requiring the enforcement of the laws against the papists (a fact which constitutes an answer to the Puritan slander that the Archbishop favoured traitors and heretics, and persecuted only the godly). Then, private meetings for preaching, reading, catechizing, etc, were forbidden unless they were meetings in the home attended only by members of the family. This was aimed at the "conventicle", which was described as a clear sign of schismatical intention, and

(1) 2P.R.i.210-220.

a cause of strife. Next, no minister might preach, read, or catechize at all unless, at least four times a year, he said the services and administered the sacraments as appointed in the Book of Common Prayer. This provision was aimed at those Puritans who showed their dislike of the Prayer Book by confining themselves to preaching, and who then claimed that they had altered nothing in the prescribed services. Again, everyone in ecclesiastical orders was to be clad in the prescribed garments, and no-one was to preach or expound the Scriptures unless he had been made Deacon or Priest according to the Anglican Ordinal. This clause was aimed at men like Walter Travers who, as will appear, had refused Anglican ordination. Finally, all the clergy were to sign their assent to three newly-drafted Articles of Subscription:⁽¹⁾

(i) They were to acknowledge the Royal Supremacy over all native-born Englishmen within the realm, ecclesiastical persons or other, and all foreign jurisdiction within the realm was to be denied. This article would entrap a papist, but by emphasizing the Royal Supremacy over persons rather than in causes, it was worded so that it would entangle a Puritan;

"Her Majesty, under God, hath and ought to have the sovereignty and rule over... persons... ecclesiastical."

(ii) Not only the Book of Common Prayer, but also the Ordinal, was to be acknowledged as not contrary to the Scriptures, and each signatory was to promise to use the Prayer Book "himself", and no other Book. Enmeshed in this net were Puritans who doubted the

(1) Knappen, op.cit.266, is mistaken in stating that these Articles were the same as those issued by Parker in 1571.

validity of Anglican orders, those who preached but never conducted services, and those who used the Genevan Prayer Book.

(iii) Each signatory was to assent to all the 39 Articles as agreeable to the Word of God, and no longer only to those Articles which dealt with the Christian faith and the doctrine of the sacraments, as had been required by the Act of 1571. Thus a Puritan could no longer avoid those Articles which ~~dealt~~ dealt with the Church's authority to decree rites and ceremonies, nor that which pronounced the Ordinal to be good and godly.⁽¹⁾

These three new Articles for Subscription were administered to the clergy in their Dioceses. Those who refused to subscribe were suspended and sent up to the Court of High Commission. It was the procedure in this Court that brought his ^greatest troubles upon Whitgift, and earned for him the reputation of being a tyrant and a persecutor. Under the Common Law a man may not now, and might not in the 16th century, be made ~~to~~ to utter under oath any statement that might incriminate him. This rule did not apply in the Canon Law,⁽²⁾ nor, as Whitgift pointed out, in the Court of Star Chamber⁽³⁾ and the Court of the Marches of Wales. Thus an officer of the Ecclesiastical Courts might, if he were proceeding in his official capacity and not as a private individual, require a defendant to take an oath to answer truly to any questions that should be put to him. Refusal to take the oath amounted to contempt of court, and the offender could be imprisoned.

(1) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 481 (2) S.W.iii.234 (3) Ibid. 109.

This procedure by oath "ex officio mero" had fallen into disuse in the Ecclesiastical Courts ~~and fallen~~ some while before Whitgift went to Canterbury, but he revived it as a weapon against the Puritans. Having taken the oath, a minister was then presented with an interrogatory composed of twenty-four complicated questions wherein he was charged with every offence against the laws ecclesiastical that a Puritan would be likely to commit. To some of the questions, no doubt, he would be able to give an answer that would satisfy the High Commission. On the rest he would stand condemned out of his own mouth, and then, if he failed to give an undertaking to mend his ways, he would be deprived.

Whitgift's action in this matter of the oath "ex officio" was entirely legal, but extremely unpopular. The secular lawyers attacked it; the Council and the Commons denounced it; Burghley likened it to the Inquisition; but Whitgift stuck to it. The Puritans had, all along, maintained that the Canon Law was a popish usurpation of that Discipline which rightly belonged to ministers and lay Elders in a parish seigniories. Now their associates in the legal profession began to attack the Canon Law as an infringement of that liberty which the Common Law guaranteed to the Queen's subjects. In fact, the Canon Law was a parallel branch of the law, independent both of Common and Civil Law. If the Puritans had had their way they would have set up a similar separate branch of the law, but it would have been even more independent than the Canon law was, for it would have stood by itself without the Queen, which the Canon Law did not do.

However offensive the oath "ex officio" might be, it was an effective weapon in the hand of an Archbishop who needed to employ every weapon he could find, and in its way it helped forward Whitgift's task. It cannot be claimed that by this means, or by any other, Whitgift succeeded, or could have succeeded, in healing the divisions within the Church of England. His achievement was rather that he perpetuated those divisions. Without him there might well have been unity, but it would have been a Puritan unity, not an Anglican one.

II.

While he was still at Worcester, Whitgift had heard of certain disorders at the Temple Church in London, and very early in his primacy, on 5th December 1583, he was reminding the Bishop of London of them. ⁽¹⁾ It was not long before his net began to encircle this centre of Puritanism, and his fishing in these waters had an indirect influence on the origin of that most famous and lasting piece of Elizabethan controversial literature, Hooker's "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity."

Alvey, the Master of the Temple, a former exile in Geneva, was growing old when Whitgift went to Canterbury, and was content to leave his Lecturer, Walter Travers, a free hand in the running of the Church. Travers, the son of a Nottingham goldsmith, though frail in body was strong in will and very sure of himself. In his Puritanism he was rather more extreme than Cartwright, and much more

(1) 2P.R.i.210.

prominent than Alvey. He had entered Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1560 at the age of twelve, and in 1567 had been chosen by Whitgift to be a Fellow of Trinity despite the fact that Whitgift's predecessor had rejected him because of his "intolerable stomach". He had become a Master of Arts in 1569, and should therefore have been ordained priest not later than 1576, the year before Whitgift left Cambridge for Worcester. He was not ordained, but gave up his Fellowship before he need have done. Whitgift found him so unbearable that he "wearied" him with punishments so that he left the College and travelled abroad. If he had not left of his own accord, Whitgift would have expelled him from his Fellowship for disobedience and obstinacy.

A letter of Cartwright's dated in 1574 shows that Travers was at that time in Geneva, and it was there that he wrote and published,

"Ecclesiasticae Disciplinae, et Anglicanae Ecclesiae ab illa aberrationis, plena e verbo Dei, et dilucida explicatio."

This work Cartwright translated into English, adding a Preface of his own. Both the Latin and English versions were printed in 1574. Two years later Travers, having received the degree of B.D. at Oxford by incorporation (which suggests that Cambridge had earlier awarded him the same degree), was appointed to the chaplaincy at Antwerp that Cartwright was later to hold, and was ordained as a minister in that city in the Puritan, i.e. the Genevan, manner.

(1) S.W.1.343 (2) Venn, op.cit.I.iv.262 (3) S.W.1.343. Whitgift made some strange appointments to Fellowships at Trinity. Besides Axton and Travers there was another extremist, Giles Wigginton. One wonders how much of their Puritanism was emotional in origin, dislike of the severe Whitgift leading to admiration for Cartwright the victim of that severity. (4) Scott Pearson, Thomas Cartwright, 434. (5) Venn, op.cit. 262.

In 1581 Travers returned to England, and after a brief period as Chaplain in Lord Burghley's household was elected ~~lecturer~~ Lecturer at the Temple Church. As the afternoon preacher in that famous pulpit he would inevitably have come to be regarded as a leader among the Puritans even if his book had not already won prominence for him at Cartwright's expense. The book was, in truth, a popular work, readable and comparatively brief. Cartwright's books were technical, lengthy, often involved, and full of reservations and qualifications. Moreover, Cartwright was far away in the Low Countries, and when eventually he returned to England it was to retire to the obscurity of the Earl of Leicester's Hospital at Warwick. Travers was at the centre. Thus Travers, rather than Cartwright, became the intellectual leader of the Classical Movement of which John Field was the chief organizer.

The Classical Movement sprang up spontaneously in many parts of the country after the suppression of the prophesyings. Puritan ministers, deprived of the public exercises, continued to meet in small groups in each others' houses, without the presence of laymen, for the study of the Bible and mutual admonition. Field's work lay in co-ordinating these detached groups or "classes" so that delegates from them met together from time to time, especially in London when Parliament was in session. This was the organization which resisted Whitgift's activities by showering Parliament and the Council with protests and petitions, and by inspiring the introduction of Bills for the reforming of the Church on Puritan lines.

One of the achievements of the Classical Movement was to draw up an agreed scheme of Church government and Discipline. In this work Travers played an important part. He drew up in Latin what was no doubt intended to be the final form of this scheme under the title of "Disciplina Ecclesiae Sacra", more commonly known as the "Book of Discipline"⁽¹⁾. But it is doubtful whether this was the final form of the Discipline. There had always been a good deal of difference among Puritans about the details of the Discipline,⁽²⁾ and Travers' form of it may be no more than a stage in its development. In an English translation, and in a revised and shortened version, the same scheme was published in 1644 as "A Directory of Church Government". The title page of this ~~version~~ version declares that the text was

"found in the study of the most accomplished Divine, Mr Thomas Cartwright, after his decease; and reserved to be published for such a time as this."

It may be that Cartwright performed a second act of translation for Travers, but if he did, he also incorporated some further thoughts of the "classes" on the plans co-ordinated by Travers in the Latin version.⁽³⁾

A form of subscription in English concluded each version of the "Sacred Discipline". These forms differ from each other verbally and in length, but the tenor of each of them is the same. In

(1) Not to be confused with Travers' earlier work of 1574. An account of the "Book of Discipline" and of the activities of the Classical Movement is to be found in Bancroft's "Dangerous Positions and Proceedings", 67ff. (2) C.25 (3) Paget, Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, has the Latin version at pp.238-251.

Travers' version the signatories

"affirm (this Discipline) to be the same which we desire to be established in this Church, by daily prayer to God: which we promise... by humble suite unto her Majesty's honourable Council and the parliament, and by all other lawful and convenient means, to further and advance, so far as the laws and peace and the present estate of our Church will suffer it and not enforce to the contrary. We promise to guide ourselves and to be guided by it, and according to it." (1)

This very moderate form of subscription seems to show that Travers, like Cartwright, was prepared to work for the Discipline, and even to practice it as much as he might, from within the Church, but not to go into schism for it. How far he was prepared to obey enactments to the contrary of the Discipline he had set down will appear in due course.

In 1584, when Travers had been at the Temple for three years, Alvey died. Either during the old Master's last days or in the period before the new Master was appointed, Travers attempted to make some changes. It had been the practice at the Temple to administer the Holy Communion to the communicants as they sat in their seats. One Sunday, without previous warning, Travers ordered the communicants to walk around the Table as it stood in the Chancel, and to receive the Communion as they went. Part of the congregation obeyed, but the rest remained where they were, and demanded that the old way should be kept. Travers had, perforce, to send his assistant curates to administer to the dissidents, and was unable thereafter to persuade them to accept his direction in the matter. Rather than yield to them, he celebrated the Holy Communion no more, and

(1) Paget, op.cit.74f.

became a preacher only, leaving his assistants to officiate at all the services. He also tried to turn the relievers of the poor at the Church into a kind of unofficial Eldership which should examine the morals of the congregation. But in this project, too, he was defeated, and did not fail to show his displeasure. (1)

Travers was not without his following at the Temple and they, along with the dying Alvey, persuaded Burghley to influence the Queen to appoint the Lecturer as the new Master. Whitgift opposed the appointment, although he professed his willingness to agree to it if Travers would mend his ways, show that he had been episcopally ordained, and subscribe to the three Articles of 1583 as other of the clergy had done. He doubted, however, whether Travers would fulfil these conditions, and he also doubted whether a majority of the congregation wanted as Master a man who neglected his reading, (2) and whose lectures had been barren of matter. The Archbishop recommended one Bond for the Mastership, but the Queen preferred Richard Hooker, a nominee of Sandys, the Archbishop of York, and appointed him early in 1585.

Hooker, who came from the West country, was only thirty-one years old at this time, six years younger than Travers, to whom he was distantly related by marriage. In childhood he had been a protege of Bishop Jewel, and had been successively chorister, clerk, scholar, and Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In this College he

(1) H.K.iii.573. (2) S.W.i.344. The remark about "neglect of reading" might be taken to refer to Travers' refusal to read the services, but Whitgift had already mentioned his "contempt of the prayers", and what he said about Travers' lectures suggests that by "neglect of reading" he meant "neglect of study".

had been tutor to Edwin Sandys, the son of the Archbishop of York, with whom he formed a life-long friendship, and to whom he owed his appointment to the Temple Church. In 1584 he became the Rector of Drayton Beauchamp, in Buckinghamshire, a benefice which he held for but a brief period before moving to London. (1)

Hooker has left an account of what happened on the Saturday evening before he preached his first sermon in the Temple Church. Travers who was staying on as the afternoon Lecturer, visited him in the company of two gentlemen whom he introduced as

"joined with him in the charge of this church, though not in the same kind of charge with him." (2)

If these gentlemen had been assistant curates at the Temple, Hooker could very easily have said so. The implication of the manner in which he referred to them is that they were laymen, and the way in which Travers introduced them strongly suggests that some sort of unofficial Eldership had been set up despite Travers' earlier defeat in the matter, and that these two were representatives of that Eldership. (3) Their presence meant that Travers was about to deliver himself of an admonition before witnesses, and so it turned out to be. He advised Hooker not to preach until the congregation had been invited to approve his appointment, and he offered to put the new Master's name forward for this approval.

Hooker replied with a courteous refusal. In a place, he said, where there had been such a custom in the past, he would not alter it, but at the Temple, where there had been no such custom, he would not introduce it. (4) This appears to be, at first sight, much.

(1) Morris, Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity (Everyman edn), Intro. v. (2) H.K.iii.571. (3) See Bancroft, Dangerous Positions, 115f. (4) H.K.iii.571.

too judicious a reply. Hooker would surely have been justified in turning down Travers' suggestion without any qualification. The clue to his attitude, and to many of the other things at the Temple Church, lay probably in the circumstance that the place was exempt from episcopal jurisdiction. To a considerable degree the Master could devise his own arrangements. Thus Alvey had the communicants sitting to receive the Lord's Supper, instead of kneeling, and Travers could direct them to receive walking, both apparently without interference from the Bishop of London. Again, Travers had not, when the Mastership fell vacant, subscribed to Whitgift's three Articles, and there does not seem to have been any idea in Whitgift's mind that he could compel him to subscribe by threat of deprivation. Whitgift clearly had a difficult task ahead of him if he was to bring this Church into conformity.

Hooker said that his refusal to comply with Travers' admonition was followed by a smear campaign against him, which some of his friends tried to end by calling the Master and the Lecturer together for a conference. At this meeting Travers mentioned the refusal of his suggestion as a matter of offence. He surmised that Hooker had conspired against him and was seeking superiority over him. He blamed Hooker for kneeling at prayer and communion, for praying for the Bishops, for praying before his sermons but not after them, and so forth.

(1)

The conference failed to bring peace between the two men, and Travers now began to use his sermons to contradict Hooker's teaching.

He said later that he resolved to pass over Hooker's minor errors and to deal only ~~with those~~ with those that seemed important. He would not go out of his way to correct even those major errors, but would deal with them only as they arose naturally out of his own text. Moreover, he would not mention in his sermons that he was deliberately contradicting his colleague. ⁽¹⁾ In this last resolve, if it was sincere, Travers showed himself to be astonishingly naive. Any attentive congregation, but especially one of the calibre of that at the Temple Church, must very quickly have realized what was going on.

On two occasions Travers sought Hooker out, and discussed with him their differences of doctrine on specific subjects. The matters they discussed are not relevant to present purposes, ⁽²⁾ but the manner in which the discussions were conducted affords a glimpse of the difference between the two minds. Travers supported his arguments with vague appeals to "all churches" and "all good writers". When challenged to produce his authorities all he could do was to refer Hooker to a passage in Peter Martyr

"which came not near the question by many miles".⁽³⁾

When, in his turn, Hooker was challenged to produce authorities for one of his statements, he replied, "reason". This would have been a damaging statement in an Elizabethan divine if he had meant, as Travers supposed he meant, "his own reason". The preacher must

(1) H.K.iii.558 (2) They were, whether things perceived by faith are as certain as things perceived by the senses, and, whether God's election to salvation is absolute or conditional, etc.
 (3) H.K.iii.592.

expound the Scriptures, not adulterate them with his own speculations. Hooker therefore found it expedient to explain that he had meant

"true, sound, divine reason... Reason proper to that science whereby the things of God are known; theological reason, which out of principles of scripture that are plain, soundly deduceth more doubtful inferences, in such sort that being heard they neither can be denied, nor anything repugnant unto them be received..."(1)

After these further conferences Travers seems to have abandoned Hooker as a hopeless case, and there were no more attempts at reconciliation. Instead, there came a Sunday morning in 1586 when Hooker asserted that there were some points of doctrine, and even some points of the doctrine of justification, wherein papists and protestants were agreed. That afternoon Travers preached his sermon as prepared, but in a short extempore addition to it contradicted what Hooker had said in the morning, although still without mentioning Hooker by name.

On the next Sunday morning following, Hooker repeated what he had said a week earlier, and Travers contradicted him again in the afternoon.

Hooker was a peaceable man.

"I take no joy in striving", he wrote. "I have not been nuzzled or trained up in it. I would to Christ they which have at this present enforced me hereunto, had so ruled their hands in any reasonable time that I might never have been constrained to strike so much as in mine own defence... There can nothing come of contention but the mutual waste of the parties contending, till a common enemy dance in the ashes of them both..." (2)

But peaceable though he was, he was not to be trodden down by the

(1) H.K.iii.594. As will appear, Hooker was later able to find a place for his "own reason" in his theology. (2) Ibid. 596.

man of "intolerable stomach". He went into the pulpit on the following Sunday, and defended and emphasized the doctrine which Travers had attacked.

Travers was by now thoroughly aroused, and seems to have lost his head. In the pulpit that afternoon he addressed himself to the Master in person, mentioning him by name but, to quote his own words,

"without any immodest or reproachful speech to Mr Hooker... Notwithstanding I knew well what speech it deserved, and what some zealous and earnest man of the spirit of James and John, sons of thunder, would have said in such a case; yet I chose rather to content myself in exhorting him to revisit his doctrine."(1)

The undignified scenes might have continued indefinitely, but Whitgift had no doubt been informed of their progress, and had all along been awaiting an opportunity to dislodge Travers from his stronghold. By his indiscreet conduct the Lecturer had delivered himself up, and before he could enter the pulpit again he received a letter from the Court of High Commission inhibiting him from preaching either at the Temple Church or elsewhere. The inhibition was issued without any hearing of the case, a circumstance which lends colour to the idea that Whitgift had been kept informed of what was going on, and had waited for Travers to over-reach himself.

(1) H.K.iii.596.

III.

Travers contested his inhibition with a "Supplication" to the Privy Council to have it removed. This document, which has already in part been quoted here, was copied and widely circulated in manuscript among the congregation at the Temple, to Hooker's discredit. (1) Hooker had therefore to make some defence of himself, and this he did in a lengthy letter to the Archbishop. The letter was intended, perhaps, more for the Privy Council than for Whitgift personally, for the Archbishop was himself a Councillor, and would no doubt be Hooker's defender when the matter was raised.

Travers revealed that the High Commission had given two reasons for inhibiting him:-

(a) He was not "lawfully called to the function of the ministry, nor allowed to preach according to the laws of the Church of England."

(b) He was guilty of "indiscretion, and want of duty" in that he had "inveighed against certain points of doctrine taught by" Hooker "as erroneous, not conferring with him, nor complaining to" the Commission. (2)

The first of these reasons dealt with Travers' ordination (his calling "to the function of the ministry"). It will be considered later in connection with another document. This first reason also mentioned that Travers was not lawfully allowed to preach, that is, that he was not licensed. Travers admitted that this was true, but he produced two letters testimonial from the Bishop of London to the Inner Temple, written evidently in 1581 when Travers was appointed Lecturer. Without these testimonials Travers would never have been elected to his position, and he considered them a suffic-

(1)
 ient authorization in law for his work as a preacher. If Whitgift was aware all along that Travers had not been formally licensed, it is strange that he had not taken action ~~re~~ earlier to get rid of him, but perhaps it was felt that this defect was too much of a technicality to stand by itself as a reason for attacking a protege of Lord Burghley, and especially one who was officiating in a place exempt from episcopal jurisdiction.

Travers' ordination and licensing were no concerns of Hooker's, and in his Answer he avoided all mention of them. The indiscretion of contradicting another preacher, and the aggravation of that indiscretion by doing it from the same pulpit, however, touched Hooker very nearly, and he not only defended himself as to the matters about which he had been attacked, but also delivered a telling counter-attack upon Travers for his mis-conduct. First, he quoted the authority which forbade such behaviour, the Advertise-

(2)
 ments of 1565. The relevant section ordered that

"if any preacher... shall fortune to preach any matter tending to dissension, or to the derogation of the religion or doctrine received... the hearers (shall) denounce the same to the ordinary, or the next bishop of the same place; but no man openly to contrary or impugn the same speech so disorderly uttered, whereby may grow offence and disquiet of the people... And that it be presented within one month after the words spoken."(3)

Neglect of this provision was probably in the Commission's mind when it charged Travers with "want of duty". His "indiscretion" was that he had failed to confer with Hooker about their later differences, a thing which, however, he was not legally required to do.

 (1) H.K.iii.556 (2) Ibid 587ff (3) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 469.

After pointing to the Advertisements, and having asserted that other reformed Churches, including that of Geneva, had similar rules forbidding public disagreement among their preachers, Hooker exposed Travers' excuses for disobeying the rules. These excuses, Hooker claimed, might be taken as grounds for pardoning the breaking of the rule, but they could not be taken as a justification for breaking them, as though the breaking of them was right.

"His first reason of not complaining to the high commission is, that sith I offended only through an over charitable inclination, he conceived good hope, when I should see the truth cleared and some scruples which were in my mind cleared by his diligence, I would yield. But what experience soever he had of former conferences, how small soever his hope was that fruit would come of it if he should have conferred, will any man judge this a cause sufficient why to open his mouth in public without any one word privately spoken? He might have considered that men do sometimes reap where they sow with but small hope; he might have considered that although unto me... his labour should be as water spilt or poured into a torn dish, yet to him it could not be fruitless to do that which order in Christian Churches, that which charity among Christian men, that which at any man's hands even common humanity itself, at his many other things besides did require. What fruit could there come of his open contradicting in so great haste with so small advice, but such as must needs be unpleasant and mingled with much acerbity? Surely he which will take upon him to defend that in this there was no oversight, must beware lest by such defences he leave an opinion dwelling in the minds of men that he is more stiff to maintain what he hath done, than careful to do nothing but that which may justly be maintained." (1)

(1) H.K.iii.595f.

IV.

In his "Supplication" to the Privy Council Travers defended his ordination by a presbytery at Antwerp, and he repeated his defence in a memorandum addressed to Burghley. This memorandum is extant, and its value is enhanced because Burghley sent it on to Whitgift, who returned it with comments added in the margin. The memorandum shows that Travers gave the following reasons why he should not have been inhibited because of a defect in his calling to the ministry, and why he should not be ordained again according to the Ordinal in the Book of Common Prayer:-

(1) The making of a minister, once lawfully done, ought not, by the Word of God, to be repeated. In the Old Testament Aaron and the priests were appointed only once to their ministry, and so likewise in the New Testament were the Christian pastors and teachers. Scripture contained no example of a minister being appointed to the ministry a second time.

(3) Whitgift agreed that lawful ordination should not be repeated, but he did not agree with Travers' "Scripture" for this conclusion. The Bible certainly provided no example of a second appointment to the ministry, but neither did it provide any example of the prohibition of a second appointment which had been proposed, nor any prohibition in general of such second appointment. Therefore,

"These scriptures prove not the purpose."

(1) S.W.i.478 (2) S.W.iii.182ff (3) Whitgift did not make it clear whether he meant that, for scriptural reasons other than those given by Travers, ordination ought not to be repeated, or whether he meant that, for reasons other than scriptural reasons, it ought not to be repeated. Probably the latter correctly interprets him.

(ii) Christ's kingdom, Travers continued, transcended national boundaries. That kingdom would be divided and disunited if what had been done by Christ's authority in one nation were to be repeated in another.

Here Whitgift commented that, despite anything that Travers might say, the French (Calvinist) Churches would not accept as ministers those who had received Anglican ordination without

"a new kind of calling according to their platform."

(iii) To repeat a minister's ordination, Travers argued, would make his first ordination void, together with all confirmations, marriages, etc, performed by virtue of that first ordination. Moreover, if it was lawful to ordain a minister again when he passed from the country of his first ordination to another, then it must be lawful to baptize again or marry again a baptized person or a married couple when they entered England from abroad.

Whitgift's comment was a blunt denial that a second ordination implied the invalidity of the first, or of any acts done by virtue of the first. He denied, too, that there was any likeness between ordination on the one hand and Baptism and marriage on the other such as could justify similar action with the baptized and the married as with ministers.

(iv) Travers next appealed to the universal practice of Christendom. That practice had been that each Church accepted the ministry of clergy ordained in other Churches as lawful, providing those other

Churches were sound in faith. Thus St Polycarp, a minister of the Eastern Church, had travelled from Smyrna to Rome, and in Rome had been permitted to officiate as a minister without being ordained a second time.
(1)

Again Whitgift agreed, but pointed out that the Calvinistic Churches apparently did not. As for St Polycarp, his case and that of Travers were not comparable. St Polycarp had not gone to Rome so that he might be ordained, but Travers had despised Anglican ordination and

"ran to be ordained elsewhere, by such as had no authority to ordain him, to the contempt of the ministry of this Church, and the manifest maintenance of schism."

(v) Romish priests, Travers went on, officiated in any part of the Romish Church where they happened to be. Since the Reformation the Churches of the Gospel had mutually recognized each other's orders. Doctors of any University were recognized as Doctors in all other Universities. Scotsmen who had been ordained by presbyteries in Scotland had officiated, and were still officiating, in the Church of England, without episcopal ordination.

Whitgift replied that he did not know of any such Scottish ministers in the Church of England, but if there were any, their cases were quite different from Travers'.

(2)

(vi) Before Whittingham's case, Travers claimed, there had never

(1) Irenaeus, Adv.Haer.III.iii.4 (2) William Whittingham had been a Marian exile in Geneva, where he had helped with the preparation of the "Geneva Bible" and had written a preface to Goodman's "Superior Powers". He was one of those able Genevans who might have become Bishops if they had been less extreme in their Puritanism. Shortly after his return to England he became Dean of Durham. During a Visitation by Archbishop Sandys in 1578 Whittingham was challenged to prove that he had been ordained. He produced a document signed by eight witnesses to show that he had been elected by the

been any question of doubting the legality of ordinations effected overseas according to Calvinistic (i.e. Puritan) rites. In Whittingham's case nothing had been found against the law of God or the law of England, and he had continued in office until his death.

Whittingham, Whitgift replied, would certainly have been deprived if he had lived long enough. But even so, his case and Travers' were not comparable. Whittingham had been ordained by those in authority in a persecuted Church. Travers, not being under persecution, had refused ordination at home, and had gone abroad in order to receive an unauthorized ordination.

(vii) In his own favour Travers pleaded the Subscription (Thirty-nine Articles) Act, 1571, which allowed those ordained otherwise than by the Anglican Ordinal to retain their ministry in the Church of England provided that they subscribed to those of the 39 Articles which dealt with doctrine. Travers was entitled to claim that the letter of this Act was in his favour, but he could not do so without disregarding the intention of the Act. The Act was an answer to the Papal Bull of Excommunication of 1569. Subscription had been confined by it to the doctrinal Articles so that crypto-papists would

be enmeshed, but not Puritans nor former papists who had become sin-

 English congregation in Geneva, and ordained by that congregation according to the Genevan rite. The Queen had ordered Sandys to deprive Whittingham if his ordination turned out to be irregular, but when Sandys proposed to do this the matter was postponed in case the Church of Geneva (which, however, was not involved) should be offended, and it should seem that ex-papist priests were favoured more than a man so ordained. Whittingham died in 1579, before any final decision was made. It is doubtful if Whitgift was right in saying that he would have been deprived if he had lived. Whittingham's case was surely that of a man who had been legitimately ordained in an irregular manner in peculiar circumstances, and who should have sought and received a wider and more regular authorization upon his return to England. See S.A.II.ii.167ff.

cere Anglicans. The

"other form of institution, consecration, or ordering," (1) contemplated by the Act was the form used in the ordering of the Henrician and Marian clergy, and not the Genevan or any other non-Roman form. Whitgift was therefore justified in replying,

"When the like Act is made for Travers' ministry, then may he allege it. But the laws of this realm require, that such as be allowed as ministers in this Church of England, should be ordered by a Bishop, and subscribe to the Articles before him." (2)

(viii) Finally, Travers maintained that Grindal had known all about the ordination at Antwerp, and had been satisfied that it was allowable in England; that the Bishop of London (Aylmer) had also known about it, and had permitted Travers to preach at the Temple for six years without taking exception to it; and that Whitgift himself had not inhibited him for it until the trouble with Hooker had
(3)
arisen.

Whitgift's comment upon this part of Travers' pleadings shows that he had patiently tolerated Travers (perhaps because he could do no other) while Travers behaved himself, but that he had not, and could not, approve of the Antwerp ordination.

(1) Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 478. (2) Besides the Act of 1571 Whitgift was referring to the Preface to the Ordinal which was made a part of the law of England by the Act of Uniformity, 1559, and which contained the words, "It is requisite, that no man not being at this present, Bishop, Priest, nor Deacon, shall execute any of (these offices), except he be tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following." (3) The question of the Antwerp ordination had been raised by Whitgift himself when Travers had been a candidate for the Mastership of the Temple. Travers had at that time refused episcopal ordination (S.W.iii.115ff), but had not been inhibited.

Throughout his memorandum to Lord Burghley Travers argued upon the assumption that the congregation to which he had administered at Antwerp was a part of the Dutch Reformed Church. This was the same congregation as that to which Cartwright had ministered after Travers returned to England, and the congregation which Cartwright, in his open letter to Harrison, had assumed to be an overseas congregation of the Church of England. Whitgift, in his comments on Travers' memorandum, clearly agreed with Cartwright about the connection between the Antwerp congregation and the Church of England, for he wrote,

"Mr Travers, misliking the order of his country, ran to be ordered elsewhere, by such as had no authority to ordain him, to the contempt of the ministry of this Church, and the manifest maintenance of schism. And as well may Mr Cartwright and his adherents now make ministers at Warwick, to serve in this Church of England, as he and Villers might have done at Antwerp." (1)

There would have been no point in this remark unless Whitgift had thought of the Antwerp congregation as belonging to the Church of England, for the Dutch presbyters by whom Travers had been ordained certainly had authority to ordain within their own jurisdiction. But they had no authority to ordain Travers to the ministry of the Church of England. Equally pointless would be the comparison between the ordination of Travers at Antwerp and the hypothetical making of ministers at Warwick to serve in the Church of England, unless it

(1) Whitgift seems to say here that Cartwright was one of the presbyters who ordained Travers, and Strype had the same idea (S.W.i. 477f). Scott Pearson has shown that this is unlikely to have been true ("Thomas Cartwright", 176). De Villiers was a French reformer who spent some time in England and then migrated to the Low Countries. He may well have been involved in Travers' ordination, at least as an instigator of it.

was to be assumed that Travers' ordination had been carried out with the intention of appointing him to a ministry within the Church of England.

Scott Pearson has succeeded in showing what the status of the Antwerp congregation actually was, and what also was the intention behind Travers' ordination. ⁽¹⁾ The congregation was composed of English people, among whom was Davison, Queen Elizabeth's ambassador in Antwerp.

"It is obvious", Scott Pearson writes, "that Davison and his friends were working for the establishment of a Presbyterian Puritan Church among the Antwerp merchants."

There was an

"intended alteration of the exercise of common prayer in the English House at Antwerp, contrary or at least not agreeable to the received order of the Church of England."

Sir Francis Walsingham, the Queen's Foreign Secretary, who was himself a Puritan sympathizer, warned the ambassador not to proceed with the plan to presbyterianize the Antwerp congregation, or to quash it if it had already been put into operation. Before he left England on his journey to Antwerp Travers was made aware of the Foreign Secretary's opinion, and disregarded it. Walsingham's warning letter to Davison arrived too late, for it was on the very day that it was written that Travers received his presbyterian ordination, and four days later was elected by the congregation as their minister. In all this transaction there was a deliberate intention to act in a manner contrary to the practice of the Church

(1) "Thomas Cartwright", 171-177.

of England. Travers was aware of the intention, and was a party to it. Whitgift was therefore not without justification when he declared that Travers had acted

"to the contempt of the ministry of this Church, and the manifest maintenance of schism."

Whitgift's comments in the margin of Travers' memorandum must be understood in the light of his knowledge of the nature of the Antwerp experiment in presbyterianism. He condemned Travers' ordination out of hand, but that did not mean that he condemned all non-episcopal ordination. If a minister of, say, the French Church, were to be episcopally ordained so that he might officiate in the Church of England, his episcopal ordination would ~~not invalidate~~ invalidate neither the actions performed by virtue of the previous presbyterian ordination, nor the presbyterian ordination itself. So far as the actions were concerned, Whitgift was allowing nothing new. Ever since the Council of Arles in A.D. 314 schismatical and heretical Baptism, and presumably also Marriage, had been accepted as valid even when the ordination of the officiant had been called in question. Whitgift went further than this by acknowledging the validity of the ordinations even of men whom he would have required to be ordained again, by a Bishop, before he would have allowed them to officiate in the Church of England. Thus Whittingham's ordination at Geneva had been valid for that time and purpose, but Whitgift obviously regarded it as an insufficient ordination to justify Whittingham's continuance in the ministry within the realm

(1) Greenslade, Schism in the Early Church, 116.

of England.

Thus Whitgift recognized the existence and validity of more than one type of ministry. There was the episcopally ordained ministry, in which the minister bore an "indelible character" and did not cease to be a minister when he had no flock to which he might minister. There was the presbyterian ministry which, if it followed Cartwright's principles, gave no permanent character to the minister, but regarded him as a minister only for so long as he exercised his ministry in a definite congregation. It was open to the Church of each nation to decide which kind of ministry it would have, and which kind of ministry was valid for its purposes. The Church of England had decided to have its ministers episcopally ordained, and was not to be blamed for requiring those otherwise ordained to be ordained again by a Bishop, just as the French Reformed Church required those who had been episcopally ordained to be ordained again by a presbytery. There ought to be mutual recognition of each other's orders, as indeed there was so far as their validity within their own sphere was concerned, but each Church had the right to decide how its ministers should be ordained, and to insist, as the French Church insisted, on ordaining in its own way ministers who had already been ordained in another manner. But there was no cover for Travers in this. Being within the Church of England, he had accepted a type of

(1) It is noticeable that in the Articles by which Whitgift at the beginning of his primacy attacked some of the abuses in the Church, the Bishop who ordained any man "sine titulo" was to be punished, but there is no hint that such an ordination was to be regarded as void. The ordination, that is to say, gave the ordinand a character quite independently of any congregation he might serve, even though it might be undesirable to give him that character unless he had a congregation to serve. S.W.iii. 130f

ordination which that Church did not allow, when he might have had that type of ordination which she did allow.

(1)

In his "Supplication" to the Privy Council Travers wrote a justification of his actions over the Antwerp ordination which, in view of all the circumstances, cannot be regarded as wholly accurate or completely frank, but then, of course, he was trying to put the best possible construction upon what he had done.

"The place of ministry whereunto I was called was not presentative: and if it had been so, surely they would never have presented any man whom they never knew."

Travers, that is to say, had to make himself known to the Antwerp congregation before he could expect to be appointed minister. But why had he not taken Orders from an English Bishop before setting out for Antwerp?

"The order of the Church (of England) is agreeable herein to the Word of God, and the ancient and best canons, that no man should be made a minister "sine titulo": therefore having none, I could not by the orders of this Church have entered into the ministry, before I had a charge to tend upon."

This consideration, however, had not prevented Travers from receiving ordination from the Antwerp presbytery before being elected to his cure, and thus remaining a minister "sine titulo" for four days! But why had he not, instead, returned to England after his election, and obtained episcopal ordination?

"When I was at Antwerp, and to take a place of ministry among the people of that nation, I see no cause why I should have returned again over the seas for orders here; nor how I could have done it, without disallowing the orders of the Churches provided in the country where I was to live."

(1) H.K.iii.555ff.

This seems, at first sight, to be reasonable. But it conveys a false impression. Travers was to administer to English people, not to Dutchmen. The true reason for his not returning to England was not the one he gave. He had already disallowed the ordination administered in his own country while he was still a Fellow of Trinity, and his concern not to disallow the Orders of the Dutch Church does not ring true. He was concerned, rather, to be ordained by a presbytery, or not at all.

Travers now turned from his Antwerp ministry to his Lectureship
(1)
at the Temple.

"I hope it appeareth, that my calling to the ministry is lawful, and maketh me, by our law, of capacity to enjoy any benefit or commodity that any other, by reason of his ministry, may enjoy. But my cause is yet more easy, who reaped no benefit of my ministry by law, receiving only a benevolence and voluntary contribution; and the ministry I dealt with being preaching only, which every deacon here may do being licensed, and certain that are neither ministers nor deacons."

The Antwerp ordination, that is to say, ought to be regarded as the equivalent in England of episcopal ordination to the priesthood. But if it was not to be so regarded, then Travers would be content to be looked upon as a lay preacher. In two respects his Lectureship did not fulfil the requirements of a title to Orders. Its duties entailed nothing more than preaching, and there was no secure and definite maintenance attached to it. Because it did not afford a title, nobody could require that the Lecturer should be episcopally

(1) This part of Travers' argument is obscure. If he was still referring to his ministry in Antwerp it is difficult to see what force the argument has. It has therefore been assumed that at this point he turned his attention from Antwerp to the Temple Church. On this assumption a relevant statement emerges from the obscurity.

ordained.

What Travers had to plead about his ministry at the Temple would be more convincing were it not known that he had behaved there as though he had been episcopally ordained to the priesthood, that is, that he had celebrated the Holy Communion. His request to be treated as a lay preacher must therefore be regarded as an after-thought, justified, no doubt, by the fact that preaching was the only duty the Lecturer was obliged to perform, but manufactured for the purpose of getting the inhibition cancelled.

Travers' "Supplication" did not succeed. He remained under inhibition, but the Benchers continued to pay him his honorarium and to provide him with lodgings at the Temple as late as 1596,⁽¹⁾ even though by that date he had been Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, for two years. He remained in Dublin for a further two years, and then there followed a long period of obscurity. In 1613 he became a preacher at All Saints, Hertford, where he stayed until his death in 1624.⁽²⁾ For eight years after his inhibition, however, he occupied his lodgings at the Temple, surely as a continuous embarrassment to Hooker.

(1) Sisson, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr Richard Hooker*, 22

(2) Venn, *op.cit.* I.iv.262.

V.

In the Preface of his translation of Travers' "Full and Plain Declaration of Ecclesiastical Discipline", Cartwright commended the work as having in it no personal attacks upon anybody, such as his own first "Reply" had made upon Whitgift. The book, nevertheless, contains some fierce assaults on the Bishops as a bench, along with severe criticism of the worship and organization of the Church of England. These attacks occur in lengthy digressions from the main theme of the work, and occupy well over half of its not very numerous pages. The technical details of the Discipline are stated in short sections, and without much argument in justification of them. All this makes the book easy reading, and it is not difficult to see why it became the favourite popular exposition of English Puritanism. The reader is not over-burdened with passages from the Scriptures and Fathers, nor called upon to decide the meaning of obscure passages from those authorities. The medicine, such as it is, is given in small doses at long intervals, and can readily be assimilated by the uncritical.

Travers derived many of his ideas from Cartwright, and it is needless to follow him in detail through all that he had to say on these matters. But, as Cartwright noticed in the Preface, there were some points on which they differed, and these are of interest.

(1) Bancroft, Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline, pp 225f, accused Cartwright of suppressing seventeen lines of Travers' Latin text because they spoke against the necessity of an order of Widows, which Cartwright favoured. Bancroft realized that Travers possibly consented to this omission, but thought that it ought to have been mentioned in the Preface. The lack of any mention of it gave an impression of greater agreement between Cartwright and Travers than there was in reality.

In common with most other theologians of his time, Travers identified the Church with the Kingdom of God, and so could speak of "the government of this Kingdom of his Church here."(1)

Out of this identification he made certain deductions. Thus ecclesiastical discipline was

"the polity of the Church of Christ ordained and appointed of God for the good administration and government of the same."(2)

The mode of governing the Church must necessarily have been appointed by Christ, for Christ is King in his Kingdom, and

"what doth more belong unto the name, office, and duty of a king than... to make such decrees and ordinances whereby all the parts of his kingdom may be maintained?"(3)

The New Testament declared Christ to be that expected prophet "like unto Moses",

"but how should we think him to be like unto Moses, if he either hath wholly omitted, or not so clearly and perfectly (as far as was needful for us) showed and declared this doctrine of the manner and governing of the Church, being so necessary, and which Moses hath so diligently and faithfully declared?"(4)

In Travers' opinion it was impossible to separate Discipline from Doctrine as Anglicans were wont to do. The two were identical twins.

"For they know not, I say plainly, they know not, who, being content with the doctrine of the Gospel, neglect discipline, that the disposition and nature of these two is like the disposition of two sisters who are twins, or of those brothers of whom Hypocrites speaks, who began to be sick together, and to amend together, so that for the natural inclination and disposition of the one towards the other, they were affected one with the other's health and infirmity."(5)

(1) T.12 (2) T.6 (3) T.10 (4) T.9 (5) T.14.

Like Doctrine, Discipline must be regarded as of the "esse" of the Church. For

"whereas I affirm that Christ hath left us so perfect a rule and Discipline, I understand it of that Discipline which is common and general to all the Church, and perpetual for all times, and so necessary that without it, this whole society and company and Christian commonwealth cannot well be kept under their Prince and king, Jesus Christ."(1)

Because God was the author of the Church's Discipline, that Discipline could not be regarded as among the "adiaphora". Therefore,

"it followeth that we have to fetch the rules thereof from no other fountains but from the holy scriptures."(2)

Certain Old Testament prophecies about the Kingdom of God were to be referred to the Church, such as those which said that all things were to be ordered by perfect justice and equity, that there was to be no Canaanite in the land, that the Gentiles were to be shut out of the city of God, and so on. The fulfilment of these prophecies

"we grant properly to belong to the kingdom of Christ in heaven after this life, yet are those prophecies not so wholly to be referred thereunto, but that they have also some relation to the beginning of his kingdom in this life."(3)

During the great Forty Days between the Resurrection and the Ascension, Christ taught his Apostles the Discipline.

"How carefully and how long (even for the space of forty days together) did he talk with his disciples touching his kingdom; for these are those charges and commandments which S. Luke and S. Matthew do write that he gave to his Apostles and Ambassadors,

(1)T.9. This was written in 1574. Ten years later Travers's attitude, like Cartwright's, had changed. When he compiled the "Book of Discipline" in 1584 he was willing to work for the Discipline from within the Church of England by all legal and constitutional means, but he no longer regarded the Discipline as essential to the existence of the Church. (2) T.6 (3) T.11

"of the administration of his government and his empire; and whereof he commanded them to give his subjects warning to keep them with all duty and reverence."(1)

The uniformity of the Apostolic arrangements for the government of the Church was to be taken as evidence that those arrangements came from a single source, the mind of Christ.

"How came it to pass that there was one order, form, and discipline of all the Churches which were founded by the Apostles, except they received the pattern from Christ himself, which they thought not lawful to alter and change?" (2)

St Paul established the same sort of discipline in the Churches of his foundation as the other Apostles had done in their's. But St Paul did not derive his discipline from them; he obtained it direct from Christ, which was further evidence that the Apostolic discipline was divine in origin.

"St Paul, seeing he no more received this part touching discipline from the Apostles than the rest of the Gospel... from whence, I say, received he all that form and order of establishing the Church by, except he were taught of Christ by revelation, as well concerning this as concerning the rest of the Gospel?"(3)

 (1) T.12. This is an astonishing statement to come from the pen of a Puritan divine, for it is the sort of thing which occurs quite often in Catholic theology, and something very similar to it was accepted by the Council of Trent, as Travers ought to have been aware. It cuts away the whole basis of the Puritan case that the Discipline was expressed in Scripture and not contained in a secret tradition committed to the Apostles.

(2) T.11f. This argument is very similar to the proposition of St Augustine against which Cartwright had inveighed so sternly, that whatever was universally observed in the Church must be of Apostolic origin. But Travers made the further assumption that there was a uniform discipline and order in the Apostolic Church.

(3) T.13. Here Travers assumed that St Paul imposed the same form of discipline upon his Churches that the other Apostles applied to theirs, and then assumed that St Paul had not learned it from the others. In each case the assumption depends upon Travers' flat assertion that it was so, without any evidence or argument to prove that it was so.

After making all these assumptions, however, and after erecting so many certainties upon so uncertain a foundation, all that Travers was able to hope for amounted to no more than an approximation to the supposedly precise form of Church polity laid down in Scripture.

"Let this be the first article of the new reformation, that all things be exacted (? enacted) as near as may be unto the Word of God; that our particular laws ground upon this foundation."(1)

Travers was very definite that an apostolic example ought to be taken as a rule in matters of Church government, and this applied to negative as well as to positive example. For instance, the Apostles and the Bishops of the primitive Church had not sought to become ministers, but had waited until they were called.

"These so notable and worthy examples let us esteem as a law made against ambition; which if we shall be so bold as to transgress, let us assure ourselves that one day in a most solemn court and assembly we shall be charged with ambition." (2)

Similarly, the Apostles appointed ministers only to definite charges; they had not ordained "sine titulo" and then left the ministers they made to pass their time in idleness.

"And for this same cause I think there is scarcely anywhere in the holy scripture mention made of Elders and Deacons, where together withal is not mentioned the name of the Church, place, or city, wherein they did exercise their office... And these be not only the examples of the Apostles, but the laws which they give us, and the commandments which they left us, to ordain Elders and Deacons in the Church as the necessity and state thereof shall require."(3)

Even an example from the Old Testament might be used as a source from which to gather a law for the Christian Church. David and Solomon had seen to it that priests and Levites were appointed to

(1) T.17 (2) T.35 (3) T.38

their proper seats, towns, and cities.

"Why do we not according to this example call home the priests to the Ark of the Lord, and the Levites to the appointed cities?"(1)

Why do we not, that is to say, abolish the offices of Diocesan Bishop, Archdeacon, etc, and put these clergymen to work in the parishes?

About the selecting of men to be ordained, Travers said,

"Our Saviour Christ was very careful, and therefore declared particularly and distinctly all things which appertained to the ordering thereof, for he hath perfectly and diligently showed both who ought to choose, and to whom especially this care ought to belong, and what ought to be followed and regarded in choosing of everyone."(2)

But in spite of the Lord's supposed care in this matter, Travers was forced to admit that there was a wide difference of opinion among Puritans themselves about what Jesus had laid down.

"This question and controversy of the choosers hath been diversely disputed of by learned men. Yet almost all of them consent in this, that so great and so weighty a charge ... ought not to be committed to the authority of any one, but be ordered and ruled by the judgment and consent of many."⁽³⁾

There was a further controversy about this power of selection.

"It is doubted whether this be equally permitted unto all, or only unto certain chosen men that exercise ordinary jurisdiction in the Church."(4)

Travers' own view was that the choosing should be done by the Elders, and their choice then submitted to the rest of the Church for ratification or veto. His reason for this compromise was

"so that herein there is no cause to complain that by the bringing in of the rule of the few, the majesty of the whole Church is diminished."(5)

(1) T.40 (2) T.45 (3) Ibid. Bancroft devoted chapters 4-19 of his "Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline" to an examination of the differences of Puritans among themselves about the details of the Discipline. (4) T.54 (5) Ibid.

In putting the power of choosing in the Eldership Travers, as he himself realized, was abandoning the apostolic examples of Acts vi and xiv where, in his view, the people had carried out the act of choosing. ⁽¹⁾ To justify this abandonment he argued that these two cases were exceptional, and not therefore to be treated as providing a precedent. In Acts vi the Seven had been elected by popular vote so that the electors might feel confident that the Church's alms would be fairly distributed. In Acts xiv the exceptional circumstance was that the Church was only then in its infancy. Combining this circumstance with the Social Contract theory of government, Travers was able to produce the following reason for not treating an inconvenient apostolic example as a law:-

"As in commonwealths, not only such where the people is to be made sovereign, or a few, but also even where the kingdom of one is to be established, before it be confirmed all the power is in the people's hands, who of their own free will choose magistrates unto them, under whose authority they may after be governed; and afterwards not all the people, but only the magistrates chosen by them administer and govern ~~the~~ the affairs of the commonwealth, so it cometh to pass in the establishing of the Church. So that when as yet there were none set over them, all the authority was in all men's hands, but after that they had once given the helm into the hands of certain chosen men, this power no longer belonged unto all, but only to those who were chosen by them to steer and govern the Church of God."(2)

Travers noticed that in Acts vi and xiv the Apostles exercised the power to impose hands with prayer, but he asserted that later, while the Apostles were still alive, and with their allowance, this power was transferred to the Elders. ⁽³⁾ From this transference he inferred another:-

(1) Travers translated *ἕρποντες* in Acts xiv.23 as "elect by show of hands", T.48 (2) T.55 (3) The reference appears to be to I Tim.iv.14. See T.71

"Why shall I not think that the power also of examining and doing of other things that pertain to the election is together with the other, translated unto them?"(1)

Upon this inference, combined with his professed concern for the majesty of the whole Church, Travers built up his idea of how the Church should set about choosing men for its ministry.

"Keeping the right liberty of the Church, I conclude out of the Word of God and the examples of the Apostles, that nothing be done, not only against the good will thereof, but also not without the consent and approbation of it. But we must keep also the just authority of the Elders, that they go before the people in the election."(2)

The act of ordination was not, to Travers, the admission of the ordinand to an order of ministers, or to a ~~king~~ status, or the conferring upon him of a "character"; it was rather his admission to an office in the Church, and was in some ways like an Anglican institution to a cure of souls. Thus he said,

"Ordination is a setting apart of the party chosen unto his office, and as it were a kind of investing him into it."(3)

If the imposition of hands in ordination was to be carried out by one person, then that person must understand that he was acting under the authority of the Council of Elders, for

"there can be found no example where any one, or the whole Church, have used this authority in all the holy scriptures, neither any precept or commandment whereby either the Bishops or the people should think the right hereof to pertain unto them."(4)

Travers was at his weakest when he dealt with the question of the "dumb" ministry. Preaching and public worship were, in his opinion,

(1) T.56 (2) Ibid (3) T.66 (4) T.70.

"so linked together that they may by no means be separated... The office of praying and making solemn and public prayers for the Church in respect of his office can, nor ought to be, committed to no man but to him that hath power also to teach the Church."(1)

Among the Old Testament passages which he used to support this proposition were I Sam.xii.23 and Deut.xxxiii.10, in both of which places prayer (or the offering of incense, symbolical of the offering of prayer) is mentioned in the same verse as teaching. Resting upon evidence of this kind (and disregarding such a case as that of the prophet Amos, which he would no doubt have dismissed as exceptional) Travers concluded that

"in the Priesthood and the Prophecy, two of the chiefest offices in the Jewish Church... these two offices of teaching and praying were joined together."(2)

Therefore

"seeing it is plain by the perpetual use of the scripture that these two belong both to one and the same office, they cannot in any sort be draven asunder; and an unlawful divorce-ment it is when as our ministers (I speak of those Curates that are unable to teach) are of this condition ordained to the ministry, that they read their service and prescript prayers out of the book, but that they be not so bold to teach or to interpret without a new and especial authority granted to that purpose."(3)

The office of non-officiating preacher was also wrong, though not quite so wrong as that of non-preaching officiant.

"We ought to have Pastors and Doctors appointed in our Church, and not to retain still the extraordinary office of preachers, which yet I reprove more sparingly for the respect I have to many worthy men who have laboured with some fruit after this sort."(4)

(1) T.87. This is a variant of the Cartwrightian linking together of sacrament and sermon (2) T.88 (3) Ibid (4) T.137. This opinion did not prevent Travers from holding, according to his own account, precisely this office of non-officiating preacher at the Temple.

About the apparel of ministers Travers had little to say that had not already been said by others. On this matter he deserted his search for scriptural examples and contented himself with negatives. Neither in the Old Testament nor the New, he said, was any outdoor attire prescribed for the clergy, nor in the New Testament any dress for the clergy to wear in Church. Therefore no particular attire might be appointed in either case. (1)

Concerning the apparel appointed to be worn by the clergy of the Church of England he was much more extreme than Cartwright:-

"They say... that men should be admonished that they are now used to another end than they were by the Papists, and that the abuse cannot take away the right use of them; and although the popish priesthood be a most grievous leprosy, yet the apparel which they used, if it be washed again, may be applied again to our use. But I say, that of all the leprous garments, they have chosen the filthiest and most polluted, and such as cannot be washed nor made clean again by any art or cunning of the fuller. For seeing it is manifest that Popish priests received their orders by putting on of a surplice and square cap, and that they used the cope even to the singing of mass, who is he that hath learned by the law of God to distinguish and discern between sore and sore, between holy and unclean, and understandeth not, and even seeth with his eyes, that the leprosy was spread upon the garments, and that they are polluted and unclean, not only by the contagion of the leprous man, but even by their own disease, and therefore by the law not to be washed, but to be consumed with fire." (2)

Where Cartwright divided the ministry into Elders and Deacons, subdividing Elders into Pastors, Teachers, and Seniors, Travers divided it into Bishops and Deacons, subdividing Bishops into Pastors and Doctors, and Deacons into Distributors and Overseers (3) (i.e. Lay Elders). By doing this Travers was enabled to overcome a difficulty which arose out of Cartwright's classification. In

 (1) T.130 (2) T.132f (3) T.153. This difference between Travers and Cartwright is a further illustration of Puritan uncertainty about matters which they claimed were clearly expressed in Scripture.

some passages of the New Testament where the ministry is mentioned (e.g. Phil.i.1), only Bishops and Deacons are named, as though they only comprised the ministry. According to Cartwright "Bishop" was no more than an alternative title for "Pastor", so that in these passages the ministry appeared to be made up of Pastors and Deacons only, with no room for Doctors and Elders. But by asserting that the term "Bishop" embraced both Pastors and Doctors, and that the title "Deacon" included Elders and Deacons properly so called, Travers was able to make the Scripture passages in question say what he wanted them to say, even though his assertion rested upon nothing more substantial than his own conjecture.

However, while he succeeded in clearing up this difficulty which had arisen from Cartwright's classification of the officers of the Church, Travers also created another problem which demanded a solution. If Elders were to be classified as Deacons, then Pastors and Doctors, who were not Deacons but Bishops, could not be Elders. But they were preachers, and in I Tim.v.17 preachers were classified as Elders. Travers was therefore forced to return to Cartwright's classification of the ministry and to acknowledge that

"two kinds of Elders are expressly named by St Paul, whereof the first sort are occupied in preaching and doctrine, the other have charge of manners and conversation, which part only remaineth." (1)

Travers thus ends up in the complication that there are two kinds of

(1) T.157. Travers seems here to exclude Pastors and Teachers from the charge of manners and conversation, i.e. from taking part in the exercise of Discipline in a parish seignior. It is difficult to believe that, writing in Geneva, he really meant this, but nowhere in his book did he clear up the point.

Bishops, two kinds of Deacons, and two kinds of Elders; Bishops may be Elders but not Deacons; Deacons may be Elders but not Bishops; Elders may be either kind of Bishop but only one kind of Deacon. It is to be regretted that Cartwright, in "The Rest of the Second Reply", ⁽¹⁾ referred to Travers' book and to these divisions and subdivisions of the ministry, and expressed his approval of them in preference to his own. The foundation of his own classification was flimsy enough, but it was solid by comparison with the one that had to support Travers' structure.

Travers' "Scripture" for his various types of Church officers consisted of I Tim.iii and Phil.i.1 where Bishops and Deacons are mentioned together; Rom.xii.6f, where "prophesying" and "ministry" (*diakonia*) were taken as indicating the respective duties of Bishops and Deacons; and I Pet.iv.11 where "speech" and "ministry" were similarly understood as delimiting the respective spheres, and therefore the separate offices, of Bishops and Deacons. ⁽²⁾ Ephes.iv.11 provided the justification for subdividing Bishops into "pastors and doctors." ⁽³⁾ The "exhorters" of Rom.xii.8 were identified with Pastors, the "exhortations" being taken as the verbal corrections, ⁽⁴⁾ reproofs, and reprehensions which the Pastor uttered in his sermons. Rom.xii.8 also supplied the subdivision of Deacons into Elders ("he that ruleth") and Deacons properly so called ("he that giveth", i.e. ⁽⁵⁾ Distributors).

(1) p.54 (2) T.74ff (3) T.132 (4) T.147f (5) T.153, 159f. It was, of course, only by the exercise of his imagination that Travers could discern any mention of Deacons in this passage, and only by a further exercise of it that he could classify "he that ruleth" as a kind of Deacon.

The 'locus classicus' of the Puritan Discipline, Matt.xviii.15ff, where the Christian who had a grievance against his fellow-Christian was enjoined to report the matter to the Church if he could not obtain satisfaction otherwise, was interpreted by Travers in conjunction with I Thess.v.12-14 (where he assumed that "those who are over you in the Lord and admonish you" were governing Elders), with the following result:-

"Although after a sort it is all men's duty to bring him into his way which goeth astray, yet better and more diligent heed is taken that offences arise not in the Church, when every part of the Church should have their watchmen assigned to them, to whose office especially it should belong to mark, oversee, and observe all men's manners. Whereas otherwise there are many faults which may easily escape those who have not a careful eye over them. For which cause St Paul to the Thessalonians attributeth admonitions ~~especially~~ and reprehensions especially unto the Elders, which notwithstanding afterwards in another sort he declareth to belong unto all the faithful."

(1)

According to Cartwright the lay Elder was a judge in a local court who heard the complaints of one Christian against another, and adjudicated upon them as the representative of the Church. According to Travers the lay Elder should be an ecclesiastical policeman, seeking out wrong-doing and either dealing with it himself or bringing it to the attention of the parish seignior. In defining this part of the duty of the governing Elder Travers deserted the Scriptures and, although he did not say so specifically, appealed for support for his conception of what a well-reformed Church should do to the example of the Church of Geneva:-

(2)

(1) T.156 (2) See p. 121f

"Elders therefore are Deacons who are appointed to take heed of the offences that arise in the Church. Therefore in well reformed Churches every one of them have their ward, and as it were their watch to look unto in that portion of the Church in which they may most fitly serve. Wherein if anything be done otherwise than ought to be, that shall deserve just reproof, if it be privately committed he goeth unto the party and admonisheth him privately for his fault according to the word of God, exhorting him that he do so no more. But if openly, he certifieth the Council or Consistory of the Church, lest the fault of one man be spread to the destruction of all the rest."(1)

In addition to fault-finding, the lay Elder must also inform the minister of babies to be baptized, strangers to be visited, and other circumstances in his district which might require the minister's attention.
(2)

Somewhat more definitely than Cartwright, Travers located the origin of the Christian Eldership in the practice of the Jewish people. Elders were

"such as amongst the Jews were those who were called Chief of the Synagogue."(3)

Writing of the Council of the Jews before whom St Peter and St John were arraigned, Travers said,
(4)

"By this their doing we may perceive what was the form of government of the Church amongst the Jews, which ~~we~~ our Saviour Christ hath translated to his Church. For this is it that our Saviour Christ meaneth in the xviii of Matthew and xvii verse, when he commandeth the stubborn that will not be obedient to the admonition of two or three to be brought to the Church."(5)

(1) T.155f. Matt.xviii.15ff provided a remedy "if thy brother sin against thee", not a disinfectant "lest the fault of one man be spread". There is a reminiscence of Browne in this remark of Travers
(2) T.156 (3) In fact, the $\Pi\Omega\lambda\lambda\eta\ \psi\alpha\gamma\gamma\eta$ was the liturgical officer of the synagogue, usually, though not necessarily, one of the Elders. See Schurer, The Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ, II.ii.63.
(4) Acts iv.5ff (5) T.163. The identification of the Council of Elders with the "Church" in Matt.xviii.17 is mere conjecture.

Travers, like other Puritans, thought that the words of Matt. xviii.17,

"let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican", constituted a command by Christ to the Church to excommunicate a Christian who would not accept the judgment of the Council of Elders. He believed that the terms in which the commandment was expressed formed conclusive evidence that Jesus had Jewish excommunication from the synagogue in mind as he spoke, and that therefore the Jewish practice of excommunication was transferred to the Church. In order that this practice might be seen to be thoroughly scriptural, he traced it back to the exclusion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden. But he was not so successful in his search for scriptural authority for the lesser penalty of suspension from the Lord's Table,

"touching which kind of punishment, although there be nothing expressly mentioned or commanded in the gospel, yet seeing it is commanded in the fifth of Matthew that he at whom a brother is offended, bringing an offering unto the altar of the Lord, should leave his offering there and go first and be reconciled to his brother, how much more ought this to be done where the anger hath been so hot that it hath broken out into reproachful and contumelious words, and such as our Saviour manifestly declareth to be such as the Council of the Church hath to deal with; that is to say, that they be commanded to abstain from the altar of the Lord until they be reconciled with their brother who is offended."(2)

In this way Travers found himself able to reduce even a matter of personal religion into an item of ecclesiastical discipline!

(1) T.166f. The phrase "let him be unto thee" in Matt xviii.17 does not suggest excommunication by the Church, but only a personal avoiding of the offender by the offended party. The idea of excommunication by the Church is only to be justified by taking verse 17 with verse 18 and then assuming that "What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven" implies excommunication.

(2) T.166f. Matt.v.22f

Although he had expended many pages upon the duties and rights of the officers of the Church, and had expressed his anxiety to preserve the majesty of the whole Church, Travers had only a single paragraph to spare for the "saints" who held no office, and

"whose duty... only is this, to suffer themselves willingly to be ruled and governed by those whom God hath set over them."(1)

To one class of the unofficial saints, however, he did devote a little more space. Kings

"must also, as well as the rest, submit themselves, and be obedient to, the just and lawful authority of the officers of the Church."(2)

But although Kings were to have no office in the Church, they were to have duties of an official kind:-

"The magistrates have this proper and peculiar to themselves above the rest of the faithful, to set in order and establish the state of the Church by their authority, and to preserve and maintain it according to God's will, being once established. Not that they should rule the ecclesiastical matters by their authority... but... they ought to provide and see that the service of God be established as he hath appointed, and administered by such as ought to administer the same, and afterwards preserved in the same simplicity and sincerity undefiled."(3)

In other words the Magistrate must be the Visitor of the Church in his realm. But why the title and office of "Visitor" should not go with the duties, nor how the duties were to be performed without the Visitor ruling by his authority, Travers did not try to explain.

(1) T.185 (2) Ibid (3) T.187.

VI.

The effect of his face-to-face controversy with Travers was to make Hooker write. Exactly when he first conceived the idea of composing a treatise "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity" it would be difficult to say, but it cannot have been long after the inhibition of Travers in 1586, for the planning and research which lay behind the work must have been a lengthy task in itself, quite apart from the actual labour of writing.

Hooker's treatise is no mere reply to Travers' slight contribution to Puritan scholarship and activity. The whole range of Puritanism is examined in it, and many works, notably Cartwright's later and previously unanswered works against Whitgift, are more often referred to and refuted than Travers' "True and Plain Declaration".

For five years Hooker pursued his labours while remaining Master of the Temple Church. The atmosphere in which he worked cannot have been pleasant, for Travers had not been without his following, strong enough in numbers to secure his remuneration and keep him in his lodging. And so in 1591 Hooker exchanged his Mastership for the benefice of Boscombe, in Wiltshire, at one and the same time discarding the climate of hostility and, because he was a non-resident Incumbent, winning complete leisure in which to write.

Hooker was no lonely scholar creating his treatise entirely from his own resources. He was frequently in consultation with Dr John

(1) Sisson, op.cit. 45.

Spenser, another divine, and also with his friends Edwin Sandys and George Cranmer, both of whom were lawyers. All three consultants (1) were, like Hooker himself, convinced Anglicans. How far Whitgift was concerned in the project cannot be determined. He may, through Sandys, have known about it from the beginning. He certainly gave rapid approval to the publication of the first portion of the work, and signified his liking for the author by presenting him, in 1595, to the benefice of Bishopsbourne, in his own Diocese. (2) Here Hooker completed and published the second portion of his treatise, and here, (3) in 1600, he died at the untimely age of 46.

The treatise was planned in eight books, of which only the first five appeared in Hooker's lifetime. Only these five books, therefore, played any part in Elizabethan controversy. Books vi and viii (4) were not printed until 1648, and Book vii not until 1661. There has long been doubt about the extent to which these last three Books are to be accepted as genuine "Hooker", (5) but the problem is not relevant to present purposes. Only the Elizabethan publications, Books i-v, will be considered here. For most of the ground covered in the posthumous Books the work of Hooker's contemporary, Thomas Bilson, will be examined instead.

VII.

Hooker introduced his work with a lengthy survey of the process by which the Puritan programme had come to take so strong a hold as

(1) Sisson, op.cit.47 (2) Ibid 46 (3) Ibid 48, 14 (4) Ibid 80
 (5) Ibid 79ff.

it undoubtedly had obtained over the minds of many English people. He admitted that at one time he had himself been impressed by the fervour and confidence with which Puritans were accustomed to maintain their opinions, and had thought that this must be due to some very cogent reason, i.e. that the Puritan plan for the reformation of the Church was soundly based upon Scripture, and therefore ought to be put into practice. It was when he had come to study the plan in detail that he discovered how the Church of England was being called upon to accept something which was

"only by error and misconceit named the ordinance of Jesus Christ."(1)

The great prestige which Puritanism had won was due solely to the reputation of its founder, John Calvin. This man, Hooker thought, had been

"incomparably the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy, since the hour that it enjoyed him."(2)

Calvin's prestige, in its turn, had been erected upon

"two things of principal moment... the one his exceeding pains in composing the Institutions of the Christian religion; the other his no less industrious travails for exposition of Holy Scripture according unto the same Institutions."(3)

In his later writings, Hooker continued, Calvin had referred continually to the Discipline he had established at Geneva, using every opportunity to commend, by his already established reputation, its use and necessity, until in the end his books had become

"almost the very canon to judge both doctrine and discipline by"(4)

(1) H.Pref.i.2 (2) Ibid ii.1 (3) Ibid ii.8 (4) Ibid.

Hooker next exposed the methods by which Calvin had employed his increasing fame to impose his Discipline upon Geneva. At this point the force of the argument is enhanced because Hooker drew the evidence he needed to make it convincing from Calvin's own works and from Beza's "Life of Calvin".⁽¹⁾ Having in the first instance expelled Calvin from their city rather than endure his Discipline, the Genevans were glad, a few years later, to implore a man of such renown to return to them on his own terms, which terms included their acceptance of the Discipline.⁽²⁾ When, a few years later still, the Senate of Geneva rebelled against the Discipline, Calvin quelled the revolt partially by threatening to leave the city again, and then rounded off his victory by appealing successfully, but not without some misrepresentation of the circumstances of the case,⁽³⁾ for the support of the other Swiss Churches.

In showing how Calvin had managed to impose his will upon the city of Geneva Hooker was not attempting to "debunk" the great reformer, nor was he questioning the value of the Discipline for the place and time to which it had originally been applied. On the contrary, he thought the Discipline good for those circumstances.

"That which by wisdom (Calvin) saw to be requisite for that people, was by as great wisdom compassed."⁽⁴⁾

What Hooker quarrelled with was the scriptural argument employed to justify the Discipline after it had been put into operation.

"That which Calvin did for establishment of his discipline, seemeth more commendable than that which he taught for the countenancing of it established. Nature worketh in us all

(1) H.Pref.ii.7 (2) Ibidii,2,3 (3) Ibid ii.5,6 (4) Ibid ii.7

"a love to our own counsels... Wherefore a marvel it were if a man of so great capacity... could espy in the whole Scripture of God nothing which might breed at least a probable opinion of likelihood, that divine authority itself was the same way somewhat inclinable. And all which the wit even of Calvin was able from thence to draw, by sifting the very utmost sentence and syllable, is no more than that certain speeches there are which to him did seem to intimate that all Christian Churches ought to have their elderships endued with the power of excommunication, and that a part of those elderships everywhere should be chosen out from amongst the laity, after that form which himself had framed Geneva unto."(1)

Hooker's next task was to clear away the prejudices which might hinder the acceptance of his own ideas of how the Church should be governed. He did this by exposing the methods which had been used to commend Puritanism in England. First, the faults of those in high positions in the Church of England had been severely censured in public. This had the effect of creating for the Puritans, by way of contrast, a reputation for integrity. Next, all the world's ills and misfortunes were imputed to the existing form of Church government. This had the effect of building up for the Puritans a reputation for wisdom. With these advantages in their favour the Puritans had then commended their Discipline as

"the only sovereign remedy of all evils".(4)

Once the mind had been conditioned in this manner to the acceptance of the Discipline, the Scriptures could not be read without finding it expressed on every page. Finally, there came the persuasion that those who could not find the Discipline in the Holy Scriptures must be deficient in the Holy Spirit, whilst those who did find it there were favoured with a special illumination. Hooker.

(1) H.Pref. 11.7 (2) Ibid 111.6 (3) Ibid 111.7 (4) Ibid 111.8
 (5) Ibid 111.9 (6) Ibid 111.10

did not mean, however, that all this process was intentional; he was writing about effects that he had observed rather than about deliberate purposes. (1)

Hooker was perhaps somewhat less than fair to his opponents when he said that they had bestowed much labour in winning over women to the side of the Discipline. On this matter he believed that there had been a ~~disciplined~~ ^{calculated} policy, the Puritans judging that women, being less able to judge the merits of a case, and being by nature more ardent, than men, would make better proselytizers. (2)

Hooker now enquired how Puritanism had been commended to the more learned part of the English people. There had been from the Puritan side a fashionable show of reverence for antiquity, but in fact a contempt for all antiquity that was later than the days of the Apostles. (3) There had been an attempt to discover and practise the form of discipline used by the Apostles, but that form had not been, and could not be, discovered exactly, nor could reason be shown why, if it could be discovered, it should still be practised, and not rather that something more suitable for the changed times should be substituted for it. (4) Again, there had been much quoting of modern writers as though those writers were admirers of Puritanism as a whole, when in fact they had given nothing more than a qualified approval of some single element in the Puritan programme. (5)

Agreed that there had been some consensus of approval of the Genevan

(1) H.Pref.iv.1 (2) Ibid iii.13. The recruitment of a high proportion of women may have been the effect, but it is hardly likely to have been the intended effect, of Puritan propaganda. There were, anyway, very many male Puritans, including London merchants and, at times, a majority of the House of Commons. Imputation of motive of this kind is always unsafe, and usually unjust. (3) Ibid iv.2 (4) Ibid iv.4,5. (5) Ibid iv.6.

Discipline among other reformed Churches, that was because those Churches, finding themselves in the same circumstances as Geneva before them, had followed Geneva's example, and

"we are not to marvel greatly, if they which have all done the same thing, do easily embrace the same opinion as concerning their own doings."(1)

Hooker concluded his Preface with a warning about the final end of Puritanism. Like Whitgift twenty years earlier (but with rather more reason, for he had the example of Browne to teach him), he feared that a logical application of Puritan principles would result in the anarchy of Anabaptism. He warned his opponents that

"it must not offend you though touching the sequel of your present mispersuasions much more be doubted, than your own intents and purposes do haply aim at."(2)

And he appealed to them to reconsider their position:-

"Sift unpartially your own hearts, whether it be force of reason or vehemency of affection, which hath bred and still doth feed these opinions in you. If truth do anywhere manifest itself, seek not to smother it with glosing delusions, acknowledge the greatness thereof, and think it your best victory when the same doth prevail over you."(3)

VIII.

One of the terms which flowed most readily from the lips of a Puritan when he spoke of his theories of Church government was "lawful" or, when he was speaking of Anglican practices, "unlawful". Before Hooker could expect that his own teaching would be accepted by his Puritan readers, he had to clear away the loose thinking and inexact definition which accompanied these terms, and so he

(1) H.Pref.iv.7 (2) Ibid viii.3 (3) Ibid ix.1

devoted his first Book to an examination of the nature and application of law.

Hooker distinguished, in the first place, two "eternal" laws, that which God lays down to govern his own actions, and that which he lays down to be kept by his creatures.

Within the second of these "eternal" laws Hooker discovered a three-fold division:-

- (a) The law of those Natural Agents which obey God involuntarily.
- (b) The Celestial law which angels obey voluntarily.
- (c) The law of Men.

Hooker divided the law of Men, and then subdivided the divisions. First, there were, he said, Natural laws (i.e. laws of Reason). These the human reason could discover for itself. They embraced a man's duty as an individual, his duty as a child of God, and his duty as a neighbour in his relationships with his fellow-men.

Secondly, there were Human laws, some governing the internal affairs of nations, others governing the external relations of nation with nation; some governing the Church within each nation, others governing the Church in its aspect as an international society.

Finally, there were Supernatural laws, laws revealed by God and not discovered nor discoverable by human reason, and applying to man's duty as an individual and as a member of that international society, the Church.

At a blow this system of law, complex as Hooker saw it to be,

(1) A complete analysis of Hooker's systematization of laws is to be found in a folder in Paget, op.cit. at p.99.

destroyed the over-simplification of those Puritans who supposed that law could be divided into "divine", i.e. contained in Scripture, and "mere human". But Hooker went further with this matter than just to disclose its complexity. He revered all law of whatever sort as a divine thing, divine because its ultimate source was the "eternal" law of God:→

"All things, therefore, which are as they ought to be, are conformed unto this second law eternal; and even those things which to this eternal law are not conformable are notwithstanding in some sort ordered by the first eternal law. For what good or evil is there under the sun, what action correspondent or repugnant unto the law which God hath imposed upon his creatures, but in or upon it God doth work according to the law which himself hath eternally purposed to keep; that is to say, the first law eternal."(1)

Further,

"Of Law there can be no less acknowledged, than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world: all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power: both Angels and men and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy."(2)

Human reason, in Hooker's view, must play an important part in the making, or rather the discovery, of laws:-

"By force of the light of Reason, wherewith God illuminateth every one which cometh into the world, men being enabled to know truth from falsehood, and good from evil, do thereby learn in many things what the will of God is; which will himself not revealing by any extraordinary means unto them, but they by natural discourse attaining the knowledge thereof, seem the makers of those laws which indeed are his, and they but only the finders of them out."(3)

In this manner Hooker restored to its dignity that which earlier generations had called the Law of Nature, and which Puritan teaching

(1) H.I.iii.1 (2) Ibid xvi.8 (3) Ibid viii.3

(1)

had invited men to disparage and even to despise, stating his own faith in the following phrases:-

"Law rational... which men commonly use to call the Law of Nature, meaning thereby the Law which human nature knoweth itself in reason universally bound unto, which also for that cause may be termed most fitly the Law of Reason; this Law, I say, comprehendeth all those things which men by the light of their natural understanding evidently know, or at leastwise may know, to be beseeming or unbeseeming, virtuous or vicious, good or evil for them to do."(2)

The true end of man, Hooker believed, was eternal happiness, but because of sin man could not reach this end unaided, for

"the light of nature is never able to find out any way of obtaining the reward of bliss, but by performing exactly the duties and works of righteousness."(3)

But God had not left man unaided in his sinfulness. As an act of mercy

"the wisdom of God hath revealed a way mystical and supernatural, a way directing unto the same end of life by a course which groundeth itself upon the guiltiness of sin, and through sin desert of condemnation and death."(4)

There were laws connected with this way of salvation. They were supernatural laws because they

"are such as have not in nature any cause from which they flow, but were by the voluntary appointment of God ordained besides the course of nature, to rectify nature's obliquity withal."(5)

The existence of these supernatural laws did not abrogate the laws which were discoverable by reason, and the duties imposed by

(1) For an example of Puritan disparagement of human reason see Frere and Douglas, op.cit.69, where a programme of Church reform of human devising would be "a corrupt and poisoned water, drawn out of a stinking puddle of the filthy dunghill of man's brains."

(2) H.I.viii.9 (3) Ibid xi.3 (4) Ibid xi.6 (5) Ibid

the natural laws were still required to be performed by men.

"When supernatural duties are necessarily exacted, natural are not rejected as needless. The law of God therefore is, though principally delivered for instruction in the one, yet fraught with precepts of the other also. The scripture is fraught even with the laws of Nature."(1)

Natural laws were to be found in Scripture because they were either things not easily found out by the human mind, or were helpfully applied by the Spirit to particular cases, or because the assent of the human reason to them was aided by the testimony of God in Scrip-
(2)
ture. Reason and Scripture, natural law and supernatural law, were therefore not opposites of each other but, to Hooker, complementary ways of learning God's will.

"Wherefore... use we the precious gifts of God unto his glory and honour that gave them, seeking by all means to know what the will of our God is; what righteous before him; in his sight what holy, perfect and good, that we may truly and faithfully do it."(3)

In Hooker's system, the converse of natural law was positive law. He did not define what he meant by "positive", but it may be inferred that he saw natural law as inherent in the structure of creation, and therefore as something which the human reason might discover by contemplating nature. Positive laws consisted of rules added after creation, ^{and} were therefore additional to it. Because of this, natural laws had always been in force from the beginning of creation, even before men discovered them, and they had always required man's duty to be done, even before man was aware that such duty was required of him. And so Hooker wrote,

(1) H.I.xii.1 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid xv.4

"Laws natural do always bind; laws positive not so, but only after they have been expressly and wittingly imposed."(1)

All supernatural laws, Hooker said, were positive because they

"could not have been known by any to belong unto them, unless God had opened them himself, inasmuch as they do not depend upon any natural ground at all out of which they may be deduced, but are appointed of God to supply the defect of those natural ways of salvation, by which we are not now able to attain thereunto."(2)

Hooker believed all natural laws to be unchangeable, for they represented the duties which God always required of man, whether man was redeemed or not. Indeed, the purpose of man's redemption was that he might keep the natural laws. But positive laws enacted by God (i.e. positive supernatural laws) might be either changeable or unchangeable, according to the reason for which they had been enacted. If their purpose remained constant, then these laws were unchangeable.

"Neither can they have cause of change, when that which gave them their first institution remaineth for ever one and the same."(3)

To this unchangeable class of positive supernatural laws belonged the Gospel,

"because there can be no reason wherefore the publishing thereof should be taken away, and any other instead of it proclaimed, as long as the world doth continue."(4)

On the other hand there were positive laws made by God which were changeable because they applied to men

"in regard of their being such as they do not always continue, but may perhaps be clean otherwise a while after, and so may require to be otherwise ordered than before."(5)

(1) H.I.xv.1 (2) Ibid xv.2 (3) Ibid xv.3 (4) Ibid (5) Ibid

To this category belonged the ceremonial law of the Old Testament which,

"although delivered with so great solemnity, is notwithstanding clean abrogated, inasmuch as it had but temporary cause of God's ordaining it."(1)

In the conclusion to his first Book, Hooker gathered together the circumstances and relationships in which a man lived in the world, each with its own laws.

"There are in men operations, some natural, some rational, some supernatural, some politic, some finally ecclesiastical; which, if we measure not each by his own proper law, whereas the things themselves are so different, there will be in our understanding and judgment of them confusion."(2)

The Puritans were guilty of this confusion in various ways, the first being their idea that Scripture was the only law by obedience to which God might be glorified. But, said Hooker, when men breathe, sleep, or move, they

"glorify God as natural agents do... not as much as thinking thereon."(3)

The Puritans were also guilty of confusing the laws which governed the actions of men considered as individuals with those which governed their actions as parts of a politic body.

"I am persuaded that of (the Puritans)... there are whose betters amongst men would be hardly found, if they did not live amongst men, but in some wilderness by themselves... By following the law of private reason, where the law of public should take place, they breed disturbance."(4)

Hooker faced up squarely to the problems raised by the notion that all things necessary to salvation are contained in Holy Scripture. Although the Scriptures, Hooker said, contained various kinds of laws, its principal intention was to deliver to men the laws of

(1) H.I.xv.3 (2) Ibid xvi.5 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid xvi.6

duties supernatural. Scripture contained all things necessary to salvation, but that must not be taken to mean "all things necessary to the better understanding of salvation, for if that were meant, then all knowledge would have to be contained in Scripture. Before it could be known what things were necessary to salvation it was most necessary to know what books were to be counted as Holy Scripture, but this was knowledge which the Scriptures could not supply of themselves. The term "necessary" must therefore be limited to

"allthings which are necessary to be known that we may be saved, but known with presupposal of knowledge concerning certain principles whereof (Scripture) receiveth us already persuaded, and then instructeth us in all the residue that are necessary. In the number of these principles one is the sacred authority of Scripture. Being therefore persuaded by other means that these Scriptures are the oracles of God, themselves do then teach us the rest."(1)

In searching for a close definition of "contained in Scripture", Hooker asked whether the phrase meant "plainly set down in Scripture", or "to be deduced by reason from Scripture"? He rejected the former definition because the doctrines of the Trinity, the co-eternity of the Son with the Father, and other necessary matters, were not plainly set down in, but only to be deduced from, the Scriptures. But how far was the process of deduction to be allowed to go? Things were not to be drawn into the definition which could only probably and conjecturally be surmised from the Scriptures. "Contained in" must therefore be restricted so that it meant "necessarily collected
(2)
from" Scripture by the exercise of Reason. And so,

(1) H.I.xiv.1. What the 'other means' were to which Hooker referred in this passage he explained later in his treatise. (2) Ibid xiv.2.

"when we extol the complete sufficiency of the whole entire body of the Scripture, (we) must... be understood with this caution, that the benefit of nature's light be not thought excluded as unnecessary, because the necessity of a diviner light is magnified."(1)

Hooker believed that there were some rites and customs which had been instituted by the Apostles and not committed by them to writing, but handed down in the Church by tradition. Having a changeable

(2)
nature, and being known to be apostolical, these things were to be no less accounted of than those other things which were also capable of alteration and which had been set down by the Apostles in writing,

"for both being known to be apostolical, it is not the manner of delivering them unto the Church, but the author from whom they proceed, which doth give them their force and credit."(3)

IX.

In the second Book of his treatise Hooker dealt with the Puritan proposition that Scripture should be the only rule by which men should guide their actions. First, he limited his discussion of the subject as the title of his whole work indicated, that is, he confined it to the actions of men as they form an ecclesiastical

(4)
body. Then he demanded that the proposition itself should not be thought of as applying to every trivial action, but only to moral actions in which questions of virtue or vice were involved. He further demanded that it should not be considered necessary to require knowledge of some certain passage of Scripture to justify an action, but only that actions should be framed according to the

(1) H.I.xiv.4 (2) Hooker did not entertain the idea that an unchangeable law would be delivered to men otherwise than in the Scriptures. (3) Ibid xiv.5 (4) H.II.i.1

general principles of the law of Reason as those principles were expressed in the Scripture. If these limitations were not observed, the necessary use of Scripture, Hooker thought, would be extended beyond anything that the truth would bear. ⁽¹⁾ The reason why he confined the discussion within these boundaries was that he found a tendency among some Puritans to argue

"that the Scripture of God is in such sort the ruler of human actions, that simply whatsoever we do, and are not directed by it thereunto, the same is sin."⁽²⁾

Hooker now turned to Cartwright's proposition:-

"Faith is not but in respect of the word of God: therefore whatsoever is not done by the word of God is sin."⁽³⁾

First, he examined the four texts of Scripture by which Cartwright had upheld his proposition, viz:-

(1) Prov.1.1f,5. "My son, if thou wilt receive my words, and lay up my commandments with thee; so that thou incline thine ear unto wisdom, and apply thine heart to understanding... then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God".

But, said Hooker, wisdom is unduly restricted if she is thought only to teach through Scripture.

"Some things she openeth by the sacred books of Scripture; some things by the glorious works of Nature: with some things she inspireth (men) from above by spiritual influence; in some things she leadeth and traineth them only by worldly experience and practice."⁽⁴⁾

 (1)H.II.1.2 (2) Ibid 1.3 ~~is~~ This was the sort of thing propounded; for example, by "W.F.", the young woman of whom Bredwell wrote. Hooker treated it as a proposition not worth answering, and dealt only with the more moderate position of men like Cartwright.

(3) W.1.190. In his "Second Reply", p.60, Cartwright required only a good purpose for every action, i.e. not necessarily a particular text of Scripture, but the general intent of Scripture. But he held that even trivial actions needed a good purpose in accordance with the general intent of Scripture if they were to be actions of faith, and therefore not sinful. (4) H.II.1.4.

(ii) I Cor.x.31. "Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." Men glorify God, Hooker believed, when they acknowledge his glory, and they acknowledge his glory when they obey him. But

"it may be perhaps a question, whether St Paul did mean that we sin as oft as we go about to do anything, without an express intent and purpose to obey God therein."(1)

Many human actions were performed without a conscious purpose of obedience, and those natural actions were just as much a response to God's laws as were moral and spiritual actions. Further, there was no idea in St Paul's words, Hooker thought, that obedience to what God had commanded in Scripture was the only kind of obedience that would glorify him.
(2)

(iii) I Tim.iv.4-5."Every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be rejected, if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified through the word of God and prayer."

To Hooker this passage meant that the Gospel ("the word of God") made no distinction between "clean" and "unclean" things, and therefore all things thankfully received must be "clean" to the receiver. This passage could

"hardly be drawn so far as to serve their purpose, who have imagined the Word in such sort to sanctify all ~~things~~ things, that neither food can be tasted, nor raiment put on, nor in the world anything done, but this deed must needs be sin in them which do not first know it appointed to them by Scripture before they do it."(3)

(iv) Rom.xiv.23. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

This was the passage most favoured by Puritans to support their proposition that Scripture should be the only ruler of human actions. But faith was not to be restricted to the Scriptures only, declared

(1) H.II.ii.1 (2) Ibid ii.2. (3) Ibid iii.1

Hooker. Christ told those who did not believe his words to believe in his works instead, and by that means to acquire faith in him. St Thomas refused to believe the Apostles' report of Christ's resurrection, but acquired faith in Christ through the use of his senses. Therefore,

"we are said not only to believe the things which we know by another's relation, but even whatsoever we are certainly persuaded of, whether it be by reason or by sense."(1)

This passage from the Epistle to the Romans had been pressed by Cartwright to the point where it had been made to mean that, since in every action not commanded by God faith was lacking, all such actions were sinful. (2) That, Hooker believed, was to make all "things indifferent" sinful, because it was in their nature to be neither commanded nor forbidden by God. But such a conclusion was unacceptable, for it would destroy the very quality of "indifferency". Cartwright must therefore revise his proposition, at least to the extent of making it mean that

"in every action not commanded of God or permitted with approbation, faith is wanting, and for want of faith there is sin." (3)

But, Hooker now asked, what things does God permit with approbation, and how do men know that he permits them? Where the Scripture left men to make a choice, it required a choice to be made. In "things indifferent" no special choice was commanded or forbidden,

(1) H.II.iv.1 (2) W.i.190f. In his "Second Reply", p.59, Cartwright wrote, "Those things that are indifferent, and may be done, have their freedom grounded of the word of God, for that unless the word of the Lord either in general or especial words had determined of the free use of them, there could have been no lawful use of them at all." This misses the point that many of the "adiaphora" are things of which Scripture makes no mention, either in general or especial terms. (3) H.II.iv.3

but a choice of some sort was necessary, and therefore the use of human discretion in choosing was not "a thing indifferent".

"Nor let any man think that following the judgment of natural discretion we can have no assurance that we please God. For to the author and God of our nature, how shall any operation proceeding in natural sort be in that respect unacceptable? The nature which himself hath given to work by he cannot but be delighted with, when we exercise the same anyway without commandment of his to the contrary."(1)

If this proposition of Cartwright's were correct, Hooker continued then before the Scriptures were written men must have been unable to do anything but sin, because they could not have had faith in written commandments which did not exist in their time. (2) It was not allowable to argue that the use of reason had been permitted until the Scriptures were written, but was then superseded by the Scriptures, nor was it permissible to argue that reason, although not superseded, might only be used for the understanding of the Scriptures. In such a case the Old Testament prophets, and after them the Apostles, (3) could only have proceeded upon the basis of "scriptum est". They had, indeed, done that, but not only that. They had also used (4) "natural" arguments in teaching the faithful their duty.

Negative argument from Scripture, i.e. from the absence of some commandment from the Scriptures, was implicit in the proposition which formed the main subject of Hooker's second Book, and this now called for his attention.

Puritans were wont to claim that the Fathers of the Church had (5) often used the negative argument from Scripture, and Hooker was not

(1) H.II.iv.5 (2) Ibid iv.6 (3) Hooker would believe that the Pentateuch had been written in its entirety before the prophets began their work. (4) Ibid, iv.7 (5) For example, Cartwright in his "Second Reply", p.80.

disposed to contradict them on this point. But, like Whitgift before him, he declared that the Fathers had used this type of argument where questions of doctrine were under discussion, and not where cases of human action were involved:-

"To urge anything as part of that supernatural and celestially revealed truth which God hath taught, and not to show it in Scripture, this did the ancient Fathers evermore think unlawful, impious, execrable. And thus, as their speeches were meant, so by us they must be restrained."(1)

While dealing with this matter of negative argument from Scripture as used by the Fathers, Hooker referred to two places in the writings of Tertullian which Cartwright had used. (2) In the first of these, Tertullian had urged his wife, if he should die before her, either to remain a widow or, if she re-married, to marry only a Christian, and he had re-inforced his advice by quoting I Cor.vii.39,

"If the husband be dead, (his widow) is free to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord."

To these words of St Paul, Tertullian had added,

"They that please not the Lord do even thereby offend the Lord; they do even thereby throw themselves into evil."(3)

Cartwright had taken up this saying and had applied it, not to Christian widows, but to "things indifferent". But the matter about which Tertullian had been writing was not "indifferent". St Paul's words prohibited the marriage of a Christian with a pagan. Disobedience on this point would not merely fail to please God; it would displease him; it would be a throwing of oneself into evil. Cartwright had misapplied Tertullian's words. (4)

(1) H.II.v.3 (2) "Second Reply", p.81ff (3) "Ad Uxor." ii.7.
 (4) H.II.v.6.

The second case was that of the Roman soldier who, because he was a Christian, refused to wear a garland as the non-Christian soldiers were doing. Tertullian, who was by this time a Montanist, had written his book "De Corona Militis" in praise of this soldier and against those orthodox Christians who had asked,

"What Scripture is there which doth teach that we should not be crowned?"

Tertullian had replied,

"What Scripture is there which doth teach us that we should? For in requiring on the contrary part the aid of Scripture, they do give sentence beforehand that their part also ought by Scripture to be aided."(1)

Hooker pointed out the unsoundness of Tertullian's argument:-

"There is no necessity, that if I confess I ought not to do that which Scripture forbiddeth me, I should thereby acknowledge myself bound to do nothing which the Scripture commandeth me not."(2)

Tertullian himself, Hooker believed, had been well aware of the unsoundness of his argument, and for that reason had referred to the long-established custom of the Church that Christians should not be garlanded. It was this custom, Hooker claimed, that regulated a matter which had been left indifferent by Scripture, and which justified the soldier in acting as he had acted. Christian soldiers who had allowed themselves to be garlanded were wrong,

"for long-received custom forbidding them to do as they did... there was no excuse in the world to justify their act, unless in the Scripture they could show some law, that did license them thus to break a received custom."(3)

Tertullian was not therefore, in Hooker's opinion, so much a

(1) "De Corona", ii. (2) H.II.v.7 (3) Ibid.

supporter of the Puritan position as Cartwright had made out. The matter he had dealt with was not indifferent, but had been made binding by a custom of the Church, and Tertullian had been very far from arguing, as the Puritans did, that a custom of the Church might be disregarded because it was not commanded in Scripture. On the contrary, Tertullian had meant that a custom of the Church must not be disobeyed unless it could be shown that it was against the
(1)
Scriptures.

Hooker admitted that there were in the Scripture itself some arguments which at first sight seemed to be negative arguments from
(2)
Scripture, such as Jer.vii.31,

"They have built the high places of Topheth... to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded not, neither came it into my mind."

This passage, and others like it, Hooker claimed, did not refer to matters which God had left indifferent. God had already laid it down that he alone was to be worshipped, and also how he was to be worshipped. It was therefore open to Jeremiah either to charge Judah with breaking God's law or, as he did, to charge the Jews with setting up their own law in its place.

"The Prophet chooseth rather to charge them with the fault of making a law unto themselves, than with the crime of transgressing a law which God had made."(3)

Again, David had contemplated building a Temple for God, but had been forbidden to do so in I Chron.xvii.6, Viz:-

"Spake I a word with any of the judges of Israel... saying, Why have ye not built me an house of cedar?"

(1) H.II.v.7 (2) Cartwright had made use of this passage, W.i.177.
(3) H.II.vi.2

These words, Hooker asserted, had not been spoken by way of condemnation of David's project. They formed, rather, an assurance that he would not be guilty of a sin if he did not do what he had planned to do. Because no command to build a Temple for God had been given, David would be no more guilty than the Judges had been if a Temple were not built. But David's intention to build had received God's approval, and the rest of I Chron.xvii spoke of the Divine blessing upon him for having conceived so good a purpose. ⁽¹⁾

Cartwright had made use of the fact that Jewel, in his controversy with Harding, had argued negatively from Scripture, and had claimed that in doing so he was following the example of the Fathers. Jewel had said, ⁽²⁾

"The ancient learned Fathers... the better to discover the shameless boldness and nakedness of (heretical) doctrine, were oftentimes likewise forced to use the negative, and so to drive the same heretics, as we do you, to prove their affirmative."(3)

This was straightforward enough to be easily answered, as Whitgift had already answered it. Nothing might be added to nor taken from the doctrine that God required to be believed as a condition of their salvation. But Jewel appeared to have gone much further than this when he wrote,

"This kind of (negative) proof is thought to hold in God's commandments, for that they be full and perfect."(4)

These words, as Hooker realized, might have come from Cartwright's pen rather than from an Anglican, for they seemed to express the

(1) H.II.vi.3. ~~(2)~~ Cartwright had referred to the case of David in his "Second Reply", p.49 (2) Jewel's use of the negative argument from Scripture had been quoted in Cartwright's "Second Reply", 50f. (3) J.iv.886 (4) J.i.175.

Puritan claim that nothing ought to be done in the Church that was not commanded by God in Scripture. Hooker defined the problem which they set him as follows:-

"The question is not, whether an argument from Scripture negatively may be good, but whether it be so generally good, that in all actions men may urge it."(1)

Jewel had used the argument to show that the papists were innovators. He had expressed the argument in absolute terms, and without qualification or restriction. But his words ought to be treated as hyperbole, and should be interpreted according to their context.

"In speaking thus largely it is presumed that men's speeches will be taken according to the matter whereof they speak."(2)

If this were done, it would be seen that Jewel did not

"either say or prove any more, than that an argument in some kinds of matter may be good, although taken negatively from Scripture."(3)

One of the things which Hooker most regretted in Puritan teaching was its tendency to destroy the authority of man, and particularly the authority of the Church. Cartwright's idea that human authority was valid neither negatively nor affirmatively was deplorable. In matters of opinion the wise and learned should be treated with deference. In matters of fact, even the Scripture itself required that certain things should be proved by human witnesses. Even negatively there must in certain cases be some force in human authority. For

(1) H.II.vi.4 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid. Hooker's argument on this subject is vague, which is unusual for him. This may indicate that he found Jewel's words intractable. He clearly did not agree with Jewel's sweeping statement, but did not wish to say so. When he had restricted Jewel's statement to "some kinds of matter", he did not specify what those kinds were. (4) W.i.176. In his "Second Reply", p.19, Cartwright retreated from this extreme position so far as to admit that man's authority was of some small force in human sciences.

example, the Chronicles of England mentioned only six Kings of England named Edward from the Norman Conquest to Hooker's own time, and therefore it was to be accepted that there had been six such Kings, and no more. (1) Men might be ignorant and deceived in many things, but their testimony would still be needed if, for example, those who had never seen the place were to be expected to believe that there existed such a city as Rome. But most important of all, the means other than Scripture whereby Scripture was accepted as the Word of God was human testimony.

"The authority of man is, if we mark it, the key which openeth the door of entrance into the knowledge of the Scriptures. The Scripture could not teach us the things that are of God, unless we did credit men who have taught us that the words of Scripture do signify these things. Some way, therefore, notwithstanding man's infirmity, yet his authority may enforce assent." (2)

Hooker said that he had noticed how some people were troubled by doubts which seemed to them to arise from lack of faith, when in fact they were due to lack of evidence. But

"it is not required nor can it be exacted at our hands, that we should yield unto anything other assent, than such as doth answer the evidence which is to be had of that we assent unto." (3)

Hence even in matters of religion there might be things on which judgment must be suspended, and other things which might be held to be probable but not certain. Where infallible proof was lacking, there ought to be a prejudice in favour of accepting the best human authority available, that is to say, the consensus of the probable opinions of the learned. Thus,

(1) H.II.vii.2 (2) Ibid vii.3 (3) Ibid vii.5

"If a question concerning matter of doctrine were proposed, and on the one side no kind of proof appearing, there should on the other be alleged and showed that so a number of the learnedest divines in the world had ever thought; although it did not appear what reason or what Scripture led them to be of that judgment, yet to their very bare judgment somewhat a reasonable man would attribute."(1)

Hooker acknowledged that proof derived from human authority could not be as strong as proof from other sources,

"and therefore although ten thousand general councils would set down one and the same definitive sentence concerning any point of religion whatsoever, yet one demonstrative reason alleged, or one manifest testimony cited from the mouth of God himself to the contrary, could not choose but over-weigh them all; inasmuch as for them to have been deceived it is not impossible; it is, that demonstrative reason or testimony divine should deceive."(2)

Yet even Scripture itself depended for its correct interpretation upon human reason.

"Although Scripture be of God, and therefore the proof which is taken from thence must need be of all other invincible; yet this strength it hath not, unless it avouch the self-same thing for which it is brought. If there either be undeniable appearance that so it doth, or reason such as cannot deceive, then Scripture-proof (no doubt) in strength and value, exceedeth all."(3)

Concluding his second Book, Hooker set out what he believed to be the true view of the place and authority of the Scriptures. God's approval of man, he taught, depended upon the degree of goodness in man's actions. Some actions were good, but were so low in their degree of goodness that all that could be said for them was that God did not disapprove or disallow of man because of them. These actions could be discovered by the light of nature. Other actions were allowed by God to such an extent that man's salvation depended upon

(1) H.II.vii.5 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid vii.9

them. For these actions nature was an insufficient teacher, and the chief guide was Scripture. There were other things which, although not necessary to salvation, received God's rewards. These were not commanded either by nature or by Scripture, but the promise of reward drew the mind towards the performance of them. Thus it was that, in a measure, the will of God might be known otherwise than by Scripture.

The absolute perfection of Scripture, it seemed to Hooker, was to be seen in its relationship to its purpose.

"What the Scripture purposeth, the same in all points it doth perform."(2)

The purpose of Scripture was the salvation of man, and

"whatsoever to make up the doctrine of man's salvation is added, as in supply of Scripture's insufficiency, we reject it. Scripture purposing this, hath perfectly and fully done it."(3)

To stretch the authority of Scripture beyond this perfection, and to make it contain, not only all things necessary to salvation, but all things simply, was dangerous.

"As incredible praises given unto men do often abate and impair the credit of their deserved commendation; so we must likewise take great heed, lest in attributing unto Scripture more than it can have, the incredibility of that do cause even those things which indeed it hath most abundantly to be less reverently esteemed."(5)

(1) H.II.viii.2-4 (2) Ibid viii.5 (3) Ibid. (4) The limit of Puritan expectation of what the Bible ought to provide was reached by Robert Browne who, in 1590, wrote to Lord Burghley, "I offer to prove that the Word of God doth expressly set down all necessary and general rules of the arts and all learning." WHB. 530. (5) H.II.viii.7.

X.

The subject of Hooker's third Book was the Puritan assumption that Scripture must necessarily contain an unalterable form of Church government, and he introduced it by defining the Church.

The mystical body of Christ, properly so-called, was one, Hooker affirmed, and could not be other than one. It was not to be discerned by the senses, because it was partly in heaven, and because the part of it that was upon earth had not the property of visibility. Only the mind could conceive of its existence. It was to this Church that the mercy of God had been promised in Scripture. Its members were known only to God by marks which only God could see, for those marks were not perceivable by the senses. (1)

As the mercies promised in Scripture belonged to the invisible Church, so the duties mentioned in Scripture belonged to the visible Church, which visible Church consisted of a number of persons who could be perceived by the senses.

The visible Church was one, but had had two parts, the parts being separated in time by the advent of Christ. The later part was properly called the Church of Christ, and it, too, was itself one body.

"The unity of which visible body and Church of Christ consisteth in that uniformity which all several persons thereunto belonging have, by reason of that one Lord whose servants they all profess themselves, that one Faith which they all acknowledge, that one Baptism wherewith they are all initiated." (2)

(1) H.III.i.2 (2) Ibid 1.3.

Each of these three unities of Lord, Faith, and Baptism, was necessary for membership of the visible Church. (1)

It was impossible, Hooker thought, for the unworthy to be members of the invisible Church.

"Howbeit, of the visible body and Church of Jesus Christ those may be and oftentimes are, in respect of the main parts of their outward profession, who in regard of their inward disposition of mind, yea, of external conversation, yea, of some parts of their very profession, are most worthily hateful in the sight of God himself, and in the eyes of the sounder part of the visible Church most execrable."(2)

For this reason the Church of Rome was to be regarded as a part of the visible Church.

"With Rome we dare not communicate concerning sundry her gross and grievous abominations, yet touching those main parts of Christian truth wherein they constantly still persist, we gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Jesus Christ."(3)

Hooker, like all non-papist Englishmen of his time, no doubt believed that the Church of Rome was heretical in its eucharistic doctrine, and he would therefore be aware of the difficulty that the Fathers of the Church had often thought of the true Church and heretical companies as opposites. But the Fathers, he said,

"are to be construed as separating heretics not altogether from the company of believers, but from the fellowship of sound believers. For where professed unbelief is, there can be no visible Church of Christ; there may be where sound belief wanteth."(4)

Unrepented heresy, Hooker thought, would exclude a man completely from the invisible Church and separate him from the visible sound Church, but would not altogether sever him from the visible Church. (5)

(1) H.III.1.4-6 (2) Ibid 1.8 (3) Ibid 1.10 (4) Ibid 1.11 (5) Ibid 1.13.

The act of excommunication could exclude no-one from the invisible Church, nor yet completely from the visible, but only from the fellowship of the visible Church.⁽¹⁾

The Catholic Church was, to Hooker, a single society visible in the world. But just as the main body of the sea, although one, was differently named in different parts of the world, so the Catholic Church was made up of distinct societies, each of them a Church in itself.

These societies were no mere assemblies.

"Men are assembled for performance of public actions; which actions being ended, the assembly dissolveth itself and is no longer in being, whereas the Church which was assembled doth no less continue afterwards than before."⁽²⁾

A Christian society was

"a number of men belonging unto some Christian fellowship, the place and limits whereof are certain. That wherein they have communion is the public exercise of such duties as those mentioned in the Apostles' Acts, instruction, breaking of bread, and prayer."⁽³⁾

Just as the members of the mystical body of Christ had distinguishing notes by which they were known to God, so the members of the visible Church had visible notes of external profession whereby they were known to the world. Because of those visible notes of external profession, the distinct societies (i.e. the Churches of Rome, England, etc) must have properties common to them all, one of the chief of which was Ecclesiastical Polity⁽⁴⁾

(1) H.III.i.13 (2) Ibid i.14 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid. Hooker explained that he had chosen the term "polity" instead of "government" because the latter was too narrow for his purpose. It implied only the exercise of superiority, whereas "polity" embraced government and everything else pertaining to the public ordering of the Church.

Although polity was necessary for all Churches, Hooker argued, it was not necessary that all Churches should have the same form of polity. If any particular form of polity was good, God was the author of it. If it were a form devised by the light of nature, God was still the author of it, for it was God who had instituted the Law of Nature. If it were claimed that no Church polity was of God unless it had been set down in Scripture, the Puritans who made that claim should say whether it was set down in Scripture in whole or in part, and whether only that which was particularly set down was to be taken into the Church, or also that which was latent in the general principles and rules of Scripture.

"The one way they cannot as much as pretend, that all the parts of their own discipline are in Scripture: and the other way their mouths are stopped, when they would plead against all other forms besides their own; seeing the general principles are such as do not particularly prescribe any one, but sundry may equally be consonant unto the general axioms of the Scripture."(1)

Hooker attacked the Puritan idea that Discipline was to be linked with Doctrine as necessary to salvation. Some things, he argued, such as the Doctrine of the Trinity, were of faith, and could only be known and believed. Other things, such as the precepts of charity, were to be both known and done. Church government was a plain matter of action, and could therefore rightly be thought of ~~apart~~ apart from matters of faith.

To some extent, Hooker continued, but not sufficiently for salvation, nature could teach the Church her duty. In Scripture God had collected the most necessary things that nature taught, and had

(1) H.III.ii.1 (2) W.i.181 (3) H.III.iii.2

also revealed whatever else was necessary to salvation.

"But as for those things that are accessory hereunto, those things that so belong to the way of salvation as to alter them is no otherwise to change that way, than a path is changed by altering only the uppermost face thereof... in such things because discretion may teach the Church what is convenient, we hold not the Church herein further tied unto Scripture, than that against Scripture nothing be admitted in the Church."(1)

Although Hooker denied that there was any one particular form of Church polity to be found in Scripture, he was careful to point out that the principles of true government were to be found there, and even some important particulars.

"Although there be no necessity (that Scripture) should of purpose prescribe one particular form of Church government, yet touching the manner of governing in general, the precepts that Scripture setteth down are not few, and the examples many which it proposeth for all Church governors even in particularities to follow; yea, ~~that~~ those things finally which are of principal weight in the very particular form of Church polity, although not that form which (the Puritans) imagine, but that which we against them uphold, are in the selfsame Scripture contained."(2)

Hooker made a telling point when he dealt with the Puritan objection that Anglican practice, in contradiction of Deut.iv.2 and xii.32, often either added to, or took away from, the law of God. (3) The Puritans themselves, he said, when challenged to prove their own proposals from the Law of God, were in the habit of quoting incidental speeches from the historical books of the Old Testament, and then urging them as though they were set down as rules to be obeyed.

"When that which the word of God doth but deliver historically, we construe without warrant as if it were legally meant, and so urge it further than we can prove that it was intended; do we not add to the laws of God, and make them in number seem more than they are?"(4)

(1) H.III.iii.3 (2) Ibid.iv.1 (3) e.g. Frere and Douglas, op.cit. p.8 (4) H.III.v.1

There had never been a time when the Church had not added to the law of God. Even Jesus had done so when to the observance of the Passover he added the washing of the disciples' feet.⁽¹⁾

The four general rules educed by Cartwright from St Paul's epistles,⁽²⁾ that nothing in the Church be done scandalously, but everything with order and seemliness, to the edification of the Church, and to the glory of God, were rules observed by the Jews, Hooker declared, before ever they had been propounded by St Paul. They were not, however, set down in the Jewish Law; if they had been, St Paul would have quoted them from that Law. To the Jews they were edicts of nature. Were they therefore additions to the Law of God, and for that reason blameworthy? Just as the Jews had obeyed the light of nature in arranging those matters not prescribed for them in their Law, so the Church might do the same, and would have been obliged to do it even if St Paul had never written an epistle.⁽³⁾

Very briefly Hooker dealt with the Puritan confusion between the phrases "grounded upon Scripture" and "commanded by Scripture",⁽⁴⁾ a confusion by which the two expressions were treated as though they meant the same thing. By an example he showed that they ought to be distinguished as meaning different things. A man living as a celibate could claim that his life was grounded upon Scripture, for St Paul had commended such a life. But he could not claim that his life was commanded by Scripture, for without breaking any commandment he might marry. The fact was that the Puritans had taken up

(1) H.III.vi.1 (2) W.i.195 (3) H.III.vii.2 (4) E.G. in Cartwright's "Second Reply", p.56.

an impossible position when they declared that the Church must do nothing but what was commanded in Scripture, and then, Hooker thought, rather than admit their error they had invented the idea of "grounded upon Scripture". But this was no way out of their dilemma, for the two phrases in question could not be identified in meaning with each other.⁽¹⁾

Hooker traced the Puritans' excessive dependence upon Scripture to their disparagement of reason. They ought rather to have revered both Scripture and reason.

"The will of God which we are to judge our actions by, no sound divine in the world ever denied to be in part manifest even by light of nature, and not by Scripture alone. If the Church being directed by the former of these two (which God hath given who gave the other, that man might in different sort be guided by them both), if the Church, I say, do approve and establish that which thereby it judgeth meet, and findeth not repugnant to any word or syllable of holy Scripture; who shall warrant our presumptuous boldness controlling herein the Church of Christ?"⁽²⁾

The disgust with which Hooker contemplated the Puritan attitude to reason he expressed in the following terms:-

"An opinion hath spread itself very far in the world, as if the way to be ripe in faith were to be raw in wit and judgment; as if reason were an enemy unto religion, childish simplicity the mother of ghostly and divine wisdom."⁽³⁾

And he defined the place of reason in relation to the Scriptures thus

"Unto the word of God, being in respect of that end for which God ordained it, perfect, exact, and absolute in itself, we do not add reason as a supplement of any maim or defect therein, but as a necessary instrument, without which we could not reap by the Scriptures' perfection that fruit and benefit which it yieldeth."⁽⁴⁾

(1) H.III.viii.2 (2) Ibid viii.3 (3) Ibid ix.1 (4) Ibid.

Along with human authority, reason made up, in Hooker's view, those "other means" by which Holy Scripture was authenticated to men as the Word of God.

"Scripture indeed teacheth things above nature, things which our nature itself could not reach unto. Yet those things also we believe, knowing by reason that the Scripture is the word of God."(1)

The value of Scripture could only be known after Scripture had been accepted as the oracles of God. But it was not self-evident that the Scriptures were the oracles of God in the same sense that it was axiomatic that "the whole is greater than the part". Therefore,

"by experience we all know, that the first outward motive leading men so to esteem of the Scripture is the authority of God's Church... Afterwards the more we bestow our labour in reading or hearing the mysteries thereof, the more we find that the thing itself doth answer our received opinion concerning it. So that the former inducement prevailing somewhat with us before, doth now much more prevail, when the very thing hath ministered farther reason... Wherefore if I believe the Gospel, yet is reason of singular use, for that it confirmeth me in this my belief the more."(2)

The Scripture was full of disputation about the truth, and

"there is as yet no way known how to dispute, or to determine of things disputed, without the use of natural reason."(3)

Jesus himself had proceeded by reason when he asked,

"If Christ be the son of David, how doth David call him Lord?" (4)

For all these causes, then, the Church must employ both reason and Scripture, rather than Scripture alone, in forming her polity.

But Hooker was no believer in mere unilluminated human reason, for,

(1) H.III.ix.3 (2) ~~Ibid x.1~~ Ibid x.1 (3) Ibid (4) Mark xii.37.

"In all which hitherto hath been spoken touching the force and use of man's reason in things divine, I must crave that I be not so understood or construed, as if any such thing by virtue thereof could be done without the aid and assistance of God's most blessed Spirit."(1)

Scripture, Hooker declared, provided laws and examples for the making of ecclesiastical polity. But the use of scriptural examples was limited, for

"examples there neither are for all cases which require laws to be made, and when there are, they can but direct as precedents only."(2)

Natural laws in Scripture must always be obeyed, and so must also positive laws so long as they are kept in force by God. Reason must play its part in forming polity by deciding how far precedent may be followed, by determining what kind of polity best agrees with the natural laws, and by avoiding repugnancy to positive laws. In cases not covered by either law or precedent, reason alone must decide
(3)
what is best for the Church.

When the Church had once enacted her laws, continued Hooker, obedience to them must not be taken as a "thing indifferent".

"It doth not stand with the duty which we owe to our heavenly Father, that to the ordinances of our mother the Church, we should show ourselves disobedient... The laws thus made God himself doth in such sort authorize, that to despise them is to despise in them him."(4)

If God was the author of the light of nature by which the heathen were directed, much more was he the author of laws made by his
(5)
saints who were endued with his Spirit and directed by his Word.

Laws of Church polity were changed when they were repealed wholly

(1) H.III.x.2 (2) Ibid ix.1 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid ix.3 (5) Ibid.

or in part, or when they were added to. Only positive laws, Hooker held, might be changed. If a positive law had no time limit laid down for it to be in force, then its susceptibility to change must be judged in the light of its purpose, and of its suitability to its purpose. If in some of God's laws the purpose could not be discovered, then

"such laws cannot perhaps be abrogated saving only by whom they were made; because the intent of them being known unto none but the author, he alone can judge how long it is requisite they should endure."(1)

If the purpose of any law was found to be of perpetual necessity, then that law must be taken as unchangeable unless it had become ineffectual to achieve its purpose, in which case it might be changed.⁽²⁾

As examples of ^{laws} ~~the law~~ of God which the Church had altered because their purpose was no longer needed, Hooker cited the ceremonial law of the Old Testament, and the rules laid down by the Council of Jerusalem for observance by Gentile Christians.⁽³⁾ In the latter case the rules had been made by the Holy Spirit, but yet had fallen into disuse when the need for them had ceased.

Laws should be thought of, Hooker believed, not only in respect of the person who had enacted them, but also with regard to the fact that they were instruments to rule by and, as such, were not merely designed to attain their general purpose, but also to meet particular circumstances.

(1) H.III.x.1 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid x.2. Acts xv.28f.

"The end wherefore laws were made may be permanent, and those laws nevertheless require some alteration, if there be any unfitness in the means ~~which~~ which they prescribe as tending unto that end and purpose."(1)

Thus there might be a law restraining theft by inflicting fourfold restitution as a penalty. The purpose of restraining theft would be permanent, but the means (the fourfold restitution) might not always prove to be effective, and would then require alteration. It was for this reason that the Jewish judicial legislation had been abandoned by the Church, although its general purposes remained.

Hooker would not allow that it was presumptuous, or offensive in any way, to change God's laws when it became necessary to do so.

"God never ordained anything that could be bettered. Yet many things he hath that have been changed, and that for the better... In this case... men do not presume to change God's ordinance, but they yield themselves thereunto requiring itself to be changed."(4)

Hooker met the charge that alteration of God's laws involved an abrogation of the Gospel, by drawing a distinction between faith and polity:-

"There is no reason in the world wherefore we should esteem it as necessary always to do, as always to believe, the same things; seeing every man knoweth that the matter of faith is constant, the matter contrariwise of action daily changeable, especially the matter of action belonging unto Church polity."(5)

His conclusion was, therefore,

"that neither God's being the author of laws for government of his Church, nor his committing them unto Scripture, is any reason sufficient whereof all Churches should for ever be bound to keep them without change."(6)

Because Hooker had admitted that some parts of Church polity were to be found in Scripture, he warned his readers that he did not

 (1) H.III.x.3 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid x.4 (4) Ibid x.5 (5) Ibid (6) Ibid

mean by that admission that he thought many parts of Puritan Church polity were to be found there, and that he must therefore argue a case for the mutability of God's laws in order to win a victory for Anglican polity. If he wished for such a victory it was open to him to try to discover Anglican polity in Scripture.

"If therefore we did seek to maintain that which most advantageth our own cause, the very best way for us, and the strongest against them were to hold even as they do, that in Scripture there must needs be found some particular form of Church polity which God hath instituted, and which for that very cause belongeth to all Churches, to all times. But with any such partial eye to respect ourselves, and by cunning to make those things seem the truest which are the fittest to serve our purpose, is a thing which we neither like, nor mean to follow."(1)

If there had been a Church polity laid down in Scripture, and its alteration forbidden, then certainly alteration of it would be an intolerable presumption. True, St Paul had commanded St Timothy to

"keep the commandment, without spot, without reproach, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ."(3)

It was also true that what Scripture taught one man it taught all men if their cases were alike. But what, asked Hooker, did this saying of St Paul's teach St Timothy? He was to keep that great commandment which concerned his calling, the commandment so often referred to in Scripture, the commandment to preach the Word of God, and to do so without admixture of strange doctrine.

Hooker thought that to keep this commandment "until the appearing of Christ" did not refer to the time during which the commandment was to be kept, but to the time when faithfulness would be

(1) H.III.x.8 (2) Ibid xi.1 (3) I Tim.vi.14 (4) H.III.xi.11

finally rewarded. Timothy, that is to say, was not to look so much to present labour as to future reward, and in so looking was to find encouragement. But if the Puritans rejected this interpretation in favour of one importing perpetual observance of the commandment, they must at least admit that the commandment did not cover all of St Paul's charge to Timothy, for they did not propose to obey all that charge themselves, notably in the matter of widows. (1)

Hooker closed his examination of the connection between Church polity and Scripture by drawing a line between the unchangeable parts of polity, and those which he considered to be variable. It was the duty of the Church, he said, to administer the Word and Sacraments, prayers, spiritual censures, and the like.

"Laws of polity are laws which appoint in what manner these duties shall be performed." (2)

The unchangeable features of Church polity were three:-

(a) There must be a difference of persons within the Church. All the members of the Church could not perform the duties if there was to be orderliness in the performing of them.

"Hereupon we hold that God's clergy are a state, which hath been and will be, as long as there is a Church upon earth, necessary by the plain word of God himself." (3)

(b) Where the clergy were numerous there must be a distinction of degree amongst them.

"We hold that there have ever been and ever ought to be in such case at leastwise two sorts of ecclesiastical persons, the one subordinate unto the other; as to the Apostles in the beginning, and to the Bishops always since, we find plainly both in Scripture and in all ecclesiastical records, other ministers of the Word and sacraments have been." (4)

(1) H.III.xi.11 (2) Ibid xi.20 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid.

(c) No man might take upon himself to perform the duties of the Church without an authority other than his own, and therefore, into the state of the clergy

"a solemn admittance is of such necessity, that without it there can be no Church polity."(1)

Among the variable elements of Church polity, Hooker placed certain things which made for the more convenient working of the three unchangeable features. These changeable things included whatever concerned the formality and circumstance of the Church's public actions.

"Now although that which the Scripture hath of things in the former kind be for ever permanent: yet in the latter both much of that which the Scripture teacheth is not always needful; and much the Church of God shall always heed which the Scripture teacheth not."(2)

XI.

In his fourth Book Hooker considered the Puritan accusation that Anglican polity was corrupted with papistry, and ~~with~~ the demand that it be conformed with the polities of the other reformed Churches

In every public duty there was, in addition to the matter and form wherein its essence consisted, an outward fashion which gave the action decent performance. This was the case with those duties which the Church performed at God's command. For example, the essence of Baptism had been briefly laid down by God, but the decent administration of Baptism required much more than that. (3)

Edification must be the aim of the rules governing this outward

(1) H.III.xi.20 (2) Ibid (3) H.IV.i.2

fashion. Edification was a teaching of the understanding, a moving of the heart, and a stirring of the mind to reverence and devotion, and was brought about not only by speech, but also by things that could be seen. Such visible actions in Christian worship were not new sacraments added to those already ordained by God, but were "as sacraments" only.⁽¹⁾

The rites and ceremonies of the Church might be at fault regarding their kind and number, but it was useless to appeal to a supposed apostolic simplicity to set a standard in this matter, since nobody knew how far apostolic practice had gone. Hooker did not agree with St Augustine's theory that the universal practice of the ancient Church must have been due to apostolic decree or to the decisions of general councils.

"Of the positive laws and orders received throughout the whole Christian Church, St Augustine could imagine no other fountain save these two."⁽²⁾

But, Hooker pointed out, when St Augustine's theory was rejected, what apostolic practice might have been in many matters was left entirely uncertain. Only as much of it could be known as the Apostles had described in their writings, quite incidentally, when they had been writing about other matters. Therefore,

"In tying the Church to the orders of the Apostles' times, (the Puritans) tie it to a marvellous uncertain rule; unless they require the observance of no orders but only those which are known to be apostolical by the Apostles' own writings."⁽³⁾

Hooker's own position was that, providing the apostolic end of

(1) H.IV.i.3 (2) Ibid.ii.2. Augustine, De Bapt. c. Donat.v.23, Ep.54.i.1. (3) H.IV.ii.2.

decency in worship was secured, the means of securing it might be various.

"They who recall the Church unto that which was at the first, must necessarily set bounds and limits unto their speeches. If anything have been received repugnant unto that which was first delivered, the first things in this case must stand, the last give place unto them. But where difference is without repugnancy, that which hath been can be no prejudice to that which is."(1)

Hooker noticed that the Puritans wished to abolish all "popish" orders from the Church of England, for they thought it not enough to differ from the papists in doctrine while retaining part of the popish ceremonies and almost all the popish form of government, even though the things retained might be lawful and not repugnant to the Word of God. Hooker flatly rejected this position of the Puritans. In matters not blameable,

"as they affirm, so we deny, that whatsoever is popish we ought to abrogate."(2)

The principle upon which the Church of England had retained some ceremonies used by the papists was

"that we judge them profitable, and to be such that others instead of them would be worse."(3)

The burden of proving these ceremonies to be unprofitable must be borne by the Puritans,

"for in all right and equity, that which the Church hath received and held so long for good, that which public approbation hath ratified, must carry the benefit of presumption with it to be accounted meet and convenient."(4)

Although Hooker revered antiquity, he was no slave to it. He

(1)H.IV.ii.4 (2) Ibid iii.1 (3) Ibid iv.2 (4) Ibid. In "The Rest of the Second Reply", p.176, Cartwright had placed the burden of proving the ceremonies ~~profitable~~ profitable upon the Anglicans.

agreed with St Augustine's assertion

"that the custom of the people of God and the decrees of our forefathers are to be kept, touching those things whereof the Scripture hath neither one way nor other given us any charge." (1)

But he would not allow his agreement to be taken to mean that the Church was excluded from making further laws.

"We lawfully may observe the positive constitutions of our own Churches, although the same were but yesterday made by ourselves alone."(2)

Even if the papists were not the people of God nor the forefathers of Anglicans and Puritans, did St Augustine mean, Hooker asked, that the Church of England must not receive rites and ceremonies from ~~them~~ them?

"How much less when we have received from them nothing, but that which they did themselves receive from such as we cannot deny to have been the people of God."(3)

Geneva itself followed Rome in the use of wafer-bread at the Communion, and in the employment of Godparents at Baptism.

"Is conformity with Rome in such things a blemish unto the Church of England, and unto the Churches abroad an ornament?" (4)

In matters of this kind the English Puritans were more extreme than their fellows in Geneva.

"These things the godly there can digest. Wherefore should not the godly here learn to do the like both in them and in the rest of the like nature?"(5)

Merely to concur with the papists, or even with the heathen, in opinion or in action, Hooker declared, was not evil.

"Conformity with them is only then a disgrace, when either we follow them in that they think and do amiss, or follow

(1) Augustine, Ep.36.i.2 (2) H.IV.v.1. (3) Ibid. (4) Ibid vi.1
 (5) Ibid x.1. Bancroft, in his "Dangerous Positions and Proceedings" p.42, noted that Beza was more extreme than Calvin, and the English Puritans more extreme than Beza.

"them generally in that they do without other reason than only the liking we have to the pattern of their example; which liking doth intimate a more universal approbation of them than is allowable."(1)

(2)

To the proposition of Travers that it would be preferable to conform the Church to the practice of the Turks rather than to that of Rome, Hooker replied by appealing to the "reasonable man".

"Forasmuch as papists are so much in Christ nearer unto us than Turks, is there any reasonable man, trow you, but will judge it meeter that our ceremonies of Christian religion should be popish than Turkish or heathenish."(3)

He would not allow his judgment to be influenced by the fear of Rome.

"They which measure religion by dislike of the Church of Rome think every man so much the more sound, by how much he can make the corruptions thereof to seem more large... Wisdom... and skill is requisite to know, what parts are sound in that Church, and what corrupted."(4)

It was the rigid enforcement of the policy of being as different as possible from Rome that had brought about the Brownist schism.

"There hath arisen a sect in England, which following still the very selfsame rule of policy, seeketh to reform even the French reformation, and purge out from thence also dregs of popery."(5)

But, in fact, Anglican practice in rites and ceremonies was not in origin popish, but followed the custom of the Church in ancient times.

"The ceremonies which we have taken from such as were before us, are not things which belong to this or that sect, but they are the ancient rites and customs of the Church of Christ, whereof ourselves being a part, we have the selfsame interest in them which our fathers before us had, from whom the same are descended unto us."(6)

The alternative Puritan plea, that the Anglican ceremonies ought

(1) H.IV.vii.1 (2) See Travers' "Full and Plaine Declaration", p.134.
 (3) Ibid vii.6 (4) Ibid viii.2 (5) Ibid viii.4 (6) Ibid ix.1

to be abolished because they were in origin Jewish, Hooker answered according to the two headings under which the plea was usually put forward, first, that Christ had abrogated the Jewish ceremonies by his sacrifice, and second, that the early Church had legislated against the imitation of Jews by Christians. (1)

Of the Jewish ordinances some, Hooker maintained, were based on natural law, and were therefore perpetual. Of the others, which were positive laws, some were not to be observed by Christians because Christ had abrogated them, while the rest were "indifferent". But even the things abrogated, such as circumcision and sacrifice, had been observed for a time by Jewish Christians, and in these things the Apostles had not made Gentile and Jew conformable to each other. (2) As for the things positive but "indifferent", some had been laid upon the Gentile Christians by the Council of Jerusalem. (3) This had been done to keep peace in the Church between Gentile and Jew. From these circumstances two conclusions were to be drawn:-

"The first, that whatsoever conformity of positive laws the Apostles did bring in between the Churches of Jews and Gentiles, it was in those things only which might either cease or continue a shorter or longer time, as occasion did most require; the second, that they did not impose upon the Churches of the Gentiles any part of the Jews' ordinances, with bond of necessary and perpetual observation... but only in respect of the conveniency and fitness for the present state of the Church as it then stood." (4)

There were, that is to say, some things in which the Gentile Christians were to be unlike the Jews, and others in which they were not to be unlike them. (5)

(1) H.IV.xi.3 (2) Ibid xi.4 (3) Acts xv.29 (4) Ibid xi.5 (5) Ibid xi.8

The abrogation of Judaism had not become effective, Hooker thought, as early as was usually supposed, for Jewish Christians had joined in the sacrifices of the Temple for as long as that building had remained standing. Nor had Jesus so completely abolished Judaism that afterwards the very words "priest", "altar", and "sacrifice" were banished from the Church.

"Throughout all the writings of the ancient Fathers we see that the words which were do continue; the only difference is, that whereas before they had a literal, they now have a metaphorical use, and are so many notes of remembrance unto us, that what they did signify in the letter is accomplished in the truth."(1)

Hooker refused the idea that the decrees of the early Church had prohibited Christians from imitating Jewish ceremonies.

"They rather forbid communion with Jews than imitation of them." (2)
 As evidence of Christian conformity with Jewish custom he cited the varying practice of the early Eastern and Western Churches in their observance of Easter and in the celebration of the Eucharist. The one fixed the date of Easter by the Jewish way of reckoning the date of the Passover, but used a different kind of Eucharistic bread from that used at the Passover. The other differed from the Jews about the date, but agreed with them over the bread. If being different from the Jews had been a principle in the early Church, it would have been simple to suggest that East and West settle their differences by each giving up that in which it resembled the Jews. But the Emperor ^{Constantine I} had tried to compose the differences by suggesting that the (3)
 East conform to the West.

(1) H.IV.xi.10 (2) Ibid xi.11. See Canon xxxviii of the Synod of Laodicea, A.D.343-381; Percival, The Seven Ecumenical Councils, 151.
 (3) H.IV.xi.12. Eusebius, De Vit.Const.iii.18.

It was Hooker's opinion that the weightiest Puritan objection against Anglican ceremonies was not that they had been used by papists, but that having been abused by them, they were now a scandal and a stumbling block. But what, he asked, was the meaning of "scandalous"? He answered,

"Men are scandalized when they are moved, led, or provoked to sin."(2)

Sometimes good things were a scandal to evil men, as Christ was to his enemies. Sometimes things were actively scandalous because, of themselves, they invited men to sin. But good things had no scandalous nature in them.

Ceremonies might be scandalous in themselves, but

"some are offensive only through the agreement of men to use them unto evil, and not else; as the most of those things indifferent which the heathens did to the service of their false gods, which another, in heart condemning their idolatry, could not do with them in show and token of approbation without being guilty of scandal given."(4)

Nobody, Hooker thought, would argue that the ceremonies which the Church of England had in common with Rome were evil in themselves. But even if they had been devised in the first place for an impious purpose, they

"may wear out that impiety in tract of time; and then what doth let but that the use thereof may stand without offence?"(5)

The conclusion must therefore be drawn that

"customs once established and confirmed by long use, being presently without harm, are not in regard of their corrupt original to be held scandalous."(6)

(1) H.IV.xii.1 (2) Ibid xii.2 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid xii.3 (5) Ibid xii.4
(6) Ibid.

Indeed, the ceremonies preserved by the Church of England had been invented originally for a good purpose, not for a corrupt one, and being used again for that good purpose, were not to be regarded as scandalous.⁽¹⁾

Hooker did not agree that in the matter of ceremonies the Puritans should be treated as the Gentile Christians had treated their Jewish "weaker brethren" who objected to meat offered to idols. The two cases were unlike. The Jews as a nation objected to idol-meat, whereas the Puritans were only a small minority of the English people. Again, the question of idol-meat affected the private relations of Gentiles with Jews, whereas the question of the ceremonies affected the public duties of the Church. To abolish the ceremonies would deprive the majority of their benefit for the sake of a minority. The true remedy was to instruct this minority in the correct view of the ceremonies.⁽²⁾

Finally, Hooker took up the suggestion that the Church of England should conform her polity to that of the other reformed Churches,⁽³⁾ together with its variants, that there should be an exchange among the reformed ~~reformed~~ Churches of the best of their ceremonies, that where ceremonies were equally commodious those Churches which had been reformed later should give way to those that had been reformed longer, and that the minority of Churches should follow the majority in these matters.⁽⁴⁾

Hooker willingly admitted the advantages of uniformity, but he

(1) H.IV.xii.5 (2) Ibid xii.7 (3) W.ii.451 (4) H.IV.xiii.1. Cartwright, "The Rest of the Second Reply", p.183

questioned the suggested manner of reaching it, and especially
 (1)
 doubted the right to make it binding upon the Churches.

"We rather incline to think it a just and reasonable cause for any Church, the state whereof is free and independent, if in these things it differ from other Churches, only for that it doth not judge it so fit and expedient to be framed therein by the pattern of their example, as to be otherwise framed than they."(2)

The idea of a mutual exchange of ceremonies merely left open the question, who was to decide what was best? A general council would
 (3)
 be needed to solve the problem, not mutual imitation. Nor did Hooker favour the idea that differences should be settled by following the standards of the Churches whose reformations were of the longest standing, or by accepting the practices of the majority of reformed Churches. Their examples, he thought, might move other Churches to conform to them, but could not compel them to do so. Each national Church was an independent and self-contained unit, with a right to order its own ways. The Churches

"stand out single each of them by itself, their number can purchase them no such authority, that the rest of the Churches being fewer should be therefore bound to follow them, and to relinquish as good ceremonies as theirs for theirs."(4)

Loyalty to one's own Church, Hooker felt, should be allowed to play a part in this matter:-

"They grant we need not follow them, if our own ways already be better: and if our own be but equal, the law of common indulgence alloweth us to think them at the least half a thought the better because they are our own; which we may very well do, and never draw any indictment at all against theirs, but think commendably even of them also."(5)

(1) H.IV.xiii.2 (2) Ibid xiii.3 (3) Ibid xiii.8 (4) Ibid xiii.9
 (5) Ibid xiii.10.

XII.

Hooker's fifth Book, which exceeds in length the first four taken together, deals with many of the details of the polity of the Church of England, and answers the Puritan charge that in the performance of her public duties the Church was superstitious, and in her government corrupt. Many of these details, and much of the ground that Hooker covered, are not relevant to present purposes, and only such parts of the fifth Book as affect the authority of the Church and the nature of the ministry will therefore be examined here.

Concerning rites and ceremonies, Hooker saw that there was some common ground between Anglicans and Puritans:-

"On both sides the end intended between us, is to have laws and ordinances such as may rightly serve to abolish superstition, and to establish the service of God with all things thereunto pertaining in some perfect form."(1)

He distinguished between an "inward reasonable" and a "solemn outward serviceable" worship of God. The latter, which was "external adoration", was the subject under controversy.

Hooker also saw that Anglicans and Puritans were agreed that in principal matters the Church must be ordered by divine precept, but in lesser matters partly by divine precept and partly by human law. Viewing it from this angle, the controversy was whether the laws of the Church of England concerning these lesser matters were as they ought to be, either regarding the public duties of religion or the persons who were to perform those duties.

(1) H.V.iv.3 (2) Ibid

Hooker put forward four propositions to govern the making of laws for the polity of the Church:-

(i) The Church should show outwardly what each Christian ought to be inwardly. Signs must resemble the things signified, and therefore

"in the external form of religion such things as are apparently, or can be sufficiently proved, effectual and generally fit to set forward godliness... may be reverently thought of."(1)

(ii) There should be a prejudice in favour of things which had had a long usage in the Church, because such length of usage suggested that they had been found by experience to be useful, and age lent them authority. Hence

"in things the fitness whereof is not of itself apparent, nor easy to be made sufficiently manifest unto all, yet the judgment of antiquity concurring with that which is received may induce them to think it not unfit, who are not able to allege any known weighty inconvenience which it hath."(2)

(iii) The authority of the Church to enact laws dealing with polity must be respected. And so,

"where neither the evidence of any law divine, nor the strength of any invincible argument otherwise found out by the light of reason, nor any notable public inconvenience, doth make against that which our own laws ecclesiastical have although but newly instituted for the ordering of these affairs, the very authority of the Church itself at least in such cases, may give so much credit to her own laws, as to make their sentence touching fitness and convenience weightier than any bare and naked conceit to the contrary."(3)

(iv) Because it was impossible to legislate for every circumstance of human life, some relaxation from the strict observance of the law should be permitted in cases of necessity or extremity.

"Not that the law is unjust, but unperfect; nor equity against, but above, the law, binding men's consciences in things which law cannot reach unto."(4)

(1) H.V.vi.2 (2) Ibid vii.4 (3) Ibid viii.5 (4) Ibid ix.3

It should not be considered wrong, that is to say,

"if in cases of necessity, or for common utility's sake, certain profitable ordinances sometime be released, rather than all men always strictly bound to the general rigour thereof."(1)

The fourth of these propositions was not intended to give Puritans liberty to exercise their private judgment in matters of public worship, but to safeguard the Church's right, to which the Puritans objected, to grant dispensations from the observance of her laws. To make this quite clear Hooker added that if

"it should be free for men to reprove, to disgrace, to reject at their own liberty what they see done and practised according to order set down; if... the Church did give every man licence to follow what himself imagineth that 'God's Spirit doth reveal' unto him, or what he supposeth that God is likely to have revealed to some special person whose virtues deserve to be highly esteemed: what other effect could hereupon ensue, but the utter confusion of his Church under the pretence of being taught, led, and guided by his Spirit."(2)

Since the surplice was the point at which most of the force of the Puritan attack upon Anglican ceremonies had been levelled, what Hooker had to say upon this subject may be taken as typical of his attitude towards the rest of the disputed ceremonies.

At the outset Hooker denied that the wearing of a surplice was intended to impart holiness to the wearer.

"As we think not ourselves the holier because we use it, so neither should they with whom no such thing is in use think us therefore unholy, because we submit ourselves unto that, which in a matter so indifferent the wisdom of authority and law hath thought comely. To solemn actions of royalty and justice their suitable ornaments are a beauty. Are they only in religion a stain?"(3)

Hooker noticed that SS Jerome and Chrysostom had mentioned that

(1) H.V.ix.5 (2) Ibid x.1 (3) Ibid xxix.1

the clergy of their times had worn a white garment in Church, but he placed little reliance upon that precedent. He also noticed that there had been a change in the Puritan attitude to the surplice, as exemplified by Cartwright, and he asked,

"Were it not better that the love which men bear to God should make the least things that are employed in his service amiable, than that their over-scrupulous dislike of so mean a thing as a vestment should from the very service of God withdraw their hearts and affections? I term it the rather a mean thing, a thing not much to be respected, because even so they now account of it, whose first disputations against it were such as if religion had ~~scarcely~~ scarcely anything of greater weight."(3)

The surplice, Hooker claimed, had been chosen for use in the Church of England

"because it hath been of reasonable continuance, and by special choice was taken out of the number of those holy garments which (over and besides their mystical reference) served for 'comeliness' under the Law, and is in the number of those ceremonies which may with choice and discretion be used to that purpose in the Church of Christ; as also for that it suiteth so fitly with that lightsome affection of joy, wherein God delighteth when his saints praise him; and so lively resembleth the glory of the saints in heaven, together with the beauty wherein Angels have appeared unto men, that they which are to appear for men in the presence of God as Angels, if they were left to their own choice and would choose any, could not easily devise a garment of more decency for such a service."(4)

As for the advice that had come to the Puritans out of Switzerland in the days of the Vestiarian controversy, to wear the surplice rather than give up the ministry, but to use every opportunity to express dislike for it and a wish to see it abolished, Hooker said,

"Obedience with a professed unwillingness to obey is no better than manifest disobedience."(5)

 (1) H.V.xxix.3 (2) For the earlier Puritan opinion that the surplice was not to be tolerated but to be utterly abolished, Hooker quoted T.132f and Cartwright's "The Rest of the Second Reply", p.257. The latter book was published in 1577, but was probably written in 1576, just before the time when Cartwright was undergoing his change of mind on the subject of the clerical apparel. (3) H.V.xxix.4
 (4) Ibid xxix.5 (5) Ibid xxix.8.

XIII.

Much of what Hooker had to say about the ministry of the Church, and especially about episcopacy, was reserved for his seventh Book which, genuine or not, did not appear in print until long after his death. However, in his treatment of the Ordinal in his fifth Book he dealt incidentally with some of the questions raised about the ministry by the Puritan controversialists, and the brief passages in which he did this may conveniently be considered here.

The ministry, for Hooker, was a divinely instituted function in the Church. Since the minister derived his authority from God, his office must not be assumed without lawful authorization, either direct from God or indirectly from God through the Church. The power which God imparted to the ministry was an indelible mark, indicating a separation from other men. The ministry therefore formed a distinct order within the Church, as St Paul had implied when he described the laity as ἰδωτάς, for the opposite of the order of laity could be no other than the clergy. Once it had been received, the power of the ministry could not be discarded, for the knot was tied by God. The exercise of the power might be prevented by suspension of the minister but, just as with a separation in matrimony, if there should be a restitution the knot would still be there and could not be repeated.

(1) H.V.lxxvii.1 (2) Ibid lxxvii.2. I Cor.xiv.16, 23f. Unfortunately for Hooker's argument ἰδωτάς in the last-named verse is not one of the laity, but is contrasted with the laity and with the "whole Church", of which he is apparently not a member. But he is also contrasted with ὁ ἀπίστος, and must therefore be regarded as a postulant for Baptism who is as yet ignorant of the faith and way of life of Christians. In I Cor.xiv.16 he has a special place in the Christian assembly, presumably apart from the congregation. In these passages ὁ ἰδωτάς cannot mean a layman as opposed to a clergyman. See Arndt and Gingrich, op.cit. 371. (3) H.V.lxxvii.3

In ancient Israel, Hooker pointed out, God had chosen one tribe, Levi, to be his ministers, and within that tribe Aaron and his sons were given an especial charge. Out of the other tribes God had from time to time called prophets, and these men had had "sons", or pupils, who had been expounders of the Scriptures, and who had later been succeeded by the Scribes.

There had been no equality among these ministers of Israel. The Levites had been under the direction of the sons of Aaron who, in turn, had been subject to their leaders, and all had been under the High Priest. Their titles, Hooker thought, displayed their inequality. Aaron and his successors had been "High Priests"; there had been "arch-priests" over the various companies of priests; the prophets had been called "fathers", and the Scribes "masters".⁽¹⁾

In the Christian Church, Hooker said, the clergy were either presbyters or deacons.⁽²⁾ Christ himself had appointed two kinds of presbyters, one kind with the fulness of spiritual power, the other with less than the fulness. The Apostles' charge had been to preach to all nations and to deliver the ordinances to others which they themselves had received direct from Christ.

"Which pre-eminence excepted, to all other offices and duties incident unto their order it was in them to ordain and consecrate whomsoever they thought meet, even as our Saviour did himself assign seventy other of his own disciples inferior presbyters, whose commission to preach and baptize was the same which the Apostles had."⁽³⁾

(1) H.V.lxxviii.1. (2) Ibid lxxviii.2 (3) Ibid lxxviii.4. Most modern New Testament scholars would probably hold some view like that of Richardson, "The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels", p.42, who says that Matthew conflated the Mark and Q accounts of the Mission of the Twelve, while Luke reproduced them as two separate Missions. It is a question whether Luke or Q was responsible for the number

Hooker imagined that Jesus had foreseen the numerous conversions which would follow his resurrection, and had provided the Seventy to fulfil the need which would arise for a numerous ministry. For that reason there was no mention in the "history" (i.e. the Acts of the Apostles) of the institution of these lesser presbyters at Jerusalem, but only a notice of what they did. The making of similar presbyters elsewhere was, how^ever, noticed in the Acts. (1)

To these two degrees of ministers the Apostles added Deacons. (2) Their work had been to deal with finance and, as Ignatius showed, to attend their presbyters at divine service. In the exercise of her liberty, there being no prohibition to prevent it, the Church had extended the ministry of Deacons beyond its original scope.

"Suppose we the office of teaching to be so repugnant unto the office of deaconship that they cannot concur in one and the same person? What was there done in the Church by deacons which the Apostles did not first discharge being teachers?" (3)

But in spite of this change of function, the Diaconate remained

"a degree of the clergy of God which the Apostles did institute." (4)

 Seventy in the account of the second Mission, Luke x.1-16. This number is symbolical of a mission to the seventy nations of the Gentiles, just as the earlier account in Luke ix.1-6 described a mission to the twelve tribes of Israel, carried out by twelve missionaries. Nowhere else in the New Testament are the Seventy heard of, and it cannot be taken as historical reminiscence that there were any other than the Twelve Apostles who assisted Jesus in this way during his ministry. Even if there were actually seventy missionaries so sent out by Jesus, it does not follow that they formed a ministry subsidiary to the Apostolate. Nor was Hooker correct in describing the Apostles as presbyters. (1) H.V. lxxviii.4 (2) The reference is to a later interpolation into the Epistle of Ignatius to the Trallians. (3) H.V.lxxviii.5 (4) Ibid.

Christian prophets, Hooker believed, had been men with a gift from God of expounding the Scripture and foretelling the future, but they had not been of the clergy,

"because no man's gifts or qualities can make him a minister of holy things, unless ordination do give him power."(1)

Evangelists, on the other hand, had been of the clergy. They were presbyters sent abroad as agents of the Apostles, while Pastors and Teachers were presbyters settled in one place.⁽²⁾

Hooker turned next to the two passages of Scripture most relied upon by Puritans for a picture of the ministry in the days of the Apostles. It could not be denied, he claimed, that many of the things mentioned in I Cor.xii.28ff might concur in one man, and ~~therefore~~ therefore those things could not be regarded as Church offices. The people mentioned in this passage were "communicants of special infused grace", and that was why the Apostles were mentioned first; they possessed all the truth from Christ, and had received it immediately from him. Prophets were mentioned next because they had a part of what the Apostles had fully, and had received that part in the same way as the Apostles had received the whole. Then followed Teachers, men who had learned about Christ by hearing from others about him, but who were endowed by God with ability to instruct. And then,

"after gifts of education there follow general abilities to work things above nature."(3)

In Ephes.iv.7-12 only gifts of instruction were mentioned. Here

(1) H.V.lxxviii.6 (2) Ibid lxxviii.7 (3) Ibid lxxviii.8

Evangelists were placed after Prophets and before Pastors and Teachers. Hooker took this placing to mean that Evangelists were below Prophets in that their knowledge was not received by direct revelation, but they were above Pastors and Teachers because of their greater ability to instruct.

"They are, as having received one way less than Prophets and another way more than Teachers, set accordingly between both." (1)

Hooker did not agree that degrees of ecclesiastical persons might be inferred from these passages. In these two places St Paul had mentioned persons endowed with the gifts of the Spirit, and from out of the number of the persons so endowed the ministry was chosen. For example, although

"the Apostle in reckoning degrees and varieties of grace doth mention Pastors and Teachers",

he mentions them

"not in respect of their ordination to exercise the ministry, but as examples of men especially enriched with the gifts of the Holy Ghost." (2)

What grades of ministry there ought to be in the Church was to be learned from

"other parts of Holy Scripture, whereby it clearly appeareth that Churches apostolic did know but three degrees in the power of ecclesiastical order, at the first Apostles, Presbyters, and Deacons, afterwards instead of Apostles Bishops." (3)

(1) H.V.lxxviii.9. It is nothing more than conjecture that St Paul named Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, etc in the order in which they are arranged for the reason Hooker gives. The true reason may be nothing more important than that this was the order in which they chanced to come into St Paul's mind as he wrote, or dictated, the passages in question. (2) Ibid lxxviii.9 (3) Ibid. Hooker did not specify which "other parts of Holy Scripture" he meant.

XIV.

Hooker's view that ordination conferred an indelible character upon the clergy affected his approach to the question of ordination "sine titulo". The Church, he argued, was confined in its earliest days to the cities. Within the cities it was not organized in parishes, but each city was served by a College of presbyters and deacons, each College being governed at first by the Apostles or by their delegates the Evangelists. Under these conditions the cure of souls had been common to the College, and no presbyter had had an individual charge until, in A.D. 112 Evaristus, Bishop of Rome, began to appoint a district to each Church in that city, and a presbyter to each district. ⁽¹⁾ As this useful arrangement spread elsewhere, ⁽²⁾ the parochial system came into being.

At this point Hooker diverged from his main argument to notice that the unit in which the Church was to be found whole and complete was not the congregation or the parish, as the Puritans supposed, for the Church had been in existence before ever the parochial system had been started. That Puritan supposition lay at the root of the objection to ordination without title; the objection, if upheld, would render impossible the sending of ordained missionaries to the heathen, since the heathen were not assembled in congregations or parishes; it would equally prevent the employment of stipendiary ⁽³⁾ curates.

(1) Hooker's authority for this statement was the Liber Pontificalis, vi. This is a sixth century work in the period with which Hooker was dealing, but based upon the fourth century Catalogus Liberianus. It is a poor authority for events as early as A.D. 112.
 (2) H.V.lxxx.2 (3) Ibid lxxx.3,12.

Resuming his main argument, Hooker declared that there was no apostolic prohibition of ordination "sine titulo". If the example of the Apostles was to be imitated, then

"indefinite ordination of Priests and Deacons doth come more near the Apostles example, and the tying of them to be made only for particular congregations may justlier ground itself upon the example of Evaristus than of any Apostle of Christ." (1)

The key to the problem, Hooker believed, was to understand the true purpose of ordination:-

"Presbyters and Deacons are not by ordination consecrated unto places, but unto functions." (2)

Further to the point were the four following considerations:-

- (a) The nature of the ministry must be clearly distinguished from the exercise and use of it.
- (b) Ordination made men ministers by consecrating them to God for life, whether they exercised their ministry or not.
- (c) The giving of a title concerned the placing, and not the making, of a minister.
- (d) Where ancient canons forbade ordination without title, it was to be considered whether later circumstances were the same as those which prevailed at the time the canons were made. (3)

On the last of these points Hooker asserted that in the ancient Church ordination without title had been forbidden so that ~~every~~ a minister should have a secure maintenance. After ordination he could not return to the world, and so must be protected from possible destitution. But if an ordinand had a private income, or was

(1) H.V.lxxx.4 (2) Ibid. lxxx.6 (3) Ibid.lxxx.8. In the first three of these considerations Hooker was, of course, begging the question which lay between him and the Puritans.

provided for in some other way, then the canons did not absolutely forbid his ordination "sine titulo". The basic Puritan mistake was to refer the canons to the cure of souls rather than to the
(1)
maintenance of the minister.

(1) H.V.lxxx.10. Canon vi of the Council of Chalcedon, however, absolutely and without any reservation prohibited ordination without title. Such ordination was "inoperative", but this does not appear to mean that it was invalid. Rather, it seems to mean that the person so ordained was not to officiate in the office to which he had been ordained. See Percival, op.cit. 271f.

XV.

In course of time Hooker's treatise became famous for its literary excellence, but it may be doubted whether it would have retained its fame for so long if it had not been for the breadth of its author's view of the universe and of man which it so fully displays. The conclusions which Hooker drew out of his view of creation so convince the reason that, just as in Elizabethan times they turned out to be as final as any on the subjects with which they deal were ever likely to be, so in the twentieth century they are found to be generally satisfactory and broadly true.

Underlying much Puritan teaching was the idea that in Scripture, and in Scripture alone, could a knowledge of God be learned and his will discovered. That God might be revealed, although only partially, in his creation was a conception that was lacking in Puritan philosophy. From this defect Hooker delivered the Christian thought of his time. By showing that God's laws operated in the natural creation and in the physical side of human nature, and by declaring that God rejoiced in the right response of nature (even though that response might be unconscious) to the laws which he had given to nature to work by, Hooker went beyond the limits of Scripture to discover some of the laws of God, and consequently to find some of the obedience which God demanded to his laws. But in doing this Hooker was more, rather than less, scriptural than his opponents, for Scripture itself professes a belief that the heavens declare the glory of God, wind and storm fulfil his Word.

From this starting point in the material creation Hooker was

able to advance to a similar view of the immaterial side of human nature. Reason was a gift of God to man, and the purpose of the gift was that it should be used. By employing his reason man was not offending God, but obeying the purpose for which he had been created a reasonable soul. By using his reason in the contemplation of God's handiwork in nature and in his own nature, man might attain, and had attained, to some knowledge of the laws that he was required to obey. But Hooker was no humanist. He did not believe that unaided human reason could take mankind very far along the path he was required to follow. Reason must be illuminated and guided by the Spirit of God. Nor did he set up reason as an authority alternative to the authority of Scripture; it was rather an instrument to be used in the better understanding of Scripture. Nor did reason supply any supposed deficiency in Scripture; it was rather Scripture which supplied the deficiencies which arose from the employment of reason by sinful man. It was in this matter that Scripture was perfect; it revealed to man what human reason could not discover, the way to salvation.

As he restored human reason to the authority from which Puritanism had removed it, Hooker at the same time restored the collective illuminated human wisdom of the Church to its authority. This authority he saw to be twofold. There was the authority of the inherited experience of the former ages of the Church which she had gained in the exercise of her reason. This authority was sufficient to create a presumption in favour, for example, of some ceremony that showed by its long continuance in the Church that it had been

valued by many generations of Christians. But the authority of antiquity was not absolute. The purpose of ceremonies, Hooker held, was edification, and each generation of the Church must decide, and had the authority of its reason by which to decide, what ceremonies were most edifying for its own time. Having regard to this, the Church might justifiably either use an ancient ceremony or discontinue its use in favour of another only newly invented, always provided that nothing was done which was repugnant to Scripture.

Such was the authority of the Church in the use of her corporate reason that even the laws of God contained in Scripture, where they were clearly not intended to be in force permanently, might be repealed, or they might be adapted to suit the altered needs of different times. The laws of God were instruments by which to govern, and the Church must consider their suitability in each age to achieve the purpose for which they had originally been enacted. It had been by the use of her illuminated corporate reason that the Church had, in the first instance, decided which of the ancient Christian writings were to be regarded as Holy Scripture, and therefore which contained, and which did not contain, the laws of God.

Because the purpose of ceremonies was edification it was not, Hooker thought, a valid objection against any ceremony that it had had an unedifying origin, or that it had at some time been put to an unedifying use. What alone was of consequence was the present value of that ceremony for edification. This the Church had authority to decide, and in this she must be obeyed for her authority was ratified by God.

The foregoing answers which Hooker gave to some of the questions raised by Puritan teaching are satisfying and acceptable, but those which now fall to be considered were not, in every case, quite so obviously the right answers.

The Catholic Church to Hooker was a single visible world-wide Society, but it was expressed in a number of component units, each unit being a Church in its own right and having the full authority of a Church. When he made this definition Hooker had in mind the New Testament pattern of the one Church comprised of the component Churches of Corinth, Ephesus, and so on. The components in his own day were national Churches such as the Church of England. Hooker did not say whether, as a matter of principle, he thought the components of the Catholic Church should be national, or whether he merely recognized that, as a fact, they were national. He appears to have thought that the Catholic Church might be made up of independent components because that was the way in which the Church of the New Testament was made up, and to have believed that each national Church had the right of self-government, and his definition went no further.

The components of the Catholic Church ought to have some outward resemblances to each other, and one of the chief of these was polity. But that did not mean that each of them was to have the same form of polity as the others, for there was no one form of polity laid down in Scripture. Thus, although uniformity might have its value, each national Church had the right to determine its own polity to suit its own needs. Each national Church was self-governing with respect

to every other national Church. If one Church differed from the others, that did not imply that it condemned the others, but only that it thought its own ways more profitable for its own purposes.

Although Hooker could not find in Scripture any one binding form of Church polity, he believed that he could find ~~there~~ there the principles upon which all polities should be built, and especially the chief matters which underlay the manner in which the Church of England was governed. These principles were three in number, and they were unchangeable:-

(a) There must be a ministry. Hooker found this principle in the appointment of the tribe of Levi to be the priestly tribe of ancient Israel, in St Paul's description of the laity as ἰδιώτας (which meant that they formed an order of laity, with its complement the order of clergy), and in the fact that Jesus had created a ministry out of certain of his disciples. It has been seen, however, that an argument based upon the idea that the word ἰδιώτας refers to the laity will not stand, and therefore the idea of an "order" of clergy cannot be inferred from it. Again, the appointment of the Twelve by Jesus does not necessarily imply the creation of a ministry apart from the ministry of the whole Church, for it is possible to argue that the Twelve were commissioned as a representative section of the Church, and not as an order apart from the laity.

(b) There must be degrees within the ministry. Hooker took the higher degree of Aaron and his sons above the rest of the Levites as an example establishing a precedent for degrees within the Christian ministry, but his chief authority was the New Testament

itself. Here he found two degrees of the ministry, Presbyters and Deacons. The diaconate had been created by the Apostles, but the Presbyterate by Christ. In creating the Presbyterate, Christ had formed it in two degrees, the Twelve and the Seventy. Each of these degrees created by Christ had been commissioned to preach and baptize but the Twelve, in addition, had exercised the power which Christ had exercised, the calling and ordaining of men to the ministry. Here again, however, it has been seen that nothing can be inferred from any supposed difference between the Twelve and the Seventy, and Hooker's attempt to show that Jesus was the originator of degrees within the ministry must be dismissed as invalid.

(c) There must be a solemn calling to the ministry. It was not enough that a man should have the gifts necessary for a minister; he must also have the "power of order" conferred by ordination. This power was not merely the grace that he would need in order to make effective use of his gifts; it was the authority he needed to deal in the affairs of God as God's representative, viz:-

"we know that spiritual gifts are not only abilities to do things miraculous... but also that the very authority and power which is given men in the Church to be ministers of holy things, this is contained within the number of those gifts whereof the Holy Ghost is author, and therefore he which giveth this power may say without absurdity or folly 'Receive the Holy Ghost', such power as the Spirit of Christ hath endued his Church withal..."(1)

It was the "power of order" that constituted the indelible character of the minister, and that marked out the clergy as an order separate from the laity:-

(1) H.V.1xxvii.5

"To whom Christ hath imparted power both over that mystical body which is the society of souls, and over that natural which is himself for the knitting of both in one (a work which antiquity doth call the making of Christ's body); the same power is in such not amiss both termed a kind of mark or character and acknowledged to be indelible. Ministerial power is a mark of separation, because it severeth them that have it from other men, and maketh them a special 'order' consecrated unto the service of the Most High in things wherewith others may not meddle."(1)

Hooker believed that the "power of order" might be conferred directly from Christ (no doubt he was thinking of the Twelve and the Seventy) or indirectly from Christ through the Church:-

"God... hath ordained certain to attend upon the due execution of requisite parts and offices..., which men thereunto assigned do hold their authority from him, whether they be such as himself immediately or as the Church in his name investeth."(2)

If Hooker had lived long enough to complete and put through the press the last three Books of his treatise he might have cleared up some of the uncertainty in which he left this question of the "power of order", for it was in those Books that he proposed to deal with Episcopacy. As it is, he seems at first sight to say that the Twelve (and consequently the Bishops who later took their places) had a power of order over and above that which the inferior Presbyters, the Seventy, received.

"Of presbyters some were greater and some less in power, and that by our Saviour's own appointment; the greater they which received fulness of spiritual power, the less they to whom less was granted. The Apostles' peculiar charge was to publish the Gospel of Christ unto all nations and to deliver them his ordinances received by immediate revelation from himself. Which pre-eminence excepted, to all other offices and duties' incident into their order it was in them to ordain and consecrate whomsoever they thought meet, even as our Saviour Christ did himself assign seventy other of his own disciples inferior presbyters, whose commission to preach and baptize was the same which the Apostles had."(3)

(1) H.V.lxxvii.2 (2) Ibid lxxvii.1 (3) Ibid lxxviii.4

If the power to ordain others (which is the power to confer the power of order) was itself a special "power of order" over and above that which was given to the Seventy, and if it was the "power of order" that constituted the clergy an order distinct from the laity, then Hooker might reasonably have argued that the "power to ordain" constituted the Apostles an order separate and distinct from the order to which the Seventy belonged. But Hooker did not argue in this way. He knew of only one order of the ministry, and to that both the Twelve and the Seventy belonged. Within that order there was a difference of degree, for the Apostles, but not the Seventy, had a "peculiar charge" to preach to all nations and to deliver the ordinances they had received direct from Christ. But this created a difference of degree, not a difference of order, and therefore it must be supposed that Hooker did not include the "peculiar charge" in the "power of order". Indeed, it may be questioned whether Hooker intended, in the passage under discussion, to include the "power to ordain" either with the "peculiar charge" or with the "power of order". The charge had reached the Apostles, and the power had reached both the Apostles and the Seventy, direct from Christ without any intermediary. But there was no "scripture" for holding that Christ had charged or empowered the Apostles to ordain others, and so Hooker cautiously contented himself with the statement that it was "in" the Apostles to ordain others as Christ had ordained them and the Seventy, and did not try to define how it was "in them".

In two out of the four passages from Hooker quoted above, the Church is mentioned in connection with the "power of order". The power is given to men "in the Church". It is a power with which the Spirit has "endued the Church". The Church in Christ's name "invests" men with that power. All this suggests that in Hooker's opinion power to bestow the power of order (i.e. power to ordain) belonged to the Church as a whole, and not to the order of clergy alone, nor to any degree alone of that order. On the other hand Hooker described a Bishop as "he who giveth this power". What, then, is the relationship between the Bishop and the Church which allows the Bishop to "give" that with which the Church is "endued", and with which she "invests"? Is the power to ordain in the Church because it is in the Bishop and the Bishop is included in the Church? Or does the Bishop, when he ordains, act as the mouthpiece and instrument of the Church as a whole, giving that which belongs to the Church of which he is the representative? From the scanty material which Hooker provided in his fifth Book it is, unfortunately impossible to say with any certainty what his answers to these questions might have been.⁽¹⁾

(1) See the article on "Ordo" by Professor S.L.Greenslade in the "Scottish Journal of Theology", vol 9, No 2, June 1956, p.161ff.

SOME ELIZABETHAN CONTROVERSIES
ABOUT
THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY

Part VII

Bilson v. All Puritans

Part VII.

Bilson v. All Puritans

.....

I.

Whitgift's firm enforcement of the settlement of 1559 gave a feeling of confidence to those who, like Hooker, found in Anglicanism a positive virtue. The new climate which the Archbishop created encouraged the writing of a number of works which, while they attacked Puritanism, even more emphatically justified the "status quo" in the Church of England, and pleaded for its continuance. Among the first in this field was Richard Bancroft. In a sermon preached at Paul's Cross in February 1589 and later printed and sold, Bancroft asserted that the Bishops exercised their office "jure divino"⁽¹⁾. But Bancroft had been anticipated by Dr Bridges, who in 1587 had published his massive "Defence of the Government established in the Church of England"⁽²⁾.

In 1590 Hadrian Saravia, a former minister of the Dutch Reformed Church but by this time a prebendary of Canterbury and one of Whitgift's Chaplains, published his "De Diversis Ministrorum Evangelii Gradibus"⁽³⁾, a defence of episcopacy. The defection of this former Calvinist to Anglicanism so upset Beza that he wrote and published in 1592 a "Responsio" to Saravia's book. When Saravia replied, Beza⁽⁴⁾ wrote to Whitgift complaining that the Dutchman had attacked him.

.....
 (1) S.W.i.559, ii.48 (2) Brook, op.cit.121. This book was the spark which set off the Marprelate powder. (3) S.W.ii.202ff. Brook, op. cit.156. Sykes, "Old Priest and New Presbyter", 61f.

In a lengthy reply dated 1st February 1594, in ~~his~~ temperate language but in stern tones, Whitgift took Beza step by step through the story of Geneva's mischief-making interference in the affairs of the Church of England. It was pointed out to the Swiss Pastor that he had himself attacked the polity of the Church of England on more than one occasion, but notably by the publication in 1580 of his book "De Triplici Episcopatu". In the face of such attacks Beza must not be surprised in the Church of England defended itself.

"But we must more justly wonder, that you, worthy Sir, being no where provoked, should think convenient to answer Dr Saravia in a book again set forth, as though any wrong were done either to you privately or to your Church; only on this account, he taught that there were degrees among the Ministers of the Gospel, and defended the episcopal degree." (3)

The Archbishop not only defended Saravia, but also episcopacy.

"We make no doubt but that the episcopal degree (which we bear) is an institution apostolical and divine; and so always hath been held by a continuous course of times from the Apostles to this very age of ours. For as for what you seem to hint out of Hierom and Augustin; as though custom only, and that but latter, preferred Bishops to Presbyters; it is a wonder to me that you should wrest their sayings to that purpose; and that you should not see, by other of their books, what they, as well as other Fathers, thought of this... You may remember, learned Sir, the beginnings of that episcopacy, which you make to be only of human institution, is referred by the Fathers, with one mouth, to the Apostles, as the authors thereof: and that the Bishops (were appointed) as successors of the Apostles; especially in

(1) S.W.ii.159ff (2) Ibid.166, where the date of publication is wrongly given as 1590. This book was translated into English in Scotland under the title "The Judgment of a most reverend and learned Man from beyond the seas concerning a Threefold Order of Bishops", and was circulated in England. In it Beza distinguished between Bishops of God (i.e. the Pastors of the Calvinistic Churches), Bishops of Man, and Bishops of the Devil. He left little room for doubt that he included the English Bishops in the last-named category. See Sykes, op.cit.55. (3) S.W.ii.169

"certain points of their functions. And what Aaron was to his sons and to the Levites, this the Bishops were to the Priests and Deacons; and so esteemed of the Fathers to be by divine institution." (1)

Whitgift had clearly advanced in his view of episcopacy since the days of his controversy with Cartwright. Then he had been content to claim that episcopacy was apostolical; now he claimed that it was also divine. But the ground upon which he made this new claim should be noticed. He did not use the argument that Hooker was to employ three years later, that the difference between Bishop and Presbyter rested in part on the difference between the Twelve and the Seventy. He based it upon the superiority of Aaron over the rest of the priests. Episcopacy, that is to say, rested upon an ordinance of God in the Old Testament, not upon an appointment of Christ in the New; it was a divine, not a dominical, institution.

But it is also clear that Whitgift had not advanced so far from his earlier position that he now regarded episcopacy as of the "esse" of the Church, for he expressed to Beza the wish

"that every particular Church would mind its own business, and not prescribe the laws of rites and the manner of government to others." (2)

Saravia, by defending episcopacy, had done nothing that should offend
 (3)
 non-episcopal Churches. Episcopacy might be apostolical and divine, but the Archbishop evidently did not think of any Church as bound to
 (4)
 that form of government and no other.

 (1) S.W.ii.170 (2) Ibid 172 (3) Ibid 167f (4) Dawley, op.cit.208, rather overstates the case when he says that Whitgift was no longer arguing that Church government was a "thing indifferent". Whitgift certainly did not state that argument in his letter to Beza, but it is implicit in his remark about each Church minding its own business about methods of government. Whitgift's complaint about Geneva was precisely that it removed matters of government from among the "adiaphora", and therefore condemned the government of other Churches.

1593 was an outstanding year for the publication of books written by supporters of Anglicanism. It saw the appearance in print of the first portion of Hooker's masterpiece, and also two works from the pen of Richard Bancroft, "Dangerous Positions and Proceedings" and "A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline". Bancroft's books were frankly negative in character, being attacks upon the errors of Puritanism rather than justifications of the ecclesiastical government as by law established, but they did, nevertheless, support the establishment by implication.

In the same year there appeared also the book which is to be examined here in some detail, Thomas Bilson's "Perpetual Government of Christ's Church". As the title itself shows, this book was intended to steal some of the Puritan thunder, for it assumed that there was a form of government perpetually to be observed by the Church. The tables were to be turned on the Puritans if Bilson could manage to turn them. Whitgift's position that God had not, in Scripture, imposed any one particular form of government upon the Church, was abandoned, and episcopacy was to be shown to be divine, dominical, and apostolical, and of permanent necessity to the Church. What the Puritans had claimed for presbyterian, Bilson would claim for episcopal government. Thus on his title page he stated that his book would show

"The fatherly superiority which God first established in the Patriarchs... continued in the tribe of Levi and the Prophets and... confirmed in the New Testament to the Apostles and their successors."

Further, Bilson announced that he was about to prove

"the distinction of Bishops from Presbyters, and their succession from the Apostles' times and hands."

Little is known of Bilson's early career. On his father's side
 (1)
 he was of German descent, which may indicate that his sympathies were Lutheran rather than Genevan. In 1576 he became Warden of Winchester College and a prebendary of Winchester Cathedral. He first
 (2)
 became a public figure by ~~his~~ writing, in 1585, a rejoinder to Cardinal Allen's "Apologia" for the English Colleges at Rheims and Rome.
 (3)

Bilson was a typical clerical careerist of Elizabethan times. In 1596 Lord Burghley proposed him to the Queen for appointment as Dean of Windsor, seemingly with the idea that the Deanery should be held in plurality with the Wardenship. The statutes of Winchester College would not have allowed Bilson more than six weeks leave in each year to attend to the duties of the Deanery, and he had no intention of holding the Deanery without the Wardenship. In the last resort he was willing to accept the plurality, but he preferred something bigger. The See of Worcester was vacant, and Bilson tried to persuade Whitgift to nominate him to the Queen for that appointment. Whitgift had, however, already promised to support another applicant, and so Bilson turned to Burghley, to whom he wrote in
 (4)
 praise of his own pains in the Church and service to her Majesty.

Bilson was consecrated Bishop of Worcester in June 1596, but his Diocese could have seen little of him before it lost him. Shortly after his consecration the Bishop of Winchester died. What wires

 (1) S.W.ii.350 (2) Dictionary of National Biography, "Bilson".
 (3) S.W.ii.349 (4) Ibid 347ff. Bilson's pains and services no doubt included his book against the papists and also his book against the Puritans now under consideration. Taken together, these books marked him out as a safe Anglican to be trusted in a See.

The absence of animosity, and especially of personal animosity, from Hooker's works is the more notable because he, so far as is known, did not write with any idea of winning promotion. Moreover, his experience of Travers must have tempted him strongly to dip his pen in venom. Bilson, on the other hand, had no personal opponent either in the foreground or the background to cause him to lose his self-restraint. In so far as he was controversial rather than expository, he was shadow-boxing almost throughout his entire book. He had to create an opponent by raising questions and objections against his own arguments; then he provided the answers and rejoinders that his imaginary opponent drew from him. The questions and objections were printed in italics and interspersed with his own teaching as occasion served. Thus in the "Epistle" Bilson said,

"When I object anything that is or may be said on their behalf that maintain these new-found Consistories, I have caused it to be printed in another letter, and distinguished from the rest of the Text with this mark] as it were to enclose it."(1)

Bilson's opponent was therefore no single person, but the whole Puritan party and the entire Puritan case. It might be expected that, working in this way, Bilson would misrepresent the Puritan position, or under-represent its force, but in fact he did tolerable justice to it.

There is one exception to the anonymity of Bilson's opponent. In twenty-two out of several hundreds of marginal references he made it clear that at those points he was answering Beza

(1) The 24th page of the Epistle to the Reader, B.P.G.

"in responsione ad tractationem de gradibus ministrorum Evangelii ab Hadriano Saravia editam."

In a few of these places Bilson wrote in the second person as though he was actually addressing Beza directly. Apart from a handful of references to Calvin, most of them favourable, and one to Bullinger, Bilson mentioned by name no other author of his own times.

II.

Bilson opened his argument with an assumption that was typically Puritan and not Anglican. God, he said, could not be considered to have been so unmerciful as to leave his Church without a definite form of government.

"Since, then, the Church of Christ is the house of God, the City of the living God, and the kingdom of his beloved Son, shall we think that God is careful for others, and careless for his own?"(1)

This God-given form of government, by which the Church must be ordered and disciplined, was a fatherly superiority, and it applied not only to the superiority of Pastor over people, but also to Pastor over Pastor. Being divine in ~~and~~ origin it must not be replaced by any form invented by man.

"We must not frame what kind of regiment we list for the ministers of Christ's Church, but rather observe and mark what manner of external government the Lord hath best liked and allowed in his Church from the beginning."(2)

Where Hooker traced the superiority of one priest over others back to Aaron and the tribe of Levi, Bilson traced it back to Adam.

(1) BPG 2 (2) Ibid 3

From Adam to Jacob, he said, the Church consisted of certain families, and was ruled paternally. The father of each family was both its teacher and its ruler, declaring God's will and governing by God's authority. The Patriarchs were therefore at one and the same time rulers in their homes and princes in the Church of God.

The successors to this royal priesthood had always been the eldest sons of the families which comprised the Church.

"To which end God did consecrate the first borne of their families as holy to himself, to be priests in his Church, and increased their dignity with this princely prerogative, that they should be Lords over their brethren."(1)

After the time of Shem, the royal priesthood was transferred to Abraham and his descendants, and the Church was concentrated in Abraham's family. The royal priesthood was continued thus until God divided it among the sons of Jacob, the sceptre going to Judah, the priesthood to Levi, and the birthright to Joseph. In Egypt this government of God's people was in abeyance, but even there it was always the case that guidance and leadership were provided by the eldest, first by Jacob, then by Joseph, then by the heads of the tribes, of whom the head of the tribe of Judah was always the chief.

"And so from Adam to Moses we find a continual superiority of the father over his children, and the first borne over his brethren, approved and established by God himself in the regiment of his Church; and not any precept or precedent for equality."(3)

Under the Law, Bilson continued, God appointed the tribe of Levi to attend the ark and the offerings, and to teach the rest of Israel, for the domestic type of discipline was no longer suitable to the

(1) BPG 3f (2) Ibid 7 (3) Ibid 8

size of the Church.

"In which tribe... God did proportion and establish divers superiorities and dignities... and those not only of priests above Levites, but of priests above priests, and of Levites among themselves."(1)

Among the priests the chief example of superiority was that of the High Priest.

"The which sovereignty was not given him in respect he was a figure of Christ, but by reason God approved superior and inferior callings in that commonwealth as the best way to govern his Church."(2)

The ground upon which Bilson denied that the High Priest was a figure of Christ was that he did not bear the sceptre. Judicially

"the High Priest had a superior to control him and over-rule him, even the Law-giver of Judah, that held the sceptre."(3)

The High Priest could not therefore foreshadow the sceptre of Christ. His priesthood was not royal. He was merely an example of

"the regiment and external discipline which God then embraced in giving the Church to Israel."(4)

Bilson acknowledged that the circumstances of the Christian Church were different from those of Israel, and so

"from these superior and inferior degrees amongst the priests and Levites under Moses happily (? haply) may no necessary consequent be drawn to force the same to be observed in the Church of Christ." (5)

Nevertheless,

"for the better ordering, overseeing, and containing such in their duties as be called to be the guiders and leaders of God's people... the wisdom of God in appointing some amongst the priests and Levites to guide and govern the rest of their tribe... is not hastily to be refused, nor lightly to be neglected."(6)

(1) BPG 8 (2) Ibid 10 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid (5) Ibid 12 (6) Ibid 13.

Indeed,

"the Levitical discipline under Moses doth clearly confirm a diversity of degrees amongst Pastors and ministers in the Church to be more agreeable to the wisdom of God revealed in his Law, than a general equality or parity."(1)

In his days upon earth Christ, declared Bilson, had refused to rule his Church externally and had left it to man to do so.

"He would not reign in his Church with the presence of his body as a man, but with the power of his Spirit as the Son of God."(2)

In this spiritual rule Christ had had neither human partner nor ~~his~~ human helper, and the same was true in the Kingdom of Christ. The outward Church might be called the Kingdom of Christ, (3)

"but we must take heed that we wisely distinguish, even in the Word and Sacraments, the mighty power of God from the outward service of men."(4)

Bilson explained why he made this distinction between the true Kingdom of Christ and the external government of the Church:-

"In our times some more zealous than wise, and too much devoted to their own fancies, have promoted their Eldership and Presbytery to the height of Christ's sceptre, and made grievous outcries, as if the Son of God were spoiled of half his kingdom, because their Lay-Elders are not suffered to sit judges in every parish together with the Pastor and Teacher of the place."(5)

Even supposing there ought to be Lay Elders in the Church, they could not be part of Christ's Kingdom, for that was proper to his own person. God had indeed appointed many forms of external government, such as minister, parent, and magistrate,

 (1) BPG 14 (2) Ibid (3) It should be noticed that here and in the sentences immediately following, although Bilson does not deny that the Church may be called "the Kingdom of Christ", he chiefly applies that title to the spiritual "reign" of Christ after the Ascension.
 (4) Ibid 16 (5) Ibid 17.

"but neither Prince, Pastor, nor Parent, can search or change the heart; much less can they endue it with any heavenly grace or virtue... These always belong to the kingdom of Christ and of God."(1)

Consequently, although the leaders of the Church were needful and fruitful, and were entrusted with the keys of the Kingdom,

"yet may they not arrogate any part of Christ's honour or power as incident to their calling or function, but leave all entire and untouched to the Son of God whose right it is. Much less may the several or Synodical assemblies, proceedings, or censures, of the supposed Presbytery be reckoned the half-deal of Christ's most righteous and glorious kingdom."
(2)

III.

Bilson agreed with the Puritans that Christ had left the external government of the Church in the hands of certain officers, but he did not agree that those officers included Lay Elders. The Puritan argument, based on Matt.xviii.17, that Christ had transferred the Jewish method of ruling the synagogues to the Christian Church, Bilson summarized thus:-

(i) The mention of heathen and publicans in Matt.xviii.17 showed that Jesus was speaking to Jews.

(ii) Jesus reminded the Jews to whom he was speaking of the judicial procedure to which they were accustomed, i.e. the hearing of cases by the local Elders, or else the transference of those cases by the local Elders to the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem for decision.

(iii) In the passage under consideration, Jesus commanded this Jewish procedure to be followed in the Christian Church.

With the first two points Bilson agreed, but not with the third. If

Jesus, he said, had meant to transfer any Jewish form of government to the Christian Church, he would have chosen the form laid down by God to Moses, not a late and corrupt version of that form. But to have transferred the Mosaic form of government to the Church would have meant violating the rights of Christian magistrates, and that was something which Christ would not do.

To understand Bilson's meaning here it is necessary to consider what he thought the Mosaic form of government had been. Under Moses, the chief magistrate of Israel, tribal elders decided small cases and sent the greater ones to him. In his part of this procedure Moses had seventy elders to help him. After the death of Moses, when Israel was settled in Canaan, the same procedure was observed, but the tribal elders were placed in the tribal cities, where they became local courts of justice. These elders dealt with both civil and criminal cases as well as religious matters, and had power of life and death. Under Herod and the Romans this system was corrupted. The jurisdiction of the local ~~the~~ elders was abridged, so that they were able to redress only private and religious wrongs. The powers of the Sanhedrin were also restricted so that it could not inflict death upon an offender, but only beating and imprisonment. Even so, the Jewish elders, local and national, were still civil and judicial officers, and were therefore magistrates. They were called *οἱ ἀρχόντες*, rulers.

Bilson now asked the Puritans to say to which body of elders Jesus had referred in Matt. xviii. 17. Was it the Sanhedrin in Jeru-

(1) Bilson, like many of his contemporaries, was not above assuming that he knew what Jesus ought to have done. (2) BPG 19 (3) Ibid 20 (4) Ibid 21f (5) Ibid 22 (6) Ibid 23 (7) Ibid 24.

salem? But that was a national body as established by Moses, and it would not be appropriate to have such a body in every parish; it would, anyway, trespass upon the authority of the Magistrate. Was it the local senate of elders in every city? But those bodies, like the Sanhedrin, were civil and not only religious. Hence

"by this precedent we must not frame Presbyteries in the Church of Christ. The difference is so manifest, and the inference so absurd, that the slowest will soon perceive the decay of the consequent. From the Magistrate to the minister, from the sword to the word, from the Law to the Gospel, from cities to villages, from Canaan to Christendom, the leap is so great that cart-ropes will not tie the conclusion to the premises. These two Councils have no manner of resemblance to the Lay Elders, and besides these, there was none appointed or warranted by the Law of God." (1)

Here Bilson turned to the question of excommunication which, as it was claimed, was authorized by Matt. xviii. 17. He agreed that the Scribes and Pharisees had used this punishment, but denied that they had used it by the authority of the Law of Moses. In the Law leprosy, contact with the dead, and suchlike things, entailed separation from the congregation of Israel, but the uncleanness brought by such things did not deserve excommunication, and the separation which they entailed was not excommunication. In the Law God had provided corporal punishment, not excommunication, for sins, and to be "cut off" meant to be put to death. In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah forfeiture of goods and banishment were the punishments for apostasy. But these were civil punishments, and were not to be used by a Pastor. The Pharisaic "casting out from the synagogue" had not been a spiritual curse, but a temporal loss of honour, office, privilege, and

(1) BPG 25 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 26 (4) Ibid 27.

freedom,

"and the terror thereof wholly proceeded from the power of the sword confirmed by God to the Councils and Elders of that commonwealth, which the Leaders and Pastors of Christ's Church may not usurp nor challenge in whole or in part, unless the polity concur with them, and authorize their doings."(1)

What then, Bilson asked, did Christ mean in Matt.xviii.17? The offences which he there commanded to be reported to the Church were offences against man, not against God; and the Christian was to report offences committed privately against himself, not offences committed publicly against others.

"These be no rules for open and known sins, dishonouring God and scandalizing his Church, but for private trespasses and offences betwixt man and man. This is no judicial proceeding in the Consistory, but a charitable warning in secrecy by him alone that is oppressed and grieved with wrong or reproach... Of public sins (Christ) speaketh not, the doers whereof must not be reprov'd in secret, nor twice admonished, before they be censured by the Church. The incestuous Corinthian had neither private nor double warning given him before he was delivered to Satan by Paul, and we must not think the Apostle would so soon forget, or so flatly cross, his master's meaning, if Christ had spoken this of open wickedness hateful to God and heinous in the eyes of men."(2)

Further, Christ had evidently contemplated that the offender would repent and be forgiven when he had been admonished. But men had no power to forgive sins committed against God or against other men. To be a concealer of such sins would amount to being a consentor to and a partaker of those sins. Christ's words "if thy brother sin against thee" must not be understood as though they meant "if thy brother's sin is known only unto thee".⁽³⁾

What, Bilson now enquired, had Jesus meant by "the Church" in

(1) BPG 28 (2) Ibid 29f (3) Ibid 31.

Matt.xviii.17? He thought Jesus could have meant only the Jewish Church, since the Christian Church was not in being when Christ spoke the phrase. To redress private wrongs was, anyway, a civil matter, and with such matters the Christian Church might not concern itself. Further, the Christian Church could not be described as shunning Gentiles and Publicans. Again, the arrangements made by St Paul for settling quarrels between Christians confirmed the view that Jesus had been referring to the Jewish Church. St Paul had not disallowed the jurisdiction of the Roman courts, but he had required that Christians should be chosen as mediators and arbitrators in quarrels between Christians. These appeasers were to be the least in the Church, not Pastors and Elders. It was not to be thought that St Paul, who in this matter had had a chance to put Jesus's commandment into practice in the Corinthian Church, had actually changed that commandment. And so

"certainly our Saviour never meant the faithful should, for private trespasses complain to the Pastors and Elders of every parish, and they should have power sufficient to hear and determine all such matters as were so offered unto them, and to excommunicate those that would not stand to their sentence and judgment."(4)

Still pursuing his search for Jesus's meaning in Matt.xviii.17, Bilson guessed that the Publicans mentioned in the Gospels (because they were Roman officials even though they were Jews by race), and also any Gentiles living among the Jews, must have been exempt

 (1) Again Bilson takes up a position more Puritan than Anglican, and one, moreover, which is not quite consistent with I Cor.vi.1-8, with which he is about to deal. (2) BPG 32ff (3) Here Bilson treats I Cor.vi.4 as a command, agreeing with R.V.marg. against R.V.text which takes it as a question. (4) BPG 35

from the Jewish Law, and could therefore only be sued in the Roman Courts. On the other hand any Jew of Jesus' time might, if he chose, sue a fellow-Jew in the Roman Courts rather than in the courts of his own nation. In personal disputes, then, Christ had enjoined his Jewish hearers to try, in the first place, to settle their grievances out of court by private negotiation. If that failed, offenders were next to be sued in the Jewish Courts. But if any offender refused to accept the jurisdiction of the Jewish Courts, then he might be sued in the only way in which a Gentile or a Publican could be sued, i.e. by recourse to the Roman Courts. Alternatively, the reference to heathens and Publicans might mean that the injured party should shun the offender if he refused to accept the verdict of the Jewish Court. Either way, Jesus had not meant that the offender was to be excommunicated, for that punishment could not be inflicted for private wrongs.

In case anybody should object that, by Bilson's interpretation, Jesus seemed to have used the word ἐκκλησία for a body other than the Christian Church, Bilson pointed out that in the Septuagint the word had been applied even to civic assemblies, that it had so been used by St Luke in Acts xix.32, and that Beza in his "Annotations" on Matt.xviii.17 had applied it to an assembly of Jewish Elders.

Bilson's next undertaking was to find an interpretation of Matt. xviii.18-20 suitable to the interpretation he had already put upon

(1) BPG 36-39 (2) One of Bilson's characteristics is the number of times he offers his readers an alternative explanation to that which he prefers himself. This constitutes a sort of insurance against disagreement. If the readers dislike the first explanation, perhaps the alternative will satisfy them. (3) BPG 37f.

the three preceding verses. The ratification in heaven of earthly binding and loosing (which he identified with the forgiving and retaining of sins) he connected with the admonitions which were to precede a complaint to the Church, and not with the verdict of the Church upon the case. He made this connection because the words of Jesus immediately following those about binding and loosing are,

"If two of you shall agree in earth upon anything, whatsoever they shall desire, it shall be performed unto them of my Father which is in heaven."(1)

Out of this connection Bilson drew the conclusion that

"as there is no doubt but God will confirm the judgment of the whole Church justly given, so the Lord in this place affirmeth that the consent of any two meeting and agreeing in his name (which is, according to his will) shall be ratified in heaven.. and in their own debts and trespasses private persons have more right to bind and loose their oppressors before God than either Pastors or Presbyters."(2)

Bilson was constrained to admit that the Fathers had interpreted the direction to treat an unrepentant offender as a heathen and a publican as though it were a command to excommunicate such a person, and he refused to dispute with any who preferred that interpretation to his own, always provided that they would take into account the whole meaning of the Fathers. For, he said,

"I rest secure, that no ancient Father made the government of Christ's Church answerable to the Jews' Sanhedrin, nor mixed Lay Elders with Pastors in exercising the power of the keys given to the Apostles and their successors."(3)

(1) It did not occur to Bilson to treat this as a detached saying and one which, therefore, ought not to be referred to its context.
 (2) BPG 40. It is possible to translate Matt.xviii.18, "Whatever things ye bind on earth shall be things which have been bound in heaven" etc, thus avoiding any idea of a heavenly ratification necessarily following upon the decisions of the Church. See also Arndt and Gingrich, op.cit. p.177, col.1. Matt. xviii.19 seems to refer to agreement in prayer and not, as Bilson took it, to agreement to settle a quarrel. (3) BPG 41.

IV.

Jesus, said Bilson, founded no Churches; but so that his work should not be incomplete he made a plain distinction among his disciples, appointing twelve to be Apostles and seventy others to go before him. To the Twelve he gave a larger commission and greater gifts than to the Seventy. Unlike the Seventy the Twelve had always been with Jesus, and were present at the Last Supper, and to the eleven of them who remained after the death of Judas, he gave the final commission on the Mount of Olives. He sent them out

"not only to preach the truth and plant the Church, but in his name to command those that believed in all cases of faith and good manners, to set an order amongst them in all things needful for the government, continuance, peace and unity of the Church, sharply to rebuke and reject from the society of the faithful such as resisted or disobeyed, to commit the Church to sound and sincere teachers and overseers." (3)

The gifts of the Spirit, Bilson continued, enabled the Apostles to speak and write infallible truth, to preach in foreign languages, and to work miracles. The Apostles, but not the Seventy, had been able to pass these gifts on to others by the imposition of hands. Thus both before and after his Ascension Christ had made a difference between the Twelve and the Seventy.

(1) In Luke x.1ff the Seventy were given no authority over demons. Otherwise their commission is the same as that given to the Twelve in Mark vi.7 and parallels. It is doubtful whether Luke meant that they had a lesser commission than the Twelve, although the Twelve received additional authority later in the ministry of Jesus.

(2) As will appear below, Bilson placed Matthias and Barsabbas among the Seventy. In Acts i.21f these two are described as having been with Jesus and the Twelve from the beginning of the ministry, which does not agree with what Bilson says here about the Seventy.

(3) BPG 42f (4) As will shortly be seen, Bilson identified the Seventy with the Presbyters of the Church in Jerusalem, and Hooker may have derived this same idea from Bilson. Saravia identified the Seventy with the Evangelists, an idea which Beza (in his "Responsio", p.24) described as "mera fabula" based on pseudo-Clement and Anacletus.

In choosing the Twelve and the Seventy, Bilson thought, Jesus had imitated the twelve Princes and seventy Elders appointed by Moses. Matthias was chosen out of the Seventy, and not out of the laity, as a replacement for Judas; this was apparent from the fact that the Apostles did not lay hands upon Matthias, which showed that he had previously been called by Christ himself.

When St Paul enumerated the gifts and administrations of the Church, Bilson declared, he placed Apostles first in order and in excellence. St Paul also gave to Prophets and Evangelists (and therefore still more to Pastors and Teachers) directions about what they were to do in the Church, and thereby showed that he exercised a superiority over them which could not be supposed to be different from the superiority exercised by all the Apostles.

The authority of the Apostles was such that their writings had been taken by the Church to be the oracles of the Holy Ghost and parts of Canonical Scripture. The Gospels of St Mark and St Luke had been taken into the Canon, not because of their writers, but because they had been approved and authenticated by St Peter and St Paul, who were Apostles.

The Apostles had had companions in their journeyings whom they sometimes left behind to establish newly-founded Churches more firmly, and whom they sometimes sent to restore order in Churches that had gone astray. These delegates were given authority over

(1) Num.i.4, xi.16 (2) BPG 44f (3) I Cor.xii.28 (4) Bilson referred here to I Cor.xiv.1ff and the Pastoral Epistles. (5) BPG 48f (6) I.e., for example, Timothy and Titus.

Pastors and Elders, a circumstance which showed that the Apostles believed they had this authority to give.

"Since, then, they were willed, and consequently warranted, by the Apostles to ordain, examine, rebuke and reject Pastors and Elders, as just occasion served, and equal over equal hath no power nor pre-eminence, it is certain that as well the Apostles authorizing as their disciples authorized so to do, were superiors in the Church of Christ to Pastors and Elders."(1)

V.

Bilson believed that the superiority of the Apostles would have received a readier recognition in his generation if it had not been the case that Jesus had forbidden the Apostles to exercise dominion over their brethren, and if the Apostles themselves had not associated Elders and the laity with them in ordinations and excommunications. He therefore dealt next with these two matters in order to remove the difficulties which they presented to his assertion of apostolic superiority.⁽²⁾

As regards dominion, Bilson thought that the Apostles had had a fixed idea of an earthly kingdom of God in which they were to be prominent. When Christ had pointed out that earthly rulers exercised authority over their subjects, and had forbidden the Apostles to do so, he had meant,

"You shall not have any dominion or rule such as they have. He doth not say, You shall have no pre-rogative or pre-eminence above others, but you shall have no such, or it shall not be so with you, as it is with them. By this all civil jurisdiction, and the power of the sword to command, compel, and punish by loss of life, limb, or liberty, is secluded

(1) BPG 50f (2) Only Browne and his followers denied superiority to the Apostles over the laity. Cartwright merely thought that there was equality among the Apostles themselves, although they exercised superiority over the laity.

"From the minister's function, and reserved to the Magistrates. But Christ never meant those words to bar all degrees and diversities of gifts and administrations in his Church; he rather expresseth the contrary even in the same place... 'I appoint you a kingdom... that you may... sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel'."(1)

As an example of what Christian superiority should be like, Bilson pointed to Jesus, who had called himself Lord and Master, but had also washed the ~~the~~ disciples' feet. He had not taught his disciples to be equal, but to use superiority humbly. But if it was true that Jesus had enjoined equality, then it was to be an equality among the Apostles themselves, and not a parity of the Apostles with the rest of the Church.

At this point Bilson brought in for the first time his phantom Puritan objector, complete with quotations from Scripture and the Fathers to show that all superiority had been forbidden by Christ, and pronouncing that,

"The pattern for the Apostles themselves is this; dominion is interdicted, a ministration is enjoined."(4)

Bilson replied by pointing out the difference between pastoral and princely superiority. The Apostles had not been allowed to consider themselves Lords and Masters, for

"opposite to Lord and Master are neither children nor brethren, but servants... Christ forbade his Apostles to be lords and masters over their brethren, that is, to command them as vassals, since the believers are no servants, but brethren, and the pastors no lords over God's inheritance, but fathers unto the faithful; whereby the honour due unto the leaders of Christ's flock is not diminished, but augmented... for to whom is more honour due, to master or to father?"(5)

Pastors had sometimes to speak on God's behalf, and so,

(1) BPG 51f (2) Ibid 53 (3) Ibid 53f (4) Ibid 54f (5) Ibid 55.

"if at any time they require and command, they do it in God's name as messengers sent to declare his will, who only and rightly may command in such cases, and as fellow servants set over their master's household... to put the rest in mind of their master's pleasure."(1)

To the Puritan objection that Christ had forbidden to the Apostles not only the power of a Lord, but also the very title "Gracious Lord" Bilson replied,

"I hear the Translator, but I find no such Text... It is a gloss besides the text."(2)

The well-known and much overworked interpretation in the Genevan Bible of *εὐεργέται* in Luke xxii.25 ought to be corrected, for it meant "benefactors";

"it soundeth nothing near either Grace or Lord".(3)

It was much more clear that the title "Master" was forbidden to Christ's disciples,

"and yet I ween the meanest presbyter will look sourly if he be not vouchsafed that name."(4)

If only the affairs of the human soul were taken into consideration, then no-one but God could be called Master, Father, or Lord, for no-one but God had effectually fashioned, taught, or governed man on that level.

"But if we respect the proportion and resemblance derived from God and approved by God in his word, then those that beget or govern our bodies as God's instruments and substitutes on earth may be called Masters, Lords, and Fathers."(5)

But if governors in bodily affairs might bear those titles, still more might spiritual superiors be called by them. In short,

(1) BPG 56 (2) Ibid 57 (3) Ibid (4) Ibid (5) Ibid 58.

"Our Saviour Christ interdicted his Apostles, and consequently the Pastors of his Church by virtue of their ministry to claim any civil dominion to command and compel, which is the power that Princes and Lords use over their subjects and servants. Next, they must neither desire nor delight in any titles of honour and praise from men, but expect the coming of the Arch-Pastor, when everyone shall have praise from God. Thirdly, how great soever they be, they must serve the lowest of their brethren to do them good... Yet this nothing hindereth the rule and governance that Pastors have over their flock by the word of God, neither doth it bar them or deprive them of that honour and obedience in heart, word, and deed, which is due to the Fathers of our faith, the Ambassadors of Christ, and stewards of God's household."(1)

VI.

Bilson next took up the question of the extent to which Elders, or perhaps the whole Church, had joined with the Apostles in the choosing and ordaining of Presbyters and Deacons. The Scriptures, he maintained, did not state clearly whether the Apostles alone, or all the Church, had nominated Matthias and Barsabbas to fill the place of Judas, but it was God who had chosen Matthias, and therefore this case did not determine the matter. An Apostle might not,
(2)
anyway, be chosen by man.

Since in Acts vi the Seven had not been chosen for the ministry of the Word and Sacraments their case could not form a precedent for the popular election of Bishops and Presbyters. The Puritans, by their own argument, could not claim Philip as an example of a minister of the Sacraments who had been ordained by popular choice, for they held that he had baptized in his capacity as an Evangelist,
(3)
and not in his capacity as one of the Seven. Epiphanius had thought

(1) BPG 65f. Bilson did not deny that the clergy might exercise civil authority, but only that they might exercise it by virtue of their ministry (2) Ibid 66 (3) Adv.Haeres.I.haeres.xx.iv.

that the Seven were chosen out of the Seventy. They were therefore, Bilson believed, Presbyters, and the office to which they had been appointed in Acts vi could not have been the diaconate. Chrysostom had not believed that the Seven had been Presbyters, but neither had he believed that they had been appointed Deacons. If their office was not that of Deacon, then their case could not form a precedent for the popular choice of Deacons. But if their office was the diaconate, the method used in Acts vi for choosing them was not perpetual, either for the diaconate or any other office, for the Apostles themselves had not used that method at a later date. (1) (2)

In Greek, Bilson observed, *χειροτονέω* was sometimes used not only for the action of raising the hand, but also for the result brought about by that action, i.e. the choosing of somebody to an office. Thus in Acts xiv.23

"this word doth signify to elect and appoint, though no hands be held up, because electing and appointing was the effect and consequent of lifting up the hands."(3)

The same word was used in Acts x.41 for God's appointment of witnesses to the resurrection of Jesus. In this place there was, and could be, no question of popular election. Again,

"*χειροτονέειν* is for a man to hold up or stretch out his own hand, and not other men's hands; and no example will ever be brought that *χειροτονήσαντες* is to gather voices, or to take the consent of others, but for men to give voices themselves, and signify their own consents by stretching forth their hands. And so, however the word be pressed, it cannot prove that others concurred with Paul and Barnabas in that action."(4)

Bilson spoiled this sound argument about the meaning of Acts

(1) Homily 14 on Acts. (2) BPG 67ff (3) Ibid 69 (4) Ibid 70.

xiv.23 by trying to prove too much. In the Fathers, he argued, *ΧΕΙΡΟΤΟΝΣΙΝ* (1) meant laying-on hands. It must therefore mean the same thing in Acts xiv. But Bilson's conclusion does not follow from his premiss. The scriptural use of the term is different from the patristic use, and the one cannot be inferred from the other.

Bilson took the word *ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΙΟΝ* in I Tim.iv.14 to refer to the office of Presbyter, and not to a college of Presbyters. In support of his view he quoted Calvin, viz:-

"By this expression I understand the ordination itself; as if (St Paul) had said, Act so, that the gift which you received by the laying on of hands, when I made you a Presbyter, may not be in vain." (2)

Bilson was fair enough to his opponents to admit that in his Commentary on I Timothy Calvin had displayed some hesitation about the meaning of the word under discussion, and had preferred there, on the whole, to regard it as a collective noun descriptive of the body of Presbyters. (3) He contented himself, therefore, with the argument that while St Paul had certainly laid hands upon Timothy, it could only be conjectured, and that upon the authority of an ambiguous word, that Presbyters had done so as well as St Paul. But the conjecture was unlikely upon other grounds. Timothy had been an Evangelist and, by the Puritans' own argument, an Evangelist could not be ordained by Presbyters. Only an Apostle, Bilson agreed, could ordain an Evangelist. St Paul alone had chosen Silas when he, alone, rejected Mark. Could it be said that ordination by St Paul alone was insufficient when he had already ordained, alone, the

(1) BPG 76 (2) Calvin, Inst. II.3.xvi. (3) See p. 253 footnote 5

(1)
 first Pastors and Prophets of the Gentile Church?

How then, asked Bilson, was choosing and ordaining carried out in the Apostolic Church? Imposition of hands was used for healing the sick, for blessing, when praying for anybody, when calling those who were to serve the Church, and when bestowing the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Although the Seventy were present in Jerusalem at the time, only the Apostles laid hands upon the Seven. The people were, indeed, consulted about the choice of the Seven, but that did not imply that the people would be fit judges for the choice of Pastors. The important point, anyway, was not so much the ability to judge the fitness of men to be ordained, but the ability to bestow the gifts to make them fit.

"At the first planting of the faith, the Apostles were to make men fit, whom they found unfit, and not to discern the gifts of such as were fit; and to that end had they power with imposition of hands to give the Holy Ghost."(2)

In Acts viii.17, Bilson continued, it was recorded that Peter and John ordained the ministry of the Church of Samaria out of unfit men by the imposition of hands. In Acts xix.6 it was described how St. Paul founded the Church at Ephesus by ordaining twelve men. Philip had not joined with Peter and John in imposing hands at Samaria, nor

(3)

 (1) BPG 77ff. Bilson gave no references here. If he was thinking of Acts xiv.23, Paul was not alone, but imposed hands (as Bilson would interpret the verse) along with Barnabas. If he was thinking of Acts xix.6, then these were not the first Pastors and Prophets of the Gentile Church. (2) BPG 82. This argument was rejected by Whitgift when Cartwright advanced it. (3) Bilson regarded the imposition of hands in these two passages as examples of ordination, and not as cases of the confirmation of Baptism. His interpretation is, in each case, entirely without warrant. In fact he made no attempt to justify his interpretation by any argument, but merely asserted his opinion as though it required no argument to support it.

St Paul's companions with St Paul at Ephesus. In each case the Holy Ghost had chosen those on whom hands were to be laid, and only Apostles had laid hands on them. There had been neither an assembly to choose these men nor Elders to lay hands on them. The conclusion to be drawn was that imposition of hands by St Paul alone had been sufficient.⁽¹⁾

The gifts of the Spirit, Bilson thought, might come directly from God, or indirectly by the imposition of hands. But

"I verily believe that at the first none gave the gifts and graces of the Holy Ghost by imposing hands, save only the Apostles."⁽²⁾

One of the ways in which the Spirit had worked through the Apostles had been in the choosing out of men to be ordained as Pastors and Prophets.

"The Holy Ghost, then, electing and choosing, how could the Presbytery take upon them either to confirm it without presumption, or reverse it without rebellion against God and his Spirit."⁽³⁾

Challenged by his imaginary questioner to name any one person whom the Spirit had singled out to receive imposition of hands from the Apostles, Bilson instanced Saul and Barnabas at Antioch, whom the Spirit had chosen by direct speech (Acts xiii.1f)⁽⁴⁾, and Timothy, whom the Spirit had chosen through the utterances of Prophets (I Tim iv.14). If the Spirit had spoken directly in the case of Saul and Barnabas, he must have done the same in other cases:-

 (1) BPG 83f (2) Ibid 85 (3) Ibid 86 (4) But Saul and Barnabas did not receive imposition of hands from any of the Apostles; they received it from ~~Paul~~ Prophets and Teachers.

"No doubt the Apostles were directed as well to the persons whom they should choose, as to the places where they should teach."(1)

Bilson distinguished four kinds of choosing, viz:-

"By lots was Matthias chosen, by voices the seven deacons, by the Spirit speaking in his own person were Paul and Barnabas called from Antioch to preach to the Gentiles, by the Spirit speaking in the prophets was Timothy designed (?designated)."(2)

From the third method, direct choosing by the Spirit, Bilson inferred the following:-

"By that Spirit were Peter and John directed on whom they should lay hands at Samaria, and so was St Paul at Ephesus... For it was the Holy Ghost's doing both to notify the persons unto Paul that should receive imposition of hands, and to pour out his wonderful blessings upon them."(3)

In fact, Bilson was unable ~~to~~ to produce any case where the Holy Spirit had spoken directly to an Apostle telling him to lay hands upon a certain person. All that he could do was to conjecture that there must have been such cases. In support of his inference he was able to add, however, a quotation from Eusebius, who had said about St John's return to Ephesus from Patmos,

"He went to the Churches of the Gentiles adjoining, somewhere appointing Bishops, somewhere setting whole Churches in order, somewhere supplying the clergy with such as the Spirit named, or drawing lots for such as the Spirit signified."(4)

The imaginary Puritan now raised the objection that what the Apostles might do by themselves was not necessarily fitting for their inferiors (such as Timothy and Titus) to do without the concurrence

 (1) BPG 86 (2) Ibid 87. It will be noticed that Bilson here describes the Seven as Deacons, although he had previously denied this. (3) Ibid (4) Euseb: Hist.Eccles.iii.23. But Eusebius does not necessarily mean that the Spirit named those who were to be ordained by directly speaking to St John, as Bilson's theory would require.

of the people and the Presbytery. Bilson answered,

"These two gifts, the revealing of secrets and the discerning of spirits, which the Prophets and Evangelists had (though in less measure than the Apostles) served chiefly to distinguish who were fit or unfit for the service of Christ's Church. When Prophets failed, the Church was forced to come to voices; but so long as the Spirit declared by the mouths of the Prophets whom he had chosen, the consent of the people or Presbytery might not be required."(1)

A further objection from the Puritan side was that St Paul had laid down rules to guide Timothy and Titus in the choice of fit men to be made Pastors. These rules would have been entirely unnecessary if it was the Spirit who had done the choosing. In reply Bilson advanced the theory that St Paul's rules had been intended in the first instance to serve as a test to show whether the spirits of the prophets were true or false in their naming of men to be admitted to the ministry, and in the second instance to serve as perpetual rules by which the Church was to be guided when prophecy should fail. (2)

Bilson's insistence upon the unique authority of the Apostles in the Church of New Testament times led his Puritan cross-examiner to point out that, at the beginning, only the Apostles had had the gifts of the Spirit, and therefore only they had been in a position to bestow them upon others. The implication of this objection was that the confining of the imposition of hands to the Apostles had been purely temporary, something which had lasted only until the gifts of the Spirit had become more widely distributed. Bilson answered that the Apostles alone had imposed hands even after the gifts of the Spirit had been spread to those outside their number.

(1) BPG 88. The fertility of Bilson's imagination throughout this portion of his book is too apparent to require comment. (2) Ibid 88f

The Apostles alone had laid hands on the Seven, who had already
been described as "full of the Spirit"⁽¹⁾.

When it was pointed out to him that others besides the Apostles had imposed hands, Bilson suggested that this had been for a purpose other than ordination. The imposition of hands upon Saul and Barnabas at Antioch had not made them Pastors, nor had it made Saul a missionary to the Gentiles.

"They did not impose hands on him to give him authority to preach to the Gentiles; he received that commission from Christ long before, and had then twelve months and more preached unto the Gentiles in the very same place where they imposed hands on him."⁽²⁾

The imposition of hands at Antioch had appointed Saul and Barnabas to a certain piece of work, and had commended them to the grace of God for the success of that work. It was, anyway, an example of the laying on of hands by Prophets, and not by a Presbytery.⁽³⁾

Returning to I Tim.iv.14, Bilson wrapped himself up completely in his ingenious but implausible inventions. He admitted that the *ἡ πρεσβυτερια* mentioned there might have been a body of men and not "presbytership", but asserted that if it was a body of men, then it was composed of Prophets, and therefore had not been a presbytery.⁽⁴⁾ If that body had laid hands on Timothy, then it had not done so at the same time that St Paul laid hands on him, nor had it done so for the same purpose. Hands might be laid more than once on the same man, each time for a different reason. Ananias at Damascus and the Prophets at Antioch had laid hands on St Paul at different

(1) BPG 90 (2) Ibid 91f (3) Ibid 93 (4) But if *ἡ πρεσβυτερια* refers to an assembly, then that assembly must be composed of Presbyters and must be a presbytery, even if the Presbyters also prophesy.

(1)

times with different ends in view. Assuming that Barnabas had been one of the Seventy (and confusing him with Barsabbas upon whom the lot did not fall in Acts 1.26) Bilson declared that upon him, too, hands must have been imposed before that ceremony was performed at Antioch. In the primitive Church, Bilson continued, a man might possibly receive the imposition of hands three times, to correspond with the threefold ministry, and every priest would receive the imposition of hands at least twice. St Paul's imposition of hands on Timothy might therefore have been subsequent to the imposition by the presbytery, and might have constituted an admission to a higher calling.⁽²⁾

But, Bilson concluded, if it should turn out that others had joined with St Paul in laying hands on Timothy on the occasion mentioned in I Tim. iv. 14, it had not been done out of necessity. Timothy had been very young for the work he was to do, and it was therefore convenient for the Prophets to ~~testify~~ ^{testify} by laying their hands on him that the Spirit of God, and not the affections of St Paul, had chosen him.

"In that respect, I say, Paul might be willing that the Prophets should express to the whole assembly what the Holy Ghost spake in them touching Timothy, and permit them with prayers and hands, as their manner was, to confirm the same. Otherwise, Paul alone had power enough both to impose hands on Pastors and Prophets, as he did at Ephesus, and to make choice of his company, as he did not long before, when he utterly refused Mark, and retained Silas to travel with him." (3)

(1) Bilson is correct in saying that the imposition of hands might be used for a variety of purposes. See Daube, "The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism", 224ff. (2) BPG 93f (3) Ibid 94f. Bilson thought of St Paul's travelling companions as a degree of the ministry, i.e. as Evangelists on the analogy of Timothy, who had fulfilled both roles. See BPG 79.

VII.

The circumstance that the Elders who were present with the Apostles at the Council of Jerusalem had joined in the letter that conveyed the Council's decision to Antioch was used by the Puritans, Bilson complained, to diminish the authority of the Apostles. But St Paul had needed neither Apostles nor Elders to confirm his doctrine, which had come to him direct from Christ. St Paul had gone to the Council to have his teaching acknowledged as sound, not to have it revised. Elders had been present so that the matter should be made as public as possible, and they had joined in the letter to Antioch in order to disclaim the judaizers and to confirm the Gentiles in the way they were following. Later, when the same question troubled the Galatians, St Paul made no use of the Council's letter,⁽¹⁾ but depended upon his own authority as he did in other matters with other Churches also without a Council. With the Galatians, indeed, St Paul had gone beyond the Council by declaring that circumcision⁽²⁾ was not merely unnecessary but would exclude them from Christ. It had been, in any case, by apostolic authority, and not by any other, that the controversy at Antioch had been settled.

"In that Council, who decided the controversy but Peter and James? Yet because it touched the whole Church of Jewry... the Apostles brought the matter to be fully discussed in the open hearing of the whole Church."⁽³⁾

Discussing the idea that the presbytery (or the people) of the Corinthian Church had joined with St Paul in the excommunication

 (1) It is only by a process of harmonization of Acts with the Epistle to the Galatians that Bilson can claim the Epistle to be later than the Council. (2) BPG 95ff. Here Bilson himself diminishes the authority of the Apostles by showing that St Paul over-rode ~~exceeded~~ the authority of the Apostles as it had been expressed in the Council. (3) Ibid 98.

described in I Cor.v.3ff, Bilson said that the least that could be gathered from St Paul's words was that he had had authority to command the Corinthians to break fellowship with the offender. But, in fact, St Paul's language implied something much more than that.

"He asketh not their consents; he prayeth not their aid; he referreth not the matter to their liking; he saith, I have already decreed, afore he wrote, and afore they read, that part of his epistle."(1)

St Paul, by his decree, had delivered the offender to Satan, which was something much more than mere exclusion from fellowship. It was a smiting with disease, or even with death, as Elymas and Ananias had been smitten. (2) It was a thing to be done by the power of Christ, not by the ~~permission~~ ^{permission} of the Corinthians. It was more than excommunication, for while excommunication endangered the spirit of a man, delivery to Satan punished his body. This was the sentence which St Paul promised to execute, in absentia, at the next meeting of the Corinthian Church. But if it had to be granted that delivery to Satan had been nothing more than another name for excommunication, it was still St Paul who had decreed it and who had required the Corinthians to execute it. (3)

All the Apostles, Bilson affirmed, had been equal ~~q~~ with St Peter, and in this St Paul had not been behind the rest. Therefore St Paul, like St Peter, had wielded the power of the keys.

"It is evident he had power to bind in heaven, and to deliver unto Satan without the help of the Presbytery or people of Corinth. And why? The power of the keys was first settled in

 (1) BPG 99. In spite of Bilson, St Paul does not seem to have thought that his decision was complete without the ~~concurrence~~ concurrence of the Corinthians. How could it be if it involved the breaking of fellowship? (2) Ibid 102 (3) Ibid

"the Apostles before it was delivered unto the Church; and the Church received the keys from the Apostles, not the Apostles from the Church. And therefore when Augustine saith, 'If this (I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven) were spoken only to Peter, the Church doeth it not: if this be done in the Church, then Peter when he received the keys (represented or) signified the whole Church:' We must not think by the name of the Church he intendeth the Lay Presbytery or the people, because the Apostles and their successors, the Pastors and Governors of the Church received the keys in Peter and with Peter. 'The keys of the kingdom of heaven we all that are priests', saith Ambrose, 'received in the blessed Apostle Peter.'" (1)

At this point the first main division of Bilson's argument came to an end. He had done his utmost to define the sole authority of the Apostles, and to diminish the weight of all other authority in the apostolic Church, especially that of any supposed Lay Elders. He had introduced the idea that the Apostles had had successors to their authority, and in the exercise of the power of the keys he had pointed to the "Pastors and Governors" of the Church as those successors, to the exclusion of the laity and perhaps, according to the definition to be given to "Pastors and Governors", to the exclusion of the clergy other than the Bishops. In contradiction of what appears to be St Augustine's plain meaning he had attached the phrase "the whole Church" to the Pastors and Governors of the Church. His next task was to discover whether all, or only a part, of the apostolic authority had passed to the successors of the Apostles, and to define more closely who the Pastors and Governors were who had succeeded to it.

(1) BPG 104. Augustine, Tract.50.xii in Johann. For St Ambrose Bilson quoted "De Dignitate Sacerdot:" vi, but this work is not by St Ambrose. The word "priests" in this reference probably refers to Bishops.

VIII.

Referring to the Puritan hypothesis that whatever the apostolic authority had been, it had passed out of existence when the Apostles died, Bilson willingly agreed that some part of that authority must have been personal to the Apostles and incapable of being handed on to their successors. To be called and sent directly by Christ, to have infallible knowledge of the truth (accompanied by miracles to confirm that knowledge), to have power to transmit to others the miracle-working gifts of the Holy Spirit, were things which had been necessary at the beginning of the Church, but not necessary for its continuance nor for the maintenance of the faith. In part, Scripture was the successor of the Apostles. So far as the calling by Christ was concerned, it came no longer directly from him, but by succession in the ministry.

"The Scriptures once written suffice all ages for instruction; the miracles then done are for ever a most evident confirmation of their doctrine; the authority of their first calling liveth yet in their succession; and time and travail joined with God's graces bring pastors at this present to perfection."(1)

Certain of the functions exercised by the Apostles were, however, of a permanent nature, and were still in force as at the beginning.

"The Apostles' charge to teach, baptize, and administer the Lord's Supper, to bind and loose sins in heaven and in earth, to impose hands for the ordaining of Pastors and Elders, these parts of the Apostolic function are not decayed, and cannot be wanted in the Church of God. There must either be no Church, or else these must remain, for without these no Church can continue."(2)

If the Word and the Sacraments were to be administered, ~~Bilson~~

(1) BPG 106 (2) Ibid

Bilson reasoned, there must be a ministry. Since abuse of the Word and Sacraments was dangerous, there must be power to separate evil persons from the Church. The question was, to whom had the Apostles bequeathed that ministry and that power?⁽¹⁾

Bilson recognized that the power of the keys and the authority to impose hands were much more in dispute, so far as the offices of those who were to carry out these functions were concerned, than the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments. The former

"are more controversied than the other two... Some fasten them to the liking of the multitude, which they call the Church. Others commit them to the judgment of certain chosen persons as well of the laity as of the clergy, whom they name the Presbytery. Some attribute them only, but equally, to all Pastors and Preachers. And some specially reserve them to men of the greatest gifts, ripest years, and highest calling among the clergy."⁽²⁾

The powers of ordaining and of binding sins, Bilson thought, were so near to those of preaching the Word and administering the Sacraments that they ought not to be separated from them. No-one could give the authority to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments who did not already possess that authority himself, and therefore laymen must not purport to ordain.

"Yea, what if to give power to preach and baptize be more than to preach and baptize, even as lawfully to authorize another to do anything is more than to do it ourselves?"⁽³⁾

On this point Bilson was able to claim some degree of support from Calvin, who had favoured the confining to Pastors of the right to

(1) BPG 106ff. It will be noticed that Bilson assumed without argument that the Apostles "bequeathed" their authority. He did not believe that it was inherent in the Church and had been exercised by the Apostles as the Church. (2) Ibid 108f (3) Ibid 109.

(1)

impose hands.

Excommunication and the Lord's Supper, Bilson pointed out, were closely linked together. Those alone who were to administer the Lord's Supper were those who could withhold it.

"To whom it pertaineth to admit the worthy, to them it belongeth to reject the unworthy; they that are placed by God to deliver the mysteries to the faithful and penitent, are commanded by him to deny them to the faithless and impenitent. The charge to deliver the Sacraments is theirs, the care not to deliver them... must needs be theirs."(2)

From these considerations ~~arising~~ Bilson derived his own positive propositions, which he expressed thus:-

"The moderation of the keys and imposition of hands were at first settled in the Apostles and exercised by them... and neither the people nor Lay Elders succeed the Apostles, but only the Pastors and ministers of the word and Sacraments. They can have no part of the apostolic commission that have no show of Apostolic Succession. They must look not only what they challenge, but also from whom they derive it; if from the Apostles, then they are their successors; if from Christ as colleagues joined with the Apostles, we must find that consociation in the Gospel, before we clear them from intrusion... But, indeed, how should they be called to deny the Sacraments that are not licensed to divide the Sacraments? Or what right have they to stay the seal, that have no power to affix the seal?"(3)

Bilson granted that the laity had some part to play in excommunication:-

"If you take (excommunication) for removing the unruly from the civil society of the faithful, I am not altogether averse, that the whole Church, where there wanteth a Christian magistrate, did, and should, concur in that action... But for delivering or denying the Sacraments, I take that to be the Pastors' charge, and not the people's."(4)

(1) Calvin, Institutes, IV.xix.28, 111,16. (2) BPG 110. Throughout this part of his book Bilson assumes that the authority of the ministry is to be regarded as something separate from any authority which the Church as a whole may possess. (3) Ibid 111 (4) Ibid 113

For this opinion Bilson quoted several of the Fathers, and added,

"A thousand other places might be noted both in Fathers and Councils to show that from the Apostles to this day no lay person was ever admitted in the Church of Christ to join with the Pastors and Bishops in the public use of the keys... Yet in notorious and scandalous offences, when the whole Church was grieved, or when a schism was feared, the godly Fathers did both in removing and reconciling of such persons, stay for the liking and approbation of the whole people to concur with them, not to warrant or confirm the sentences that should be given, but to satisfy their consciences, and to prevent schisms."(1)

Bilson's shadow-opponent now pointed to I Cor.v.13, and asked what St Paul had meant and whom he had addressed when he wrote,

"Put away that wicked man from among yourselves."

Bilson replied,

"If he spake to the people, he meant they should refrain all society with that incestuous person, and not so much as eat with him. If he intended to have the malefactor removed from the Lord's Table, he spake to the Prophets and Pastors that had power and charge to do so."(2)

Bilson, that is to say, could not give a certain answer to either of the questions that had been put to him, but he preferred his second alternative because in II Cor.ii.6 St Paul had written of the same offender,

"Sufficient to such a one is this punishment which was inflicted by the many."

"By the many" did not mean "by all", and therefore the whole Church had not taken part in the excommunication but only, Bilson concluded, the "leaders and teachers" of the Corinthian Church. The imaginary Puritan critic pointed out, however, that excommunication "by the many" did not mean excommunication by St Paul alone. It could only

(1) BPG 118f (2) Ibid 124.

mean that at least the Presbytery, of whom the Lay Elders had been no small part, had joined with St Paul in pronouncing sentence. (1)

Both Bilson and his opponent missed the true implication of the phrase *ὡς πλείονες* which St Paul employed in this place. The meaning of the phrase is "the majority", an expression which could hardly be applied to the "leaders and teachers" nor to a Presbytery, but which almost certainly refers to a majority of the congregation which had assembled to consider the position of the offender, and which had decided, not unanimously but by a majority, to support St Paul's decision. (2)

IX.

In the days of the Apostles, said Bilson, each city had had many Prophets, Pastors, and Teachers, and for hundreds of years after those days the Pastors and Bishops of the great cities had had many ministers to help them. In this sense there had certainly been a Presbytery in each city from the times of the Apostles and onwards, but there was no evidence that laymen had ever been members of these Presbyteries. The question of Lay Presbyters was most important for the Church. Such Elders would be able to out-vote the Pastor in a parish Presbytery,

"and therefore the ground that shall bear the frame of the Lay Presbytery had need to be sure, especially when it is urged as a part of Christ's spiritual kingdom, without the which no Church can be Christ's, no more than it may without the truth of his doctrine. But whether the words of St Paul, I Timothy 5, infer any such thing or no, that is the matter we have now in hand." (3)

(1) BPG 125 (2) See Arndt and Gingrich, op.cit. 695 col 2.
 (3) BPG 127f.

On I Tim.v.17 Bilson commented that for fifteen hundred years no Father of the Church had ever dreamed that St Paul had been writing about Lay Elders. In the one and only place in which St Paul had mentioned a Presbytery, that Presbytery had been composed of Prophets, viz:-

"Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying-on ~~mg~~ of the hands of the presbytery."
(I Tim.iv.14)

But

"this Christian Presbytery gave imposition of hands to ordain. But Lay Elders had no right to impose hands to that purpose. Ergo, laymen were no part of this Presbytery." (3)

In I Tim.v.17, Bilson continued, St Paul had said that all Elders, whether they governed or preached, were worthy of double pay. Elsewhere St Paul had said that those who preached the Gospel should live of the Gospel, but neither he nor anyone else in Scripture had ever suggested that laymen should be chargeable to the Church.

There were four possible interpretations of I Tim.v.17, Bilson declared, and each of them better than the Puritan interpretation:-

(a) It was possible that the "Elders" mentioned in that place were ministers of the Word and Deacons, not two kinds of Presbyter, ministerial and lay.

(b) Not two kinds of Elders, but two parts of the Pastor's charge,

(1) BPG 128 (2) Bilson had now abandoned his earlier, and untenable, idea that Πρεσβυτεριον meant the office of Presbyter, in favour of the idea of a "college of Presbyters". He is wrong in supposing that "St Paul's" words necessarily imply that the Presbytery was composed of Prophets. The prophecy was not necessarily spoken by the same men who imposed hands on Timothy. (3) BPG 128 (4) Bilson's translation of Τίμω here is probably correct. (5) BPG 129f (6) Ibid 131.

might have been in St Paul's mind, so that although he commended good government, he praised earnest preaching still more. ⁽¹⁾

(c) Perhaps the verb κοπιάω, which signified painstaking labour, ought to be emphasized, in which case St Paul had meant that all the work of the clergy was praiseworthy, but that strenuous endeavour in preaching was especially commendable. ⁽²⁾

(d) If it had to be granted that St Paul had been thinking of two kinds of Elders, perhaps he had thought of the one kind as Pastors settled in definite places and doing all the duties of a Pastor, while the other kind undertook the laborious task of travelling from place to place to preach the Gospel. ⁽³⁾ Under this interpretation neither kind of Elder belonged to the laity, since both kinds were ministers of the Word.

At this point it will be useful to interpose something which Bilson had already written on I Tim.v.17 in his Epistle to the Reader. ⁽⁴⁾ He complained that the Puritans used St Paul's word *μάχιστα* to distinguish persons rather than things, i.e. to find superior and inferior Elders instead of

"divers qualities in one man... By St Paul's words... a Presbyter must not only govern well, but also labour in the word, before he may be counted to be 'specially'... worthy of double honour."

Bilson thought that the participles *ὑποζωστῆτες* and *κοπιῶντες* supported his idea that St Paul had had only a single kind of Elder in mind as he wrote:-

(1) BPG 132 (2) Ibid 133f (3) Ibid 135f (4) The 7th and 8th pages.

"The participles, as every mean scholar knoweth, may be resolved not only by the Relative and his verb, but by many other parts of speech and their verbs; which oftentimes express the sense better than the Relative... So in the sentence we speak of... well governing is the cause of double honour, neither is double honour due to Presbyters but with this condition, if they govern well. Then resolve the Apostle's words either with a causal or conditional adjunction, which is plainly the speaker's intent, and we shall see how little they make for two sorts of Presbyters."

Accordingly he translated I Tim.v.17,

"Presbyters, if they rule well, are worthy of double honour, specially if they labour in the word."

Or,

"Presbyters for ruling well are worthy of double honour, specially for labouring in the word."

To return to the main body of Bilson's work, commenting upon Rom.xii.3ff, he rejected any possibility that Lay Elders might be mentioned there by asserting that the *χαρίσματα διάφορα* were

"divers gifts and graces of the Holy Ghost",

for

"of divers offices (St Paul) speaketh not, for then they might not concur in one man, and consequently neither might the Prophet teach nor exhort, nor the Deacon distribute nor show mercy. Many gifts may conjoin in one man, many offices cannot."(1)

This was because, in the passage under consideration, St Paul had mention prophecy apart from teaching, and *διακονία* separately from *ἐλεημοσύνη*. If these were offices, then teaching could be no part of the office of Prophet, nor almsgiving a duty of the office of Deacon.

(1) BPG 136f

Bilson's Puritan questioner pointed out that the earlier part of Rom.xii (i.e.3ff) was taken up with St Paul's metaphor of the human body as a description of the Christian Church, the limbs of the body being several powers and actions. In this context, he claimed, it appeared that the "gifts" of xii.6ff ought to be taken as offices in the Church. Bilson replied,

"I ask now, whether only the officers of the Church, or the whole multitude of believers, be the body of Christ? The whole, no doubt, is the body, and not this or that part, though excelling the rest. Then as in man's body every part hath his action, so in Christ's body, which is the Church, every member must have his gift, and not a public office in the Church."(1)

To a further objection that the gifts mentioned by St Paul in Rom.xii.6ff appeared to be gifts designed for use in the public actions of the Church, and not otherwise, Bilson replied that in the case of prophecy, men and women, young and old, had had the gift. Neither this gift, nor any of the others mentioned by St Paul, had been confined to those who had held office in the apostolic Church. Even teaching and exhorting could be regarded, in certain circumstances, as private gifts. For example, Priscilla the wife of Aquila had taught the faith to Apollos, and St Paul had told husbands to instruct their wives at home. The same Apostle had told all Christians to exhort each other. The distributing of alms might be done privately by the prompting of the Spirit, and this would be more a gift of the Spirit than the public distribution of other men's alms. Like St Paul in Rom.xii, St Peter in I Pet.iv.10 had meant that all

(1) BPG 137 (2) Ibid 137f (3) Ibid 138

Christians might have these gifts, and not only Teachers and Elders. ⁽¹⁾

Turning to I Cor.xii.28, Bilson showed that "governing", too, might be a private gift of the Spirit, for every Christian must govern his own household and family. ⁽²⁾ In this passage, although Teachers were mentioned, Pastors were not. Perhaps, Bilson thought, St Paul had meant Pastors to be included among "Governors". But it was better to take the things mentioned in this passage as gifts of the Spirit, and not as offices of the Church.

"The Apostles, Prophets and Teachers in the Church, had they not power to do miracles, to cure the sick, to speak with tongues? If these three be no divers offices, but graces, and all three found in every Apostle, in many Prophets and Teachers, why should not government, being reckoned in the midst of them, be a gift likewise of the Holy Ghost?"⁽³⁾

The apostolic Church, of course, had had Governors,

"or rather Governments (for so the Apostle speaketh), that is, gifts of wisdom, discretion, and judgment."⁽⁴⁾

Those Christians could be called Governors whose task it had been to compose quarrels between their fellow-Christians rather than have them settled in heathen courts of law. But they had had neither authority, necessity, nor perpetuity in the Church. They had been arbitrators without power to compel. In a Christian commonwealth they were superfluous and must give place to the "godly Prince". ⁽⁵⁾

Bilson displayed some anxiety to emphasize his view that Lay Elders must inevitably imperil the authority of the Christian magistrate. If such Elders were appointed by the people, they would use the keys under the ~~R~~ people's authority, and not under Christ's,

 (1) BPG 138f (2) Ibid 140 (3) Ibid 141 (4) Ibid 142 (5) Ibid 143.

"and their delegation from the people must utterly cease where he that beareth the sword embraceth the faith."(1)

The godly Prince had Christ's authority direct, and that direct authority must supersede any authority delegated from the people, even though the people's authority had originally come to them from God. By the laws of God and nature every multitude might govern itself where there was no magistrate.

"Yet we must beware when God hath placed Christian Princes to defend and preserve justice and judgment amongst men, that we do not erect under a show of discipline certain petit magistrates in every parish by commission from Christ himself in crimes and causes ecclesiastical to proceed without depending on the prince's power."(2)

The regal power of Christ in his Church was delegated to the godly Prince. Whatever power Lay Elders might wield, it could not be prophetic or priestly power, for that belonged to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments.

"If they have any, it must be regal, and consequently, when the magistrate believeth, Lay Elders must relinquish all their authority to him, or derive it from him, except they will establish another regiment beside him."(3)

Lay Elders could not, Bilson thought, be classed with Pastors as though they ruled in the same way that Pastors ruled, for

"Pastors have their power and function distinguished from Princes by God himself, insomuch that it were more than presumption for Princes to execute those actions by themselves or their substitutes. To preach, baptize, retain sins, and impose hands, Princes have no power. The Prince of Princes, even the Son of God, hath severed it from their callings, and committed it to his Apostles, and they, by imposition of hands derived it to their successors."(4)

It would also be impossible, Bilson continued, to leave judgment

in the hands of Lay Elders, but the execution of their judgments in
 the hands of the magistrate, for sword and judgment went together. (1)
 Pastors had their power independently of the magistrate, but Lay
 Elders could not have it so. (2) Where there was no Christian Magis-
 trate the whole Church might shun a wicked Pastor, but where there
 was a Christian Magistrate the oversight of Pastors was a matter for
 that Prince. (3) Pastors, equally with Lay Elders, might redress dis-
 order only under the authority of the Christian Magistrate. (4)

As for the position of Lay Elders joined in one Presbytery with
 Pastors and Teachers in the "free cities" (i.e. especially Geneva),
 Bilson had evidently learned something from Browne's description of
 Elders as "Aldermen", for he wrote,

"I see not how it may be defended by the word of God as toler-
 able, except they derive the power of that Presbytery in time
 of peace from the Magistrate, in which case they be no Elders
 authorized by Christ or his Apostles to govern the Church, but
 Commissioners deputed by the State." (5)

X.

Bilson's next concern was the witness of the primitive Church
 and the Catholic Fathers, and what could be discovered there about
 Elders. His general conclusion was:-

"Elders I find; Lay Elders I never find, and by the name of
 Elders or Presbyters the ancient Fathers do mean such Teachers
 and Labourers in the word, as with their counsel and consent
 did advise and direct the Bishop of each Church and city in
 cases of doubt, danger, and importance, when as yet neither
 Synods could assemble, nor Christian Magistrates be found to
 help and assist the Church." (6)

(1) BPG 149f (2) Ibid 151 (3) Ibid 150 (4) Ibid 151 (5) Ibid 152
 (6) Ibid 157.

The first witness was Ignatius. Not all of Bilson's quotations from this Father were taken from the genuine text, but one, from the true text of "Ad Trallianos", serves to show how Ignatius regarded the Presbyters of his time:-

"Be subject unto the presbytery as unto the Apostles of Christ. Reverence... the presbyters as the Council of God and the band of the Apostles."(1)

These comparisons of Presbyters with the Apostles, Bilson held, were incompatible with Lay Presbyters, or with a Presbytery made up in part of laymen.

The second witness, from a much later period, was Jerome, who had written,

"Idem est ergo Presbyter, qui episcopus..."(2)

This passage, much used by Puritans to argue for the parity of ministers, was perfectly legitimately used by Bilson to show that Jerome knew nothing of Lay Presbyters, since a Bishop, in Puritan as in Anglican theory, must necessarily be a minister.⁽³⁾

The third witness was Ambrosiaster:-

"Nam apud omnes utique gentes honorabilis est senectus: unde et Synagoga, et postea Ecclesia seniores habuit, quorum sine consilio nihil agebatur in Ecclesia. Quod qua negligentia obsoleverit, nescio; nisi forte doctorum desidia, aut magis superbia, dum soli volunt aliquid videri."(4)

Bilson's treatment of this passage was unsatisfactory. He declared that the "Seniors" referred to could not have been Lay Elders, because Ignatius and Jerome had not indicated Lay Elders when they

(1) BPG 158. Epistle to the Trallians, ii, iii. (2) Comm. in Ep. ad Tit.i.5. (3) BPG 159 (4) BPG 160. Comm. in Ep. ad Tim.Prim. v. "Ambrosiaster" was to Bilson and his contemporaries "Ambrose".

had mentioned "Presbyters". But Ambrosiaster was worth treating as a completely independent witness. He implied a difference between "Seniors" and Teachers, and his reference to the Synagogues afforded a clue that might have led Bilson to the discovery of that difference. The passage required fuller explanation than Bilson was willing, or able, to supply.

Bilson noticed that the Latin Fathers often used the term "seniores" as the equivalent of $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\iota$. Thus Isidore had said, "Presbyter in Greek is in Latin Senior, Presbyters and Elders being so called not for years and old age, but for the honour and dignity which they took when they entered that order." (1)

The same usage had been followed in the Vulgate version of the New Testament. In accordance with this usage, in I Pet.v.1, II John 1, and III John 1, two of the Apostles had called themselves "Seniores", but that certainly did not mean that they were therefore Lay Elders. (2)

It is unnecessary to follow Bilson through all his quotations from the Fathers and from the Canons of the Councils. Suffice it to say that he complained that the Puritans, whenever they read "Presbyter" or "Senior", began thereupon to dream of Lay Elders, whereas in no case could it be proved that those officers were laymen, but in many cases they could be shown not to have been laymen.

"That Elders at first did govern the Church by common advice is no doubt at all with us; this is it which is doubted and denied by us, and shall never be proved by any, that those Elders were Laymen which so governed the Church." (3)

 (1) BPG 161. Isidore, Etymologiae, VII.xii.20. (2) BPG 161

(3) Ibid 158f. The present writer is indebted to Professor S.L. Greenslade for the information that "seniores laici" appeared in the Church in North Africa in the 4th century. There is a reference to them in Monceaux, Hist. Litt. Afrique Chret. iii.83f. They seem to have been financial officers of the Church, and had no spiritual or

Bilson agreed that in the primitive Church the people, though not through the agency of Lay Elders, had played their part in choosing their Bishops and Presbyters:-

"I do not deny but after the Apostles and their followers were dead... the good will and liking of the people was greatly respected in the choice of their Bishops, and when there wanted Presbyters and Deacons needful for the Church, the Bishop of the place used to admonish and exhort the people, if they found any man amongst themselves meet... to serve in the Church of Christ, to bring them forth or name them, that he might accordingly consider of them, whether by the Canons they were capable of that honour."(1)

The process had also worked the other way:-

"When (the Bishop) would prefer such as he knew to be sufficient for their learning, he proposed their names to the people, that their lives and conversations in time past might be remembered and examined."(2)

With this process Bilson was in hearty agreement, but he pointed out that if the approval of the whole laity was needed for the choice of a minister, then approval by Lay Elders representing the laity was superfluous. Indeed, it was more than superfluous, since it would exclude approval by the entire laity.⁽³⁾

Bilson also agreed that St Cyprian had declared his intention of acting as Bishop only after consulting his clergy and laity. The question, however, was not the fact of Cyprian's declaration, but whether he had been bound by Divine law to act in that way.

doctrinal functions. Monceaux thought they were appointed by the laity, but gave no evidence for this view. See Optatus, c. Parmen. i.17 (C.S.E.L. vol.26), Optatus, Gesta ap. Zenoph. (C.S.E.L. vol.26 p.188f), Optatus, Acta Purg. Felicis (C.S.E.L. vol.26, p. 198), Augustine Ep.78 (C.S.E.L. vol.34), Augustine, c. Cresc. iii.56, 62 (C.S.E.L. vol.52. p.467ff), Augustine, Enarratio in Psalm. xxxvi.24 (Migne P.L. vol.36 col.377ff), Cod. Can. Eccles. Afr. Africae, Canons xci, c. (Migne P.L. vol.67 cols,210, 215). (1) BPG ~~175~~ 173.

(2) Ibid 173f (3) Ibid 176. Bilson did not explain why he thought the consent of Lay Elders would exclude the consent of the whole people, and he seems to be guilty of "non sequitur" in thinking

"If it were but a private moderation and provision for his own security, no man is obliged by his example to do the like. If it be a general form of governing the Church, prescribed by the Holy Ghost, then neither might Cyprian nor any man else swerve from that direction... Then all Councils both Provincial and General, that assembled and concluded in the primitive Church without the liking and agreement of the people, did wilfully break the commandment of the living God, and all Christian Princes that in former ages by their laws and edicts intermeddled with matters of the Church without the knowledge and consent of their subjects, presumed without warrant, and offered open wrong to the kingdom of Christ. Yea, Cyprian himself was the first that cashiered his own conscience, and when cause so required, yea, sometimes without cause, excluded and over-ruled the people's just desires."(1)

But even when Cyprian expressed his intention of consulting the people, it was the people as a whole that he meant. He knew nothing of Lay Elders whom he might consult. (2)

Bilson dealt only very briefly with the idea that the Jewish Sanhedrin had been the original pattern of the Christian Lay Presbytery. God had appointed that Council, he argued, to be the governing body of the Jewish commonwealth. Its members had been civil magistrates executing the Mosaic Law, and it had acted whether under a king when there was one, or independently when there was no king.

"And therefore as they might not alter it, so we must not urge it in Christian kingdoms. It contradicteth the truth and freedom of the Gospel to tie all Christian commonwealths to the pattern of Moses' polity. Yea, that position, if it be stiffly stood to, maimeth all monarchies, and reduceth them to popular, or at the least synedrical, regiments."(3)

A thing which Bilson would not agree to was that the early Church had had a Presbytery for each parish or congregation, even

(1) BPG 178. Cyprian, Epp. 14.4, 59.15. Bilson is begging the question here. It was precisely the Puritan position that the commandment of God had been universally broken in the Church since the time of the Apostles. Merely to point out that this conclusion would have to be drawn if Puritan theory was correct amounted to no more than a repetition of the Puritan case. (2) BPG 175

(3) Ibid 182f.

though it were granted that such Presbyteries had been composed only of clergy. Villages and country towns, he asserted, had had neither Bishop nor Presbytery, but had been served by Presbyters sent by the Bishop of the nearest city. Where there had been rural Bishops, "chorepiscopoi", they had quickly been deprived of their episcopal powers, and soon afterwards had been abolished altogether. (1) These rural Bishops had had no Presbyteries, and the rural clergy had not been members of the city Presbyteries. (2) The rural Bishops had had no authority independently of the city Bishop, and sometimes, if the rural Bishop had previously been a schismatical Bishop and had returned to the Church, he held the title of Bishop merely as an honour. (3)

XI.

Bilson had now reached the point at which he could introduce the main argument of his treatise by asking, To whom did the Apostles leave the government of the Church when they died? Or alternatively, to whom did the Apostles leave the government of each local congregation which they had founded when they left it to preach the Gospel elsewhere? To some extent he begged the question by assuming that the Apostles had, in the former case, deliberately given the control of the Church into certain hands. He had already dismissed the possibility that they had left it to Lay Elders, and so he worded his subsidiary question, did the Apostles leave the govern-

(1) BPG 183f (2) Ibid 186 (3) Ibid 186f

ment of the Church to all Presbyters equally, or chiefly to some? Thus he re-opened the question of the parity of ministers which he had already dealt with at some length in his opening chapters.

The premiss from which Bilson started was, that if order and discipline were to remain in the Church, those who had succeeded to the Apostles' places and charges must have been armed with a part of the Apostles' authority, i.e. that part required for the perpetual ruling of the Church. Here he asked that three things be distinguished:-

"The things which must be derived from the Apostles to their helpers and successors in all ages and Churches; the persons to whom they were committed; and the times when."(1)

As to the things derived from the Apostles, Bilson drew attention to the Church's twofold need of Doctrine (the Word and Sacraments) and Discipline (the keys and the imposition of hands).⁽²⁾ As to the persons, he warned his readers that in the rest of his book he would be using the term "Presbyter" for the minister who came in between Deacons and Bishops in the degrees of the threefold ministry. As to the times, when the Apostles had been present they had had helpers, in their absence they had had substitutes, after their deaths they had had successors. All these times would have to be considered.⁽³⁾

According to Bilson's views, the Word and the Sacraments had been committed to all Pastors and Presbyters, and were not to be separated from each other. The Puritan office of "Teacher" ex-

(1) BPG 207 (2) Ibid 208 (3) Ibid 210.

cluded the holder of that office from administering the Sacraments, which was clearly wrong since it separated the Word from the Sacraments. Hence it must have been the Pastor who had been the Teacher of his congregation in the apostolic Church, and if that was so, then one office which Puritan theory supposed to have been in the apostolic Church could be dismissed. But if there had been such Teachers who had not been Pastors, then the Pastor must have been the superior, and the parity of ministers could be dismissed. ⁽¹⁾ Of these alternatives Bilson preferred that which allowed of a certain parity of ministers, for

"the dispensing (of the Word and Sacraments) no doubt was common to all Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, Pastors, and Teachers, and so to Presbyters and Bishops." ⁽²⁾

Nevertheless,

"the moderation and oversight of those things were still reserved to the Apostles, as well absent as present, even when the power and charge thereof was imparted to others." ⁽³⁾

Bilson distinguished two forms of the power of the keys; the key of knowledge, which was annexed to the Word and its preaching; and the key of power, which belonged to the administration of the Sacraments. He indicated that some of his contemporaries recognized the existence of only the first of these keys in the Church, but he himself thought that both should be acknowledged. The key of knowledge had been mentioned by Christ in Luke xi.52, just as the key of power had been mentioned in Christ's sayings about binding and loosing, forgiving and retaining. About these sayings, Bil-

(1) BPG 212f (2) Ibid 213 (3) Ibid

son declared,

"Lest we should understand these places of the preaching of the Gospel, as some new writers do, St Paul hath plain words that cannot be wrested to that sense, 'Sufficient for that man is this rebuking of many; so that now contrariwise ye ought rather to forgive and comfort lest he be swallowed up with too much sorrow. To whom ye forgive anything, I also. For if I forgave ought to any, I forgave it for your sakes in the sight of Christ.'"(1)

"That sense" to which Bilson referred was the idea that "binding and loosing" consisted of the preaching of the condemnation and forgiveness of sins, an idea which Jewel, for example, had held. Bilson must have felt that "binding and loosing" were in some way effective actions distinguishable from verbal declarations, but he did not define exactly what those actions were. He did, however, add that St Paul had forgiven the man of whom he had spoken, and had restored him to the Church,

"not by preaching the word unto the penitent, for as then he was absent from Corinth, but by forgiving him in the sight of Christ and his Church, as by his Apostolic power he might."(2)

To whom, Bilson asked, had the Apostles committed this ~~apostolic~~ apostolic power? To all Presbyters equally, or chiefly to Pastors and Bishops? The same questions were also to be asked about the apostolic power to impose hands, but before any of these questions could be answered correctly it was necessary to discover how Bishops first began, and to examine the Fathers to that end. (3)

Epiphanius, Bilson said, had stated that the Apostles at first appointed Presbyters and Deacons, ^{but} ~~not~~ not Bishops except where there were men fit for that office. Ambrosiaster had stated that the (4)

(1) BPG 213f. II Cor.ii.6f, 10. (2) BPG 214 (3) Ibid 215
(4) Epiphanius, Adv.Haer. 75.v.

first Presbyters had been called "Bishops", and had succeeded each other "in order" in the presidency of their assemblies, but that, so as to exclude the unworthy from the presidency, a Council had provided that succession to the presidency should be by merit, and no longer by order. (1) Jerome had spoken of the raising of one Presbyter above the rest, by a custom of the Church, to avoid schism. (2)

Out of this evidence Beza had claimed that originally there had been an equality of Presbyters, and had assumed that the presidency of the body of Presbyters had been held by course, perhaps for a week at a time, after the manner in which the priests under the Law had executed their office. Beza had then assumed that this holding of

 (1) Ambrosiaster, Comm. in Ep. ad Ephes. iv, "Nam et Timotheum presbyterum a se creatum episcopum vocat, quia primi presbyteri episcopi appellabantur; ut recedente eo, sequens ei succederet. (Denique apud Aegyptum presbyteri consignant, si praesens non sit episcopus). Sed quia coeperunt sequente presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus intendos, immutata est ratio, prospiciente Concilio, ut non ordo, sed meritum crearet episcopum, multorum sacerdotum iudicio constitutum, ne indignus temere usurparet, et esset multis scandalum." For "concilio" in this passage "consilio" should probably be read; see article by E.W.Kemp in the "Journal of Ecclesiastical History", Vol VI, no 2, p.135. Bilson did not quote the sentence enclosed in brackets.

(2) Jerome, Comm. in Ep. ad Tit. 1.5. "Haec propterea, ut ostenderemus apud veteres eosdem fuisse presbyteros quos et episcopos: paulatim vero ut dissensionem ~~#####~~ plantaria evellerentur, ad unum omnem sollicitudinem esse deletam. Sicut ergo presbyteri sciunt se ex Ecclesiae consuetudine ei qui sibi praepositus fuit, esse subjectos: ita episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis Dominicae veritate, presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere Ecclesiam regere, imitantes Moysen, qui cum haberet in potestate solum praeesse populo Israel, septuaginta elegit, cum quibus populum iudicaret (Num. xi). Videamus igitur qualis presbyter, sive episcopus ordinandus sit."

(1)
the office of president by rota was of apostolic origin.

(2)
With these conclusions of Beza's Bilson vehemently disagreed.

What, he asked, was the authority for them? Ambrosiaster's clear meaning was that the Apostles had placed the Presbyters in the order of their gifts, and had then appointed the foremost to preside over the rest until he vacated his office by death, deprivation, desertion translation, persecution, or disabling sickness. Then the next in

(3)
order of gifts was to succeed him. There was no mention whatever in Ambrosiaster of the president of the Presbyters holding the presidency by course, whether for a week, or a month, or any other time.

And what had Ambrosiaster meant by the term "first Presbyters"?

"By primi presbyteri he doth not mean all the Presbyters that were in the first age of the Church under the Apostles, for then they should all be Bishops and none Presbyters, which is a contradiction in the very words. But by primus and sequens ... he meant those that were so placed in order by the Apostles."(4)

(1) BPG 215f. Beza, "Responsio", 136f, 140-160. As Bilson later acknowledged (BPG 404) Beza ("Responsio", 143) expressed disapproval of a succession of presidents by course because that method produced the unsatisfactory results indicated by Ambrosiaster. The Presbytery should choose its presidents, Beza thought, from among those of its members who were fit to hold the office, as the Presbyters of Alexandria had done as early as the time of St Mark. Presumably Beza thought that a practice as early as this must be apostolical, and could therefore legitimately be substituted for the apostolical "succession by course". (2) If every Presbyter had held the presidency in turn, then there must be an equality among Presbyters, and Bilson could not admit this without denying his theory that superiority, and not parity, was the scriptural plan for the ministry. Perhaps it was the same consideration that led him to omit from the quotation from Ambrosiaster which is under examination the words "Denique apud Aegyptum presbyteri consignant, si praesens non sit episcopus". (3) This is by no means certainly Ambrosiaster's meaning. He spoke of succession by "ordo" being changed to succession by "meritum". He may well have meant that the merit consisted of, or at least included, the "gifts" which Bilson had in mind. In that case the succession ~~of~~ by "ordo" may well have been succession by course, each Presbyter taking his turn irrespective of his ability, as the context seems to demand. (4) BPG 217.

To support this interpretation of "primi presbyteri" Bilson called in a second quotation from Ambrosiaster:-

"He is a Bishop which is first among the Presbyters, so that every Bishop is a Presbyter, but every Presbyter is not a Bishop. Paul signifieth that he made Timothy a Presbyter, but because he had none before him, he was a Bishop. Whereupon (Paul) showeth him how he should ordain a Bishop. For it was neither meet nor lawful that the inferior should ordain the greater. No man can give that which he hath not received."(1)

Bilson considered that the meaning of the words of Epiphanius to which he had referred was obscure. There had certainly been a change during the days of the Apostles in the manner of governing the Church, for Ambrosiaster had said,

"After that Churches were established in all places, and offices distinguished, they took another order than at the beginning."(2)

When there were only Presbyters and Deacons, and no Bishops,

"the chief government to impose hands and deliver unto Satan rested yet in the Apostles, who often visited the Churches which they planted, and ordained Presbyters (as they passed) to supply the wants of every Church."(3)

Epiphanius had therefore been right when he said that the Apostles

(4)

had not at first appointed Bishops in every place. But he was wrong

(1) BPG 217f. Ambrosiaster, Comm. in Ep. I ad Tim.iii. Bilson evidently meant that "primus" in this quotation must mean the same as in "primi presbyteri". If it is necessary to harmonize the two quotations from Ambrosiaster it can be done more easily by supposing that here Ambrosiaster was referring to the time when a Bishop was appointed by merit, and not by "ordo". The phrase "primi presbyteri" can then take its natural sense of "all the Presbyters that were in the first age of the Church. (2) Comm. in Ep. ad Ephes.iv. But the change Bilson had in mind was not the one to which Ambrosiaster referred, viz:- "Tamen postquam in omnibus locis Ecclesiae sunt constitutae, et officia ordinata, aliter composita res est, quam coeperat. Primum enim omnes docebant, et omnes baptizabant, quibus cumque diebus vel temporibus fuisset occasio;... adhuc enim praeter septem diaconos nullus fuerat ordinatus." (3) BPG 219 (4) Ibid.

in suggesting that there had not been enough men fit to be made Bishops. The Apostles had appointed few Bishops because they wished to keep the keys and the power to impose hands in their own possession. They had waited to see who should turn out to be the men most suitable to be entrusted with the governing of the Church ~~after~~ after they themselves were dead. So that they might not seem to put the advancement of their followers before the conversion of the heathen they had tried at first a parity of Presbyters in the Churches they had founded, but when this led to dissension they had been forced to change to another form of government. (1)

In the passage he had quoted from Jerome Bilson noted

- (a) The primitive equation of Bishops with Presbyters.
- (b) The change to the choice of one Presbyter to rule the rest.
- (c) This change had been made by "a custom of the Church", and not by a decree of Christ.

As to (a), if, said Bilson, Jerome had meant that it was in force all the time the Apostles were alive, and that the change to (b) had been made only after their deaths, then he was against the Scriptures and all the rest of the Fathers. But if by "a custom of the Church" Jerome had meant an arrangement made by the Apostles, then Bilson was content to accept what he said, for it could not be argued that the office of Bishop had been decreed by Christ. (2)

On (c) Bilson exclaimed,

"I come now to the quick; let the Christian Reader mark this issue well in God's name, and what side bringeth soundest and surest proofs, there let the verdict go." (3)

(1) BPG 224. Bilson's imagination was running riot here, and his Puritan shadow rightly complained that none of this could be found in Scripture. (2) Ibid 221. (3) Ibid 222.

The "quick" was Jerome's identification of Bishops with Presbyters. Did Jerome mean, Bilson enquired, that the offices of Bishop and Presbyter had originally been identical, or only the titles? Surely only the titles. St Peter had called himself a fellow-Elder (I Pet. v.1). Did that mean an equation of the office of Apostle with that of Presbyter? St Peter had also called Judas Iscariot's office a Bishopric (Acts i.20). Did that mean that a Bishop and an Apostle held the same office?

"Names may be common, though offices be distinct."(1)

Having removed this difficulty, Bilson informed his shadow-Puritan that he could show from Scripture that the change in the method of governing the Church mentioned by Jerome had taken place in the lifetime of the Apostles, and therefore by their decree. For government by all Presbyters in common they had substituted government by Bishops who were chief among the Presbyters, and who succeeded to the apostolic power of the keys and of the imposition of hands. The names of those who had succeeded the Apostles as chief governors of the Church were not to be found in the apostolic writings. How could they be found there since they did not succeed until the Apostles were dead? The witness of the sub-apostolic Church must be heard as to their names. But the apostolic ordering of the succession was to be found in the New Testament.

"(The Apostles') doctrine in deed doth plainly appear by their writings; their successors do not."(2)

The Apostles, Bilson insisted, had at first kept all episcopal

(1) BPG 222 (2) Ibid 223.

power (i.e. the keys and the imposition of hands) in their own possession. Scripture did not show that this power had been passed on to the Presbyters whom the Apostles appointed, but the Fathers were unanimous in asserting that it had been passed on to the Bishops. So far as the laying-on of hands was concerned, even if Timothy and Titus were not to be regarded as Bishops, yet the Presbyters at Ephesus and Crete had not had power to impose hands. If they had, Timothy and Titus would not have been sent to them;

"and consequently this power to impose hands was at that time reserved from the Presbyters to the Apostles and their deputies."(1)

As for the power of the keys, as an example of an Apostle retaining it in his own possession Bilson took II Thess.iii.14, where St Paul required the Thessalonians to report offenders to him by letter; and to withhold company from them. (2) But why should the Thessalonians report offenders to St Paul unless he had some power to punish which they lacked? (3)

Bilson's Puritan interrupted here to point out that, since Bishops were not Apostles, the whole argument was irrelevant. But Apostleship, Bilson replied, embraced all the other offices in the Church.

"If ἑπισκοπῆν be to oversee the Lord's flock, who better deserved that name than the Apostles"?(4)

(1) BPG 224f (2) Bilson translated δια τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τοῦτον σημειῖσθε as "signify that man by an epistle". A.V. margin ~~agree~~ agrees with Bilson. RSV translates the verse "If anyone refuses to obey what we say in this letter, note that man, and have nothing to do with him." A.V. and R.V. agree. Bilson's translation is highly improbable. - (3) BPG 225f (4) Ibid 227

Although they had not been tied to one place the Apostles had been, in effect, the Bishops of each of those places of which they had had the oversight.⁽¹⁾

Having established that the first Presbyters had not been Bishops in fact, whatever they might have been in name, and that the Apostles had been the Bishops of the Churches of their times, and had for a while retained the episcopal powers in their own hands, Bilson now took up the matter of the transference of those powers to others:-

"It cannot be denied but that the Apostles had that power of imposing hands, and delivering unto Satan, which they after imparted unto Bishops. And therefore while they remained in or near the places where they planted Churches, there was no such need of Bishops, the Apostles always supplying the wants of those Churches with their presence, letters, or messengers, as the cause required. But when they were finally to forgo those parts, then began they to provide for the necessity and security of the Churches, and left such fit men as they had, with episcopal power, as their substitutes to guide the Churches which they had founded."(2)

Here the shadow-Puritan interjected that Jerome had declared episcopacy to be only a custom of the Church, and not a divine ordinance. But Jerome, Bilson retorted, had not said who decreed the custom.⁽³⁾ It was to be noticed, however, that St Paul had had to send men to Ephesus and Crete to compose dissensions in those Churches. In the Pastoral Epistles first

"did Paul by writing express that he placed substitutes where need was, with episcopal power and honour, to guide and rule the Church."(4)

Similar dissensions had occurred in other Churches, and it was with the purpose of settling them and avoiding schism that the Apostles

(1)BPG 227 (2) Ibid 227f (3) Ibid 229 (4) Ibid 231

(1)

set up episcopal government.

Timothy and Titus, Bilson maintained, had been Bishops even though they had also been Evangelists:-

"When they left following the Apostles and were affixed to certain places with this power and authority which I have mentioned, what else could they be but Bishops? ... If the Apostles, in respect of this power and care, were Bishops when they stayed in any place, much more the Evangelists. If the same fidelity and authority be still needful, and therefore perpetual, in the Church of God, they did these things not by their Evangelistical calling, which is long ceased, but by their Episcopal, which yet doth and must remain. For if this power and pre-eminence descendeth from them to their successors, it is evident this commission and charge was Episcopal, since no part of their Evangeliship was derived to their after-comers."(2)

Bilson now set out a catena of passages from the Fathers designed to show that in the early Church Timothy and Titus had been universally regarded as Bishops, and to this evidence he attached the comment,

"How then could Jerome doubt but the vocation and function of Bishops was an Apostolic ordinance, and consequently confirmed and allowed by the wisdom of God's Spirit in his Apostles."(3)

As further proof of the existence of moniscopacy in the days
(4)
of the Apostles, Bilson referred to St Augustine's opinion that the Angels of the Seven Churches of Asia (Rev.i-iii) were not, as ~~Origen~~
(5)
Origen had thought, the representatives in heaven of those Churches, but their Bishops on earth. From this he concluded that

"If John in his time saw those seven Churches governed by seven Pastors or Bishops, then was the common and equal government of Presbyters before that time changed. If Christ called them seven Stars and Angels of the Churches, they were no human invention after the Apostles were dead and buried."(6)

(1) BPG 229ff (2) Ibid 233 (3) Ibid 235 (4) Ep.xliii.viii.22.

(5) Jerome, Trans. Hom. Origenis in Evang. Lucae, hom.xiii. See also Ehrhardt, "The Apostolic Succession", pp 79, 107, 137, 139f.

(6) BPG 235.

Jerome's contrast between "the truth of the Lord's ordinance" and "a custom of the Church" might, Bilson thought, be taken in one or other of two ways.

"Veritas is often taken with the ancient Fathers for a truth written in the Scriptures, and consuetudo for a thing delivered by hand from the Apostles, which otherwise they call a tradition."(1)

Thus, although there was no written precept of Christ in favour of episcopacy, the universal and perpetual custom of the Church showed that this form of government was apostolical in origin.

Alternatively, Jerome's remark about "ordinance" and custom" might be taken with the words that followed it, viz:-

"Let the Bishops know that (according to the truth of the Lord's disposition, howsoever the custom of the Church now be to the contrary) they should rule the Church in common (with the Presbyters) after the example of Moses who, when it lay in his power to be Ruler alone over the people of Israel, he chose seventy to help him judge the people."(2)

Interpreting Jerome in this way, Presbyters had been excluded gradually from giving counsel and advice to their Bishop, and had become subject to him. But this subjection had grown up by custom, and was no part of the divine decree. The example of Moses must be followed.

"This, saith Jerome, was the truth of the Lord's ordinance, although by the custom of the Church as it then was... Bishops had the whole charge of the Church without advising or conferring with the Presbyters."(3)

It was the second interpretation that Bilson favoured. Jerome, he thought, had not been calling in question the belief that episcopacy was a divine ordinance received through the Apostles. Rather, he had complained that episcopal government had been corrupted by

(1) BPG 237 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 237f

custom, and had appealed for the restoration of its original form.
 He had not meant that the original form was a mere custom. ⁽¹⁾

Bilson returned to, and again attacked, Ambrosiaster's idea that originally each Presbyter in turn had presided over the rest of the Presbyters. This, he said, was pure guesswork, and contrary to the Scriptures. The case of Timothy showed that Bishops should be appointed by choice. Even Beza disagreed with the English Puritans about this matter, and had taught that choice by election was the correct and scriptural method when he wrote,

"The commandment of election which must be kept unchanged, not only in Deacons but in all sacred functions, is one thing; the manner of electing is another thing." ⁽²⁾

An unchangeable commandment could only be a commandment of Christ, and that, according to Beza, was succession by choice. ⁽³⁾

Out of Ambrōsiaster's writings Bilson now gathered four points which told in favour of his own position, and against Puritanism:-

"A Presbyter and a Bishop have all one ordination, for either is a Priest." ⁽⁴⁾

This excluded Lay Elders.

"Paul made Timothy both a Presbyter and a Bishop." ⁽⁵⁾

But the Puritans denied that an Evangelist could be a Bishop, and also denied that St Paul had at any time consecrated a Bishop.

(1) BPG 238 (2) Ibid 242. Beza, "Responsio", 154. It was only the presidency of the local, regional, or national, assemblies of Presbyters (i.e. the office of Moderator or "Bishop") which the Puritans thought should be held for only a short time, and which some thought should go round by course. The office of Pastor was permanent; that of Lay Elder annual. (3) BPG 241. (4) Comm. in Ep. I ad Tim.iii. "Post episcopum tamen diaconatus ordinationem subiecit. Quare, nisi quia episcopi et presbyteri una ordinatio est? Uterque enim sacerdos est..." (5) Comm. in Ep. ad Ephes.iv. "Nam et Timotheum presbyterum a se creatum episcopum vocat..."

"It is neither right nor lawful for an inferior to ordain a superior." (1)

Therefore a Presbytery must not ordain a Bishop

"A Bishop must be elected by the judgment of many priests."(2)

He must not therefore be chosen by popular election.

Having done his utmost to turn the tables upon the Puritans by using their favourite authorities against them, Bilson summed up this part of his argument:-

"Thus you see that the ancient Fathers Jerome and Ambrose, which are alleged so constantly not only for the Lay Presbyters but for the equality and identity of Bishops and Presbyters in the Apostles' time, come nothing near your new discipline. The names were common, but their callings different; the words were not then severed as now they be. But even then Presbyters might not impose hands to ordain ministers. That was referred to some special and chief men trusted with the government of others, and appointed to succeed in the Apostles' places."(3)

(1) Comm. in Ep. I ad Tim.iii. "Neque enim fas erat aut licebat, ut inferior ordinaret majorem; nemo enim tribuit, quod non accepit."

(2) Comm.in Ep. ad Ephes.iv. "Sed quia coeperunt sequente presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus intendos, immutata est ratio, prospiciente consilio, ut non ordo, sed meritum crearet episcopum, multorum sacerdotum judicio constitutum, ne indignus temere usurparet, et esset multis scandalum." (3) BPG 243f.

XIII.

Bilson propounded the theory that since the days of the Apostles, in every city of Christendom, there had been a Chief Pastor distinguished from the rest of the Presbyters by the power to administer ordination and by the right of succession from the Apostles, and whose function it was to preserve the unity and perpetuity of the Church. Other tasks, such as Confirmation and the Dedication of Churches were also normally carried out by these Bishops but might be delegated to Presbyters. Superiority in ordaining, and singularity in succeeding, however, could not be delegated. (1)

On singularity of succession Bilson said,

"As Bishops preserve the unity of each Church, in that there may be but one in a place, so they continue the same unto perennity, by ordaining such as shall both help them living, and succeed them dying."(2)

Bilson's earliest evidence for this view comprised Cyprian's whole treatise "De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate", and the same Father's Epistle to Cornelius. To this he added a long chain of comments from later Fathers to the effect that, however many Presbyters there might be, schism would result if there were more than one Bishop in any one city. From these authorities Bilson concluded that (3)

"This singularity of one Pastor in each place, descended from the Apostles and their scholars in all the famous Churches of the world by a perpetual chair of succession, and doth to this day continue, but where abomination or desolation, I mean ~~heresy~~ heresy or violence, interrupt it."(5)

 (1) BPG 244 (2) Ibid 245 (3) Bilson referred especially to, and quoted, De Unitate 8 and Ep.59.5. (4) Ibid 245-247 (5) Ibid 247.

In Bilson's opinion the succession of the Bishops in the episcopal Chairs of certain Sees was not only a fact of history, but also an arrangement made by the Apostles and set in motion by them when they ordained the first Bishops of those Sees:-

"The singularity of one Pastor in every place preserveth the peace and unity of the Churches, and stoppeth schisms and dissensions, for which cause they were first ordained by the Apostles."(1)

The succession from the Apostles, that is to say, lay not merely in the occupation of an Apostolic Chair, but also, so far as the first generation of successors was concerned, in ordination by one or more of the Apostles.

"Superiority of ordaining" was Bilson's next concern:-

"This right of imposing hands to ordain Presbyters and Bishops in the Church of Christ was at first derived from the Apostles unto Bishops, and not unto Presbyters."(2)

Thus Philip could not ordain the Samaritans whom he had baptized, but Peter and John had to be called in to do it. Although Ephesus and Crete were already supplied with Presbyters, Timothy and Titus had to be sent to those places when more Presbyters were to be ordained. And Jerome had asserted that by the Scripture the right to ordain was the sole difference between Bishop and Presbyter.

"(Jerome) saith not, what doeth a Bishop which a Presbyter doeth not, for by the customs and Canons of the Church very many things were forbidden Presbyters which by God's word they might do. But he appealeth to God's ordinance, which

(1) ~~MB~~BPG 246 (2) Ibid 248. (3) Ibid. Acts viii.14ff. As before, Bilson interpreted this imposition of hands as ordination. The example of Philip is presumably given as a negative instance of a Presbyter not having power to ordain. (4) BPG 248.

"in his Commentaries upon Titus he calleth the 'divine institution'; and by that he confesseth it was not lawful for Presbyters to ordain any. And why? That power was reserved to the Apostles, and such as succeeded them, not generally in the Church, but specially in the Chair."(1)

Chrysostom, Bilson pointed out, on the ground that Presbyters might not ordain a Bishop, had regarded the presbytery mentioned in I Tim.iv.14 as an assembly of Bishops. In saying this Chrysostom had not been guilty of anachronism.

"Chrysostom doth not reason from his own age unto the Apostles, and conclude that because they might not do it in the world wherein he lived, by a custom of the Church, ergo, they could not do it in Paul's time; that were a very senseless and unsavoury collection. But he urgeth that in Paul's time Presbyters might not ordain a Bishop."(3)

(4)

In the opinion of Chrysostom and the rest of the Fathers Timothy had been a Bishop, and therefore,

"he was no Presbyter of Ephesus, but there left with episcopal authority which he had by the laying on of Paul's hands before he stayed at Ephesus."(5)

Whether the "presbytery" in I Tim.iv.14 was an assembly of Bishops, or whether it referred to the function of a Presbyter, the Puritans ought to remember, Bilson declared, that the imposition of hands on Timothy was carried out by St Paul.

"St Paul was present and did the deed, and therefore without some succeeding and supplying the Apostles' room, as Timothy and Titus did, your Presbyteries have no warrant to impose hands."(6)

(1) BPG 248f. Jerome, Ep.146. Jerome referred to "one rule of truth" throughout Christendom, but the context does not make it clear whether this was a rule restricting ordination to Bishops, or a rule recognizing the superiority of Presbyters over Deacons. Nor is it clear that by a "rule of truth" Jerome meant a rule of Scripture. (2) Chrysostom, Homilies on I & II Tim., Hom 13. (3) BPG 249. (4) Chrysostom, op.cit. Hom.11. (5) BPG 250 (6) Ibid 252. Elsewhere in his book Bilson had argued that St Paul's imposition of hands on Timothy was later than the imposition by the Presbytery; here he is arguing that St Paul imposed hands at the same time as the Presbytery did so.

St Paul's presence at Timothy's ordination had to be taken into account in considering a point raised by Bilson's Puritan shadow to the effect that the Fourth Council of Carthage had required Presbyters to join with the Bishop in the imposition of hands at the ordination of a Presbyter. This, it was claimed, showed that there was an equality, even in ordinations, between Bishop and Presbyters. But, replied Bilson, the Presbyters could not ordain without the Bishop. Their participation was not ordination, but a consenting to the Bishop's action and a blessing of the ordinand signified by the laying-on of their hands. The Council had not required the presence of Presbyters at an ordination, nor fixed any number to be present. It had merely decreed that if any were present, they were to join in the imposition of hands. Nothing in the Canon in question prevented a Bishop from ordaining alone.

Here Bilson introduced a number of quotations from Fathers and Councils to the effect that Bishops alone were to be held responsible for unlawful ordinations. This very circumstance showed that there was an inequality in the matter of ordinations as between Bishops and Presbyters. If Bishops were solely responsible for the ordinations they administered, then they might ordain alone. If they might not, then many of the Fathers had been deceived.

It was important to Bilson's case to show, if he could, that the Apostles had not only appointed Bishops, but that they had initiated

(1) See Hefele, History of Councils, ii.409ff, Canon 3. There was no "Fourth Council of Carthage". Its supposed Canons were older material collected together at Arles c. ~~12~~ A.D.500. The provision to which Bilson referred is mentioned by Hippolytus in the "Apostolic Tradition" (Dix's edition, p.13) and dates therefore from the second century, if not earlier. BPG 250 (2) BPG 256 (3) Ibid 256ff

the process of succession of Bishops. The place for this to be shown most effectively was within the covers of the New Testament, but there even Bilson's inventive genius was defeated. He might claim that Timothy and Titus had been Bishops appointed by St Paul, but he could not demonstrate from the New Testament that they had handed their episcopate on to others, nor even that they had been succeeded after their deaths by Bishops consecrated by others. He might claim that James had been the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and had been a Bishop in the days of the Apostles, but he could not show from Scripture that James had been appointed by the Apostles, nor that on his death he had been succeeded by another Bishop. All that he could do was to claim that it was unreasonable to expect to find in the writings of the Apostles any mention of the names of their successors, and to look outside the New Testament for evidence of the succession.

Bilson found what he wanted in the episcopal succession lists for the Sees of Rome, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria reproduced by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History. In support of these lists he added a catena of passages from other Fathers, together with some of the traditions preserved by Eusebius himself. These, he thought, showed that the succession lists (and others like them which he believed Eusebius could have compiled for other Sees if he had had space in his book to do so) proved what he wanted them to prove, i.e. that the Apostles had started the process of success-

(1) BPG 259f. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles.vii.19 et seqq.

(1)

ion by consecrating their successors and placing them in their Sees.

Many of Bilson's supporting authorities were of a date later than Eusebius, and were probably dependent for their information upon Eusebius or some other writer earlier than themselves; only a very few were earlier than Eusebius.

For Jerusalem Bilson quoted Clement of Alexandria and Hegesippus, both of whom had named James as the first Bishop of Jerusalem; in addition, Clement had indicated that James had been made Bishop by the Apostles. (2)

For the beginning of the episcopal succession at Antioch, Bilson quoted the Epistle of Ignatius to the Antiochenes, which named Euodius as the first Bishop after the Apostles, and as having been appointed Bishop of Antioch by the Apostles. This Epistle, however, is spurious. Origen, another of Bilson's authorities for Antioch, named Ignatius as the second Bishop after St Peter, but did not say that St Peter intentionally set the succession in motion. (3)

That St Mark had been appointed by an Apostle to be the first Bishop of Alexandria was an idea for which Bilson could find no authority earlier than Gregory the Great, who said that St Peter sent the Evangelist to Alexandria as its Bishop. (4) Jerome, also quoted by Bilson, mentioned St Mark as the first Bishop of Alex-

(1) BPG 261-270. The lists themselves show a succession in the occupation of the Sees to which they refer, but have nothing to say about a succession of consecration. (2) Ibid 261. Bilson referred to "Clemens in his first book Hypotyposeon" (i.e. the 6th Book of Institutions) as quoted by Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. ii. 1, and to Hegesippus as quoted by Jerome, De Vir. Illust. ii. In this passage Hegesippus said merely that James received the Church of Jerusalem after the Apostles; Jerome added that James was appointed Bishop by the Apostles. (3) Jerome, Trans. Hom. Origenis in Evang. Lucae, Hom. vi. (4) Gregory, Ep. 40.

andria, but he knew only of Mark's association with Peter as his interpreter and not of any association as St Peter's nominee to an episcopate. Eusebius, Bilson's earliest authority for Alexandria, called Mark himself an Apostle, and named his successor, as though Mark had been the first in the line by virtue of his Apostleship rather than by virtue of appointment by an Apostle.

Only in the case of Rome was Bilson able to quote an early authority to show that the episcopal succession had been started by apostolic action. Here he had Irenaeus as witness, long before the time of Eusebius, testifying that Peter and Paul had made Linus their successor.

The succession lists were themselves older than Eusebius, and were derived by him, at least in part, from Hegesippus, a thing which Bilson knew but of which he made no use. In their original form these lists date, in all probability, from the second half of the second century. From the time, that is to say, of Irenaeus, the earliest of the Fathers to show an interest in episcopal succession from the Apostles as a guarantee of the succession of truly apostolic doctrine. Taking them at their face value and assuming that they are a correct record of fact, the succession lists certainly show one Bishop following another in each of the four Sees from the days of the Apostles to the time of Eusebius. What they do not show

(1) BPG 263. Jerome, Preface to Commentary on Matthew. (2) Euseb. Hist. Eccles. ii. 24 (3) BPG 263f. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. iii. 2, 3. (4) Ehrhardt, The Apostolic Succession, p. 60. (5) Ibid. pp 40f.

is that the Apostles intended that there should be such a succession. At the best they are a witness to the fact, but not to the purpose, and Bilson was not justified in claiming that they

"make proof sufficient for the matter in question, to wit, that Bishops were placed by the Apostles to govern as well the Presbyters as the people of each place, and succeeded the Apostles in imposing hands, which Presbyters did not."(1)

What Bilson did was to impose upon the first names in each of the succession lists (i.e. upon the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages) the conditions and theories of a later age. He said,

"Clemens Alexandrinus, who lived in the next age to Saint John, reporteth out of former stories, that S. John returning from his banishment to Ephesus, went to the Churches round about, being thereto requested, and in some places made Bishops, in other places chose such into the clergy as the Holy Ghost signified unto him."(2)

But this idea of the activities of St John in Asia Minor (which is to be found also in Clement's contemporary, Irenaeus)⁽³⁾ is itself a reflection of the interest shown in the middle and late second century in a succession from the Apostles. This interest led to the compiling of the succession lists, but it was an interest very different from Bilson's. Irenaeus and his generation were not concerned to prove that a Bishop should have, and had always exercised since the days of the Apostles, "superiority in ordination and singularity in succession". They were anxious to show that the Church had possessed a succession of apostolic doctrine, and of teachers of that doctrine, from the time of the Apostles to their own days. Some of Irenaeus's words, which Bilson quoted without noticing their sign-

(1) BPG 266 (2) Ibid 268. Clement of Alexandria as quoted by Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. iii.23. (3) Irenaeus, Adv. Haeres. III.i.1, iii.4.

ificance, clearly show where Irenaeus's interest lay:-

"We can reckon those which were ordained Bishops in the Churches by the Apostles and their successors even to our age. If the Apostles had known any hid mysteries, which they taught to the perfect secretly and apart from the rest, they would most of all have delivered those things to such as they committed the Churches unto. For they greatly desired to have them perfect and unproveable in all things, whom they left to be their successors, delivering unto them their own place of teaching."(1)

Irenaeus, it is true, spoke of the ordination of Bishops by the Apostles and their successors, but this was incidental to his argument..His plea would have been equally valid if the form of Church government with which he was familiar had been presbyterian, and he had asserted that the Apostles appointed the original presbyteries, committed their doctrine to them, and left them to hand on that doctrine to successors appointed in turn by them. But this would not have suited Bilson's purpose of proving "superiority and singularity" in Bishops. He isolated what Irenaeus had to say about the apostolic appointment of Bishops, and then applied it to a purpose which Irenaeus never intended. In this way he produced evidence for a succession of rulers and ordainers, not for a succession of teaching and teachers.

There was in Bilson's mind a picture of the Church static and unchanging in its early stages, a picture of a Church rigidly adhering to a pattern laid down for it by the Apostles. He said,

"No example before our age can be showed that ever the Church in any place or time since the Apostles died, had any other form of government than by Bishops succeeding and ruling as well the Presbyters as the people that were under them."(2)

(1) BPG 267. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. iii.3. (2) BPG 270.

In forming this picture Bilson was undoubtedly influenced by a pronouncement of Tertullian's (later repeated in a modified form by St Augustine) which he quoted:-

"It is certain, that came from the Apostles which is sacredly observed in the Churches of the Apostles."(2)

He himself placed great reliance upon the witness of the early Church to the origins of the ministry. Of the Fathers he said,

"They were nearer the Apostles' time and likelier to understand the Apostles' meaning."(3)

Of the evidence provided by the Fathers about the organization of the early Church he said,

"What I find generally received in the first Church of Christ, I will see it strongly refuted before I will forsake it."(4)

It was upon this basis that Bilson was prepared to explain away, or even to contradict flatly, anything that might be brought out of Jerome and Ambrosiaster that tended to break up the clear outline of his picture, and it was upon this basis that he was prepared to read back into the apostolic age the evidence of Irenaeus and later Fathers:-

"All the Churches of Christ throughout the world could not at one time join in one and the self-same kind of government, had it not been delivered and settled by the Apostles and their Scholars that converted the world."(5)

The Epistles of St Ignatius must have played a major part in

(1) De Baptismo c. Donatistas. iv.24. (2) BPG 258. Tertullian, Adv. Marc.iv.5. "If that is evidently more true which is earlier, if that is earlier which is from the very beginning, if that is from the beginning which has the apostles for its authors, then it will certainly be quite as evident, that that comes down from the apostles which has been kept as a sacred deposit (sacrosanctum) in the Churches of the Apostles." But Tertullian wrote this about the Canon of the New Testament, not about forms of Church government. (3) BPG 285 (4) Ibid (5) Ibid.

the formation of Bilson's mental picture of the Church in its very early days. The genuine Epistles indicated that episcopacy was a feature of the Church of Antioch and of other Churches in Asia Minor, while the Epistle to the Antiochenes (which Bilson could not be expected to know was spurious) seemed to provide first-class evidence that episcopacy was an apostolical arrangement of the government of the Church. Elizabethan scholars did not know the First Epistle of Clement of Rome; if Bilson could have used it he would have been provided with evidence of a Church organized without a monarchical Bishop, and the effect might have been the breaking up of his rigid conception of the government of the primitive Church.

But when all these allowances have been made for Bilson, it has to be said that he made too much of the authority of the Church. He was arguing for episcopacy as a perpetual form of Church government (that is, in Elizabethan theological idiom, a form appointed by God to be observed for ever). He could not prove his case from Scripture, and so he tried to do it from the practice of the Church by inferring that the Church must necessarily have obeyed the Apostles implicitly, and could therefore be taken as an authority parallel with Scripture in revealing the purposes of the Apostles, and therefore the purposes of Christ. He could not bring himself to think that the Apostles might have left the Church without any one fixed and definite form of government, or that the Church would have presumed to alter the apostolic form if it had been

something other than episcopacy. Upon these two assumptions he based the weakest of all his arguments:-

"So many thousand Martyrs and Saints that lived with the Apostles would never consent to alter the Apostles' discipline, which was once received in the Church, without the Apostles' warrant."(1)

There is something about this remark which is reminiscent of Puritan reasoning, but a still stronger Puritan flavour can be detected in the place where Bilson revealed that he was aware, consciously or subconsciously, of the weakness of his case, and where he therefore appealed to what he supposed had been an apostolic example, because he had failed to produce an apostolic command:-

"I trust there are few men so deeply drowned in their own conceits, or wholly addicted to their fancies, but they will acknowledge the first distinction and institution of Bishops from and above Presbyters was, if not commanded and imposed by the Apostles' precepts unto the Church, yet at least ordained and delivered unto the faithful by their example."(2)

Bilson could, and should, have known that Whitgift had made short work of that precise argument from example when Cartwright advanced it twenty years earlier.

(1) BPG 285 (2) Ibid 259

XIII.

In the third and final main division of his book Bilson dealt with the kind of power that a Bishop ought to have over his clergy and people, with the choosing of Bishops, and with the government of the Church by Synods.

On the power of the Bishops, which he described as "fatherly", Bilson commenced his argument by repeating his identification of the Angels of the Seven Churches of Asia with the Bishops of those Churches. ⁽¹⁾ Since it was the Lamb who had addressed those Bishops, Bilson inferred that

"first, their pre-eminence above their helpers and co-adjutors in the same Churches is warranted to be God's ordinance. Next, they are God's messengers to reprove and redress things amiss in their Churches, be they Presbyters or people that be offenders."⁽²⁾

Granted that to some extent other Pastors besides the Bishops shared in the same charge as these "Angels", yet why had God written to the Bishops only, and not to all? The reason could only be that the Bishops had a power and a responsibility greater than the others. ⁽³⁾

Here Bilson produced another of his catenas of passages from ancient writers, this time to the effect that Bishops were the chief Fathers of the Church. Therefore,

"If they be Fathers, they must be honoured, and the chiefest part of their honour is obedience."⁽⁴⁾

The episcopal power was thus paternal as well as pastoral, and could be described in terms resembling those which Bilson had used on his title page:-

(1) BPG 289. Rev.1-iii. (2) BPG 290f (3) Ibid 292 recto, properly 291. (4) Ibid 292 verso.

"This fatherly kind of regiment began in the Patriarchs, dured in the Priests and Prophets of Moses' Law, was derived to the Apostles, and so descended to the chief Pastors of Christ's Church to this day."(1)

Bilson did not agree that in the exercise of this paternal power a Bishop must necessarily consult his priests.

"In all cases determined by the laws of God, the Church, or the Prince, consultation is both superfluous and presumptuous: execution is only needful, and that must be committed to some persons that may precisely be challenged and punished for the contempt, if that which is commanded be not performed."(2)

Certainly Ambrosiaster and Jerome had thought that the earliest Bishops ruled with the advice of their Presbyters, but even those writers had given no hint that Presbyters might over-rule or cen-
(3)
sure their Bishop if a difference arose between them.

Although in order to establish his case for episcopal government Bilson had read the practices of the early Church back into Scrip- ture, he fully realized that to make his case convincing he must demonstrate it from Scripture without using inference or supposition. He gave a clear statement of this awareness when he came to define out of the Scriptures what he thought should be the limits of a Bishop's authority:-

"All that we can say for the power of Bishop's above Pres- byters out of the Scriptures is this, that the Holy Ghost by the mouth of St Paul hath given to the Bishop of each place authority to ordain such as be worthy, to examine such as be faulty, and reprove and discharge such as be guilty either of unsound teaching or offensive living. Thus much he saith to Timothy and Titus, and in them to their success- ors, and to all other Bishop's of Christ's Church for ever... This indeed is the main erection of the episcopal power and function, if our proofs stand... For if this fall, well may

(1) BPG 294 (2) Ibid 295 (3) Ibid 298. Ambrosiaster, Comm. in Ep. ad Tim. Prim. v. Jerome, Comm. in Ep. ad Tit. i. 5.

"Bishops claim their authority by the custom of the Church, by any divine precept expressed in the Scriptures they cannot. But if these rules be delivered by the Apostles to the Bishops, as we say they are, and not to Timothy and Titus in respect of their Evangelship as the Presbyterists affirm, then can there be no question but this new discipline is a very dream, and the ancient and primitive Church of Christ held the right and Apostolical form of governing the house of God according to the prescript of his Word."(1)

The office of Evangelist, Bilson agreed with the Puritans, had been temporary. But the need to ordain, he argued, was permanent. Power to ordain, therefore, was not given to Timothy and Titus because they were Evangelists. This was true even by Puritan principles. Puritan Presbyters claimed for themselves the power to ordain, but they did not claim that they were therefore Evangelists. Thus the power to ordain was not a power proper to the office of Evangelist, and it must have been given to Timothy and Titus because they had some capacity other than that of Evangelists. Again, St Paul told Timothy to keep until the appearing of Christ the charge to ordain. But it was impossible for Timothy to do this in his own person. Therefore the injunction was laid both upon Timothy and upon those who were to succeed him in his place. The power to ordain was a perpetual power in the Church, and one which had not died with Timothy.
(2)

Returning to his theme of "fatherly power", Bilson admitted that a Bishop ought not to have absolute authority:-

"His power I call a moderation, and not a domination, because the wisdom of God hath likewise allowed and provided Christian means as well to bridle him from wrongs as to direct him in doubts."(3)

(1) BPG 299f (2) Ibid 300f. Bilson meant that the power to ordain residing in one man was perpetual. Puritans would have agreed that the power residing in a presbytery was perpetual. (3) BPG

Before there had been Councils or Christian Magistrates, Bilson explained, each Church had been left to direct its own affairs.

"Lest therefore the Bishop's only will should be the rule of all things in the Church, the government of the Church was at first so proportioned that neither the Presbyters should do anything without their Bishop, nor the Bishop dispose matters of importance without his Presbytery."(1)

But as the Church prospered and increased, Synods and General Councils took the place of Presbyteries.

"Provincial Councils undertook the debating and resolving of those doubts and difficulties that before troubled the Presbyteries. And as you tie your President to the execution of such things as your Presbyters shall decree, so the Primitive Church of Christ had greater reason and better ground to bind her Bishops to see those things performed which were concluded by general assent of the Bishops and Pastors of any Province." (2)

By this process the Presbyteries lost their power, though not to Bishops as the Puritans complained, but to Synods of greater authority, experience, and judgment.

On the idea that the Bishop was the head of a unit of the Church, Bilson commented:-

"One flock cannot have many Pastors, except they be subordinate one under another. But many Pastors of equal power must needs have many flocks. Wherefore one Church must have but one Pastor, to whom the rest, be they Presbyters or others, must by God's Law be subject and obedient... Yet to temper the pastoral power of Bishops, that it might be fatherly, as it hath always been in the house of God even from the beginning, and not Princely for fear of reigning over the Lord's inheritance, the Church of Christ did in certain cases of importance not suffer the Bishop to attempt anything without the consent of his Presbyters, or a Synod."(3)

After showing from the Canons of the Councils how ancient the

(1) BPG 307. In this and the two following quotations from his book Bilson seems to vary from the remark he had made a little earlier when discussing what Ambrosiaster and Jerome had said about episcopal power over Presbyters. There he claimed that the Presbyters could not over-rule the Bishop. (2) BPG 310 (3) Ibid 313.

organization of the Church into Dioceses was, Bilson traced the origin of that organization in the following manner:-

"As the use of Dioceses was ancient, so the reason that first occasioned them was inevitable, even the pattern of the Apostolic Discipline. For when country towns and villages first began to receive the faith, how were they furnished with fit Pastors, and how were their Churches governed, but by the Bishop and Presbytery of some city adjoining... It was not possible in the Primitive Church to have Presbyters to succeed in the rooms of such as died in country parishes but from the Bishop in whose Diocese the Churches were. He supplied their wants out of his own Church and Presbytery, which served to store the whole Diocese."(1)

That this organization followed an apostolic pattern, Bilson demonstrated thus:-

"If Bishops were placed by the Apostles' hands to ordain Presbyters and contain them in their duties, lest in so great a number emulation might breed confusion, which all the Fathers were fully resolved was the Apostles' deed, they must needs be of opinion the Apostles meant to have country towns and villages guided and assisted the very same way that they left for cities, and the same men that governed the one, all things considered, were the fittest to be trusted with the other."(2)

If the Puritans complained that this organization of the Church in Dioceses did not provide adequate pastoral oversight, they should know that the ancient Fathers of the Church thought otherwise, as also St Paul must have done when he placed Titus over the whole of the island of Crete.
(3)

(1) BPG 325f (2) Ibid 326 (3) Ibid 328

organization of the Church into Dioceses was, Bilson traced the origin of that organization in the following manner:-

"As the use of Dioceses was ancient, so the reason that first occasioned them was inevitable, even the pattern of the Apostolic Discipline. For when country towns and villages first began to receive the faith, how were they furnished with fit Pastors, and how were their Churches governed, but by the Bishop and Presbytery of some city adjoining... It was not possible in the Primitive Church to have Presbyters to succeed in the rooms of such as died in country parishes but from the Bishop in whose Diocese the Churches were. He supplied their wants out of his own Church and Presbytery, which served to store the whole Diocese."(1)

That this organization followed an apostolic pattern, Bilson demonstrated thus:-

"If Bishops were placed by the Apostles' hands to ordain Presbyters and contain them in their duties, lest in so great a number emulation might breed confusion, which all the Fathers were fully resolved was the Apostles' deed, they must needs be of opinion the Apostles meant to have country towns and villages guided and assisted the very same way that they left for cities, and the same men that governed the one, all things considered, were the fittest to be trusted with the other."(2)

If the Puritans complained that this organization of the Church in Dioceses did not provide adequate pastoral oversight, they should know that the ancient Fathers of the Church thought otherwise, as also St Paul must have done when he placed Titus over the whole of
(3)
the island of Crete.

(1) BPG 325f (2) Ibid 326 (3) Ibid 328

XIV.

Discussing the method used in the Church of England for the choosing of Bishops, Bilson declared that the Puritans were quarrelling more with the Queen than with Anglicans in general, for the latter did not hold that the popular election of Bishops would necessarily be unlawful. He made a point in favour of the royal authority in this matter, however, by reminding the Puritans that without the royal prerogative it would have been impossible to carry out a reformation of the Church of England. Popular election of the Bishops when the whole realm had been papist would have worked in precisely the opposite way to reformation. ⁽¹⁾

Bilson would not allow that the election of the Seven should be taken as a precedent for the election of Bishops and Presbyters. The Seven were not ministers of the Word and Sacraments, even though in the early Church Deacons had been allowed to preach and baptize. ⁽²⁾

⁽³⁾ Cyprian, whom Bilson's shadow-Puritan claimed as a supporter of the theory that popular election was a necessary element in the ordination of the clergy, had not, Bilson maintained, said what he was alleged to have said. He had said only that the choice of the clergy should be made with the knowledge of the people, who should be allowed to testify to the characters of those who were chosen, and to object to any who were of bad reputation. There was no evidence in Scripture that the people had a necessary right to choose those who were to be ordained. ⁽⁴⁾ Cyprian's

(1) BPG 330 (2) Ibid 331f. Here Bilson identified the Seven with Deacons, an identification which he had earlier rejected.

(3) Ep. 67. 3-5. (4) BPG 335.

"proofs (i.e. from Scripture) are weak, if not mistaken; his purpose is to have the people's presence and testimony to witness their lives that shall be chosen; his confession is that this was not general, though in favour of his cause he saith, Apud nos et fere per provincias universas tenetur."(1)

In the Pastoral Epistles, Bilson continued, St Paul had laid the blame for the ordination of unworthy persons squarely upon the shoulders of those who ordained them, and who must, for that reason, have power to examine and liberty to reject any candidate for ordination. Timothy, a Bishop, had been chosen by prophecy, or, in other words, by the Holy Ghost, and not by popular election. Choice by the Holy Ghost was usual in apostolic times, and no other kind of choosing of Bishops was mentioned in Scripture.

"Popular election of Bishops I find afterwards practised in the Primitive Church, but not mentioned in the Scriptures; and therefore well may the people's interest stand upon the grounds of reason and nature, and be derived from the rules of Christian equity and society, but God's law doth not meddle with any such matter, nor determine more than I have told you, which is, that such Bishops as shall ordain them shall answer for them with the peril of their own souls."(2)

Because of the absence of any law about election, Bilson was able to continue his argument thus:-

"I acknowledge each Church and people (that have not by law, custom, or consent restrained themselves) stand free by God's law to admit, maintain, and obey no man as their Pastor without their liking, and so the people's election, by themselves or their rulers, dependeth upon the very first principles of human fellowship and assemblies. For which cause, though Bishop's by God's law have power to examine and ordain before any man be placed to take charge of souls, yet have they no power to impose a Pastor on any Church against their wills, nor to force them to yield him obedience without their liking. How far authority, custom, and consent may prejudice and overrule this liberty, which God's law leaveth undiminished, shall anon be handled."(3)

And anon Bilson did handle it by affirming that a Prince had, of

(1) BPG 336 (2) Ibid 338f (3) Ibid 339f.

right, more interest than the people in the election of a Bishop.

"If the people by God's law, were to choose their Bishop, the king, as the principal part and head of the people, by the same law must be suffered to have the chief place amongst them."(1)

The difference between Geneva and England in this matter of election, Bilson thought, was the difference between a popular State and a monarchy. But even in Geneva the people did not choose their Pastors; they were appointed by the authorities of the State. Again, in Geneva the people paid their Pastors; in England the Queen made provision for them. In Geneva Pastors-elect were known to the people whom it was proposed they should serve; in England Bishops-elect were not known in the Dioceses for which they were designated. Above all,

"The people of this realm at the making of the Law most apparently submitted and transferred all their right and interest to the Prince's judgment and wisdom, which lawfully they might, and wisely they did."(2)

Thus Bilson, like Hooker, was an exponent of the Social Contract theory of government, with its fiction of a people originally free surrendering its liberty to a ruler in return for the advantages that his rule would give them. Out of this theory Bilson was able to conclude that a Bishop appointed by Queen Elizabeth could not be said to be thrust upon his Diocese against its will, for

"the people's consent is by the public agreement of this realm yielded and referred to the Prince's liking."(3)

Bilson distinguished three methods of choosing Bishops which had been employed in the early Church:-

(1) BPG 349 (2) Ibid 335f (3) Ibid 358.

- (a) Election by the clergy and people.
- (b) Election by the clergy with the approbation of the people, and with a right reserved to the ordaining Bishops to refuse the nominee.
- (c) Postulation by the Metropolitan. ⁽¹⁾

The right of the clergy and people of the early Church to elect their Bishop might, Bilson thought, be lost in a variety of ways; for example, by petition, when they had no candidate of their own, and asked the Metropolitan to appoint their Bishop; by compromise, when they could not agree on a nominee, and the Metropolitan made the final choice; or by devolution, when they neglected for six months to exercise their right, and the Metropolitan exercised it for them. Sometimes, too, so as to preserve order, the Emperors ⁽²⁾ had forbidden popular election. General Councils had also laid upon Metropolitans the duty of controlling the elections of Bishops so that disorder did not occur. From all this it could be concluded

"that the people's right to elect their Bishop never depended on God's express commandment, but on the foundation and reason of human government, and was subject both to the Canons of Councils and laws of Princes, and might be moderated and restrained by either of them, and by the people's assent, default, or abuse, be transferred, relinquished, or forfeited, and without their wills by superior powers and public laws for just cause be abridged, altered, or abrogated. For the ~~people's~~ power and freedom of the people is not only submitted to the sword which God hath authorized, but wholly enclosed in the sword. Neither is anything lawful for the people (setting aside the commandments of God, which are subject to no mortal man's will or power) which the laws of their country refrain or prohibit. Wherefore, there can be no question but the people may willingly forsake and worthily lose the right which they had in the choice of their Bishops, and the Prince, either way, be lawfully possessed of the people's interest." (3)

(1) BPG 340f, 343 (2) Ibid 346 (3) Ibid 348f. In brief, Bilson argued that popular election of Bishops was one of the "adiaphora". The Puritans could produce no commandment of Scripture in favour

The appointment of a Bishop by a Prince, Bilson continued, was not of itself sufficient for the making of a Bishop, any more than the election of a Bishop by the people was enough for that purpose.

"It is not sufficient for a Bishop to have the Prince's consent and decree. He must be also examined and ordained by such as the Holy Ghost hath appointed to impose hands on him."(1)

Matters of Church government, Bilson emphasized, should be classified as Discipline and not as Doctrine. From such a classification a necessary consequence arose:-

"Rules of discipline be not like rules of doctrine. In Christian faith whatsoever is once true is always and everywhere true. But in matters of ecclesiastical goverhment, that at some times, and in some places, might be received and allowed, which afterwards and elsewhere was haply disliked and prohibited. If any Father or Council affirm that by God's law the people have right to elect their Bishop, the Prince hath not, the assertion is so false, that no man need regard it."(2)

XV.

Bilson's final topic was that of Synods, and the moderation of Synods. On this subject he thought there might be some common ground between Puritans and Anglicans, since not even the Puritans would place all the authority of the Church in their proposed parish Presbyteries. In his view, Synods were a means to discern error and redress wrong when there was no godly Prince to do so. (1)(3)

of popular election except by treating the example of Acts vi as though it were a commandment. Bilson would not allow this example to be raised to the level of a law, even though he himself had treated the example of the superiority given to Timothy and Titus as though it were a law determining the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters. (1) BPG 369 (2) Ibid 368. Nevertheless Bilson had, throughout his book, treated the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters as though it were a matter of Doctrine, as the use of the term "perpetual" implied. (3) BPG 370.

Bilson's scriptural authority for Synods was threefold:-

Matt.xviii.17. "Tell it unto the Church."

18. "What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

20. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."(1)

He noticed especially the order of the procedure laid down in Matt. xviii.17, from private dealing to dealing before witnesses, and from witnesses to assemblies, i.e. the Church, whether those assemblies were composed of Elders or only of Pastors. An assembly at the end of the procedure was inevitable in the early Church, he said, for judges must necessarily be either single or assembled, and in the absence of a godly Prince the Church had no single judge.

"Princes are single and sovereign judges of earthly things, and when they believe the defence and maintenance of the Church and faith is by God himself committed to their power and care. But Christ did not settle the sword to be the general and perpetual rule to govern his Church, for then without a Prince could there be no Church, and consequently neither in the Apostles' times, nor three hundred years after, had Christ any Church here on earth."(2)

Since there was no single judge for the Church except the godly Prince, there must either be no judge at all when there was no godly Prince, or else there must be a conference of the Pastors to whom the charge of the Church had been committed. Such a conference might be conducted by letter, but was more effective if the Pastors met together.
(3)

(1) BPG 370f. Bilson apparently took the plural pronouns in the second and third of these sayings as implying that Jesus authorized the Church to settle its affairs synodically. (2) BPG ~~371~~ 371
(3) Ibid 372.

The authority of a Synod of Bishops to legislate for the Church
"is builded on the main grounds of all divine and human societies, strengthened by the promise of our Saviour, and assured unto them by the example of the Apostles and perpetual practice of the Church of Christ."(1)

Bishops were to be included with those fathers who were mentioned in that commandment which required honour from children. Again, although in the Body of Christ all the members had a common care for the whole, yet the principal parts must direct the whole, as the eyes, ears, and mouth directed the human body. Further,

"What commission they (i.e. the Bishops) have from Christ severed and single in their proper charges, the same they must needs retain assembled and joined throughout their circuits."(3)

So great was the authority of a Church Synod that the assembly described in Acts xv.22-29 had written,

"It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us..."(4)

Bilson's representative Puritan disclaimed any wish to minimize the importance and authority of Synods. Had not Beza praised them? But it was objectionable that Synods should be called together by the ~~Metropolitan~~ Metropolitan and not by the Magistrate. This preserved a useless distinction among the Bishops. Further, it was wrong that Presbyters should be excluded from Synods.

Before there were any Christian Magistrates, Bilson replied, the Metropolitans called and moderated the Synods of the Church. Under the authority of godly Princes they did the same. There was no example in the early Church of any other method of calling a

(1) BPG 372 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 373 (4) Ibid 374 (5) "Responsio", 159. (6) BPG 377 (7) Ibid.

(1)

Synod besides these two. In England

"no Synods may assemble without the Prince's warrant, as well to meet as to consult of any matters touching the state of this realm. And why? They be no court separate from the Prince, but subjected in all things unto the Prince, and appointed by the Laws of God and man in truth and godliness to assist and direct the Prince when and where they shall be willed to assemble. Otherwise, they have no power of themselves to make decrees when there is a Christian Magistrate, neither may they challenge the judicial hearing or ending of ecclesiastical controversies without or against the Prince's liking."(2)

In private matters, and in cases where a decision on a similar question had already been made by a Synod, a Metropolitan might judge the case himself so that the Synod's time should be saved. In such cases the Metropolitan did not make the law, but merely executed laws already made by the Synod.

In England, Bilson pointed out, Presbyters might and did sit in Synods. There was no reason except expediency why they should not sit in General Councils. In fact, Presbyters had sometimes done so as the delegates of absent Bishops.

From these premises, Bilson concluded, it was to be denied that the Archbishops and Bishops ruled the Church arbitrarily. Rather, they administered the Canons of Synods and the edicts of Princes.

(1) BPG 378-381 (2) Ibid 382 (3) Ibid 384 (4) Ibid 391
 (5) Ibid 392 (6) Ibid 401.

XVI.

Bilson's book is a sustained piece of special pleading supported by much conjecture and some inconsistent argument, but this is not to say that its author lacked anything of value to contribute to the controversy in which he took part. He wavered between the two meanings which Calvin had attached to the term *πρεσβυτέριον*, but he approached very nearly to the correct meanings of *χειροτονέω* and *βασιλεία*.⁽¹⁾ It may be doubted whether he was right in thinking that in Matt.xx.25f and Luke xxii.25f Jesus forbade his disciples to exercise "civil" authority (and did not rather forbid them to use any kind of authority in a domineering manner), but alongside this misinterpretation can be set the clearness with which he saw that I Cor.xii.28 and Ephes.iv.11f contained a description of God's gifts and graces bestowed upon the Church for its edification, and not a catalogue of the degrees and ranks of the ministry of the Church. His explanation of Matt.xviii.17 cannot be accepted, but he did at least face the difficulty of detecting in this passage a direction to the Church to excommunicate those who would not submit to her jurisdiction.⁽²⁾

More than any of his Anglican predecessors Bilson investigated thoroughly the meaning of I Tim.v.17, and succeed in producing some alternative interpretations, any one of which is at least as prob-

(1) Bancroft, however, at about the same time as Bilson, was stating that *βασιλεία* referred to the spiritual rule of Christ, and not to the Church. See "A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline", p.399. (2) "Let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the Publican" does not look like a direction to the Church.

able as the Puritan idea that in this passage two kinds of Elders, ministerial and lay, are referred to, ⁽¹⁾ each with its sphere of duty marked out. He was also the first of the controversialists whose works have been examined here to give expression to the important idea that Holy Scripture, and not the Church or the ministry or any section of the ministry, is in some particulars the successor of the Apostles.

Although at times Bilson was hesitant and uncertain, and even inconsistent, in his argument, yet on one subject he wrote with a high degree of assurance. Like Hooker he thought the Seventy were presbyters appointed to their ministry by Christ, ⁽²⁾ and he identified them with the presbyters of the Church at Jerusalem mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. But unlike Hooker he did not regard the Twelve as forming a degree of the presbyterate. At first only the Twelve, he thought, had had power to pass on to others the gifts of the Spirit, and it was the possession of this power which distinguished them from the Seventy as from all others.

Bilson clearly differentiated the "power to ordain" from the "power of order" (although he did not use those terms). To give authority to preach was more than to preach, and the power to give that authority lay with the Twelve. Even after they had committed the ministration of the Word and Sacraments to others, the Apostles retained for a while in their own hands the moderation and oversight

(1) The Puritan interpretation of I Tim.v.17 is, nevertheless, an unconscionable time a-dying. It appears, for example, on p.32 of "Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches" (1957).

(2) Bilson wrote about the Seventy in 1593; Hooker in 1597. What Hooker says about them follows closely what Bilson had said earlier, and may have been derived from him.

of these ministrations. This oversight was the "Power of the keys". Along with the "keys" the Apostles also for a while retained in their own possession the "power to ordain".

Bilson recognized that there were various schools of thought about the persons upon whom the Apostles had eventually bestowed their powers. Some believed that they had bequeathed them to the Church as a whole; others thought they had committed them to presbyteries composed of laymen and ministers; yet others thought they had given them to pastors only, but to all pastors equally. Bilson himself believed that the Apostles had passed their powers on to those only who were of the highest calling in the ministry, i.e. to Bishops. He asserted that the Apostles had ordained Bishops to be their successors, and had appointed them to the "chair of succession". In these Bishops the Apostles had placed the power of the keys and the power to ordain others. A Bishop might delegate some of his powers to presbyters, but he could not delegate the "power to ordain" for that, by divine institution, had not been committed to presbyters. Whoever exercised the "power to ordain" was a Bishop, no matter what he might be called. It was the Bishop who gave "perennity" to the Church; the Church depended upon the episcopate for its continuance.

Bilson clearly thought of the Bishop as belonging to a different order of the ministry from the presbyter. It was not a matter of degree but of order, for there was a "power" attached to the episcopate which was lacking in the presbyterate. In modern terms the Bishop was the "essential minister", for the full powers of the

Church were committed to him, and to him alone. Without him the Church would not continue to be a Church.

In spite of the emphatic assurance with which Bilson upheld his view of the episcopate throughout the greater part of his book, towards the end his uncertainty returned. He realized, and frankly admitted, that he could show no scriptural precept upon which he might rest his claim that his type of ministry ought to be taken as "perpetual". He could only offer an example, the example of Timothy and Titus. If that failed, then episcopacy might be justified as a custom of the Church which ought to be continued, but not as a divine institution. Here he left two uncertainties. Are Timothy and Titus cases of episcopacy of the kind favoured by Bilson? If they are, do these cases constitute a law binding upon the Church?

When Bilson said that episcopacy might be justified as a custom of the Church if his own justification of it should fail, he must have realized the implications of such a justification. If episcopacy was set up in the first place by the authority of the Church, then the Church might conceivably discontinue it, and yet remain the Church; episcopacy could not then be regarded as "perpetual". Further, if episcopacy existed by the authority of the Church, then a Bishop was the delegate and representative of the Church exercising powers derived from the Church, not the wielder of powers derived independently of the Church through a succession of Bishops from the Apostles. The "perennity" of the episcopate would depend upon the Church, not the continuance of the Church upon the episcopate. The Church would be "essential" to the Bishop, not the Bishop to the Church.

SOME ELIZABETHAN CONTROVERSIES

ABOUT

THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY.

Part VIII

Conclusions

Part VIII

Conclusions.

.....

I

Cartwright and Travers certainly read many of their own ideas between the lines of the New Testament, but at least they could fairly claim, for example, that the traditional interpretation of Acts vi.1-6 supported them when they said that Deacons should concern themselves with the care of the poor, that many passages in the New Testament, more especially in the Acts of the Apostles, mentioned the appointment of Elders in local Christian congregations, and that the organization of the primitive Church under these officials resembled the organization of the apostolic age. How far the Church as it is pictured in the New Testament really supports these, and some of the less substantial Puritan tenets, must now be considered. (1)

 (1) The view put forward in the following pages, that with some modification the organization of the synagogues formed the model for the organization of the primitive Christian congregations, can be held only provisionally. In "The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect", p.44, Gaster speaks of "the many parallels which these (Dead Sea) texts afford with the organization of the primitive Christian Church. The (Qumran) community calls itself by the same name ('edah) as was used by the early Christians of Palestine to denote the Church. The same term is employed to designate its legislative assembly as was used by that community to denote the council of the Church. There are twelve 'men of holiness' who act as general guides to the community - a remarkable correspondence with the Twelve Apostles. These men have three superiors, answering to the designation of John, Peter and James as the three pillars of the Church (Galatians ii.9f). There is a regular system of mebbaqquerim or 'overseers'- an exact equivalent of the Greek episkopoi, or 'bishops' (before they had acquired sacerdotal functions)... " Much more work will have to be done on the Dead Sea Scrolls before they can be used to throw light upon Christian origins. Their present effect is to introduce an element of uncertainty into any theory formed, as every theory at the moment must be formed, without reference to them.

When St Luke introduces his readers to the Church at the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles, that body seems to have been in an amorphous condition:-

ἦν τε ὄχλος ὀνομάτων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὡς ἑκατὸν εἰκοσίν. (Acts 1.15)

Leadership in this assembly was assumed by the Apostles, who initiate the appointment of a successor to Judas Iscariot.

After Pentecost the growing number of converts practised community of goods, a thing which demanded organization and wherein the Apostles acted as financial officers, taking charge of the common property and arranging its distribution. (1) There were also νεώτεροι (2) who performed the menial task of burying Ananias and Sapphira. The word does not imply an office in the Christian community; indeed it suggests lack of an "office", but that very suggestion may imply that there were some who did hold office, i.e. the Apostles, who were acting as the πρεσβύτεροι (3) of the community.

In Acts v.11 St Luke for the first time applied the title "Church" to the community of the disciples of Christ. The term ἐκκλησία is the usual Septuagint translation, in the later books of the Old Testament, for the Hebrew קָהָל , a word used indiscriminately for Israel as a whole or for a local congregation of Israelites. In the latter sense ἐκκλησία might be used as a synonym for συναγωγή as a term describing a local congregation, and it was so used among Greek-speaking Christians, perhaps with the deliberate intention of dist-

(1) Acts 11.45, 14.34f. (2) Acts 5.6 (3) On the other hand νεώτεροι may mean nothing more than "novices" who, as a part of their novitiate, performed the most elementary duties of the community.

(1)
 inguishing between a Christian congregation and a Jewish. In the New Testament there is only one example of the use of the term *ἐκκλησία* for a Christian congregation. The epistle in which it occurs suggests that in Aramaic-speaking circles *סְנוּאָה* (synagogue) may have been employed for both Jewish and Jewish-Christian congregations.
 (2)

It is difficult to be sure whether by *ἐκκλησία* in Acts v.11 St Luke meant the Church considered as the company of God's people (i.e. as the New Israel), or the Church considered as a single organized congregation with the Apostles as its officers. The difficulty arises because at this point in the narrative the New Israel appears to be identical with a single congregation. However, St Luke does not leave his readers long in doubt about the organization of the congregation. In Acts vi.1-6 he describes how the Apostles expressed a wish to divest themselves of their financial duties, and how the Seven were appointed to deal with the communal property. These men were appointed because the Greek-speaking brethren had complained that they were not receiving equal treatment with the rest, and it is noticeable that all the Seven had Greek names. One, indeed, was a proselyte, a circumcised Gentile.

(1) See Jalland, op.cit. 51ff. In the Gospels *ἐκκλησία* is employed twice only, Matt; xvi.18, xviii.17. In the latter case the derogatory reference to heathens and publicans makes it hard to regard the utterance as a genuine saying of Jesus, and the verdict of Form Criticism, that it is a saying created by the Church, seems justified (see Redlich, Form Criticism, p.137, where Bultmann's classification of the sayings of Jesus is set out). In Matt; xvi.18 it is natural to equate "my Church" with the New Israel, i.e. Israel is refounded upon faith in Jesus as Christ. Thus there is no reference to an organized and officered community or congregation of Christians. (2) James ii.2. *ἐκκλησία* here may perhaps refer to the building in which the congregation met, rather than to the assembly itself. See Souter, Pocket Lexicon of the Greek N.T.

Jewish communities normally had ⁽¹⁾ הקטן יצא, "receivers-of-alms", among their officials. These men were also relievers of the poor, and it may have been to some similar office in the Christian congregation at Jerusalem that the Seven were appointed. But if so, it is difficult to understand why they were all Hellenists. If they served only the Greek-speaking Christians, they must have relieved the Apostles of only a part of the financial task. It is a question therefore whether the tradition which lies behind St Luke's account, and which he perhaps only partially understood, really saw in the Seven the Christian counterpart of the Jewish relieving-officers, and not rather the division of the Christian congregation into two sections, with the Seven as the Elders of the Greek-speaking section on the model of a Jewish community. Seven was the least number of Elders to be appointed to manage the affairs of the smallest of the Jewish communities (a large community might have as many as twenty-three Elders). The "Seven of a City" were chosen by the inhabitants of a Jewish community to represent them in the carrying out of their corporate affairs much as the Seven were chosen, seemingly by the Greek-speaking Christians of Jerusalem, for a similar purpose. ⁽²⁾

The imposition of hands upon the Seven, as described in Acts vi.6, raises some important points. Daube distinguishes between two different methods in Biblical usage of the ceremony of laying-on hands. The first is the placing of one's hands upon some person for such purposes as blessing or healing. The second is the more vigour-

(1) Schurer, The Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ. II.ii.66.
 (2) Easton, The Pastoral Epistles, p.191. Daube, op.cit. p.237.

ous action of leaning, or pressing, with the hands. It signified the imparting of the personality of the one performing the action to the person or thing upon whom the hands were pressed, and was thought of as establishing an identity between the two. (1)

In New Testament times this ceremony of "leaning with the hands" was employed in Judaism for two purposes only, in the sacrificial cultus (which may be disregarded here) and in the ordination of a Rabbi. Any individual Rabbi might ordain others, and he did so by imparting to them the authority of his own personality, an authority he had himself received through the succession of Rabbis reaching back to Joshua who had been ordained by Moses. When ordaining another, a Rabbi would identify himself with him and "press" his personality into him by imposition of hands. (2) (3)

The "Seven of a City" were not, in Judaism, appointed by imposition of hands, but merely by the choice of those whom they were to represent. (4) Yet hands were laid upon the Seven mentioned in Acts vi.1-6, the Christian Church thus showing a certain independence of Judaism at an early stage. (5) Grammatically Acts vi.6 requires it to be understood that it was those who had chosen the Seven, and not the Apostles, who laid hands upon the Seven. There was an Old Testament precedent for this action; the Israelites had identified themselves with the Levites, their representatives in the service of God, by laying (i.e. "leaning") their hands upon them, and the Christians appointed their representatives in the same manner. (6)

(1) Daube, op.cit.229 (2) Ibid (3) Ibid 231, 232. ~~xxx~~ Num.xxvii, 18ff. (4) Daube op.cit.230 (5) Ibid 237 (6) Ibid 226, 237f. Num. viii.10.

But this was not Rabbinic ordination; it was the appointment of representatives, not the creation of another self. Even if the traditional interpretation of Acts vi.6 is maintained and it is taken that the Apostles laid their hands upon the Seven, it is still not Rabbinic ordination, for it was not the transference of the full apostolic personality and authority; it was not the creation of new Apostles. Nevertheless, there are reminiscences in Acts vi.1-6 of the ideas and language of Num.xxvii.18ff, and Daube remarks,

"The first Christians regarded a major step in the development of their organization as of sufficient moment to be linked with that outstanding event in Old Testament history" (i.e. the ordination of Joshua) (2)

Daube's interpretation of Acts vi.1ff is sufficient of itself to overthrow the Puritan idea that the Apostles followed in detail the organization of the synagogues of Judaism when they came to organize the Church. Resemblances to that organization there certainly were, but not exact imitation. The Church was prepared to strike out on a line of its own, and to be guided therein by Old Testament precedent. Still less can it be argued that in organizing the Church the Apostles were following a precept of Jesus to shape the Church after the models of Judaism. The appointment of the Seven was prompted by practical needs, not by divine command, and in organizing the new Israel the early Christians seem to have been guided as much by precedents set at the beginning of the old Israel as by the precedents of Judaism.

(1) Daube, op.cit.238 (2) Ibid. 238f.

Daube speaks of the office of the Seven as the office of Deacon.

This is the traditional, though not the universal, view. It seems to depend upon the fact that St Luke used the terms *διακονία* and *διακονεῖν* for the work which the Seven took over from the Twelve.

(2)

But in the same passage St Luke described preaching as *διακονία*

τοῦ λόγου, so that there is no need to regard *διακονία* as a technical term for the relief work which the Seven were to do, and only for that work, nor to regard that work as the sole activity of one particular type of official in the apostolic Church. The theory that the Seven were the first Deacons has never explained the predominantly liturgical assistance which the Deacons of the post-apostolic Church rendered to their Bishops, and it is a question whether we should not see in the Seven the earliest Christian Elders, looking elsewhere for the origin of the office of Deacon.

If the Seven were officers of a Greek-speaking Christian congregation, and the Apostles divested themselves entirely at this time of their "table-serving", where are we to look for the Aramaic-speaking counterparts of the Seven? There is no account in Acts of their appointment, but they appear in Acts xi.30 as the receivers of the alms brought by Paul and Barnabas from Antioch, and they are called "Elders". From this point onwards the presence of Christian Elders in Jerusalem is noted from time to time in Acts, and they seem always to be the officials of a non-Hellenist Christian community. This inference seems to be required by St Luke's description of the persecution carried out by Saul. The contro-

 (1) Daube, op.cit.238 (2) i.e. Acts vi.1ff.

versy of which Stephen was the centre arose among Jews of the Diaspora living in Jerusalem. Saul himself was a Hellenist, and the persecution appears to have been directed against the Hellenist Christians, with the result that Stephen was martyred, Philip fled to Samaria and, presumably, the rest of the Hellenist Christians were dispersed. Yet the Apostles remained at Jerusalem unmolested in this particular affair, and by inference the non-Hellenist Jewish Christians with them. ⁽¹⁾ The first definite mention of Christian Elders in Acts comes after the account of Saul's persecution, and was therefore probably intended by St Luke to refer to Aramaic-speaking officials of the non-Hellenist section of the Church.

The very use of the title "Elder", or Presbyter, for a Christian official implies the organization of a congregation as an entity separate, though not necessarily in schism, from the synagogues of Judaism, and it suggests the employment of the Jewish method of government. In the first century of the Christian era all Jewry was in theory under the Great Sanhedrin of seventy members which sat at Jerusalem, but each local community, whether in Palestine or abroad, had also its local board of Elders. Schürer has shown how, in Palestine, the powers of these local councils might differ from place to place. ⁽²⁾ They were, in Jewish eyes, always religious bodies, for to the Jew all law was divine law; there was no separation between civil, criminal, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. In areas with a predominantly Jewish population the local Elders would have civil as well as religious powers, but in predominantly

(1) Acts vi.8 - viii.14 (2) Schürer, op.cit. II.ii.56ff.

Gentile districts their civil powers would hardly exist, and they would tend to become exclusively ecclesiastical bodies. In these latter areas, notably in Galilee, the synagogue and its affairs must have been the chief concern of the Elders.

There does not appear to have been a separate council of Elders for each synagogue. In large towns the single council might have many synagogues under its control; in a small community it might have only one. Each council had to administer the law of Moses, and so the Elders had to be men of good standing in the eyes of their neighbours and also men well-versed in the law and in the traditional method of interpreting it. Practice in the administration of the law would doubtless bring greater knowledge of it. ⁽¹⁾

Although the Elders administered the synagogues, they had no liturgical duties necessarily attached to their office. They had power to discipline offenders, to order corporal punishment or to expel from the synagogue fellowship, but the nearest they came to liturgical authority was their duty to appoint the officers who were to be responsible for the synagogue worship. But the synagogues were quite as much places of instruction as places of worship, and the Elders must often, because of their training in the law, have been called upon to address the congregation. In theory any adult male Jew might be called upon to lead the prayers, read the Scriptures, or give the address at a synagogue service. ⁽²⁾ The Elders were neither obliged to perform these tasks, nor forbidden to do so. Their zeal, or lack of it, would influence them in accepting or

(1) Jalland, op.cit.34 (2) Easton, Pastoral Epistles, 192.

refusing an invitation to preach. Thus the Puritan idea that the primitive Church had two kinds of Elders, one authorized to preach and the other forbidden to do so, cannot be upheld from the existence of a similar pattern of Eldership in the synagogues of Jewry. It must rest solely upon a dubious interpretation of I Tim; v.17.

II

Outside Palestine each Jewish community had its council of Elders, but the circumstances of each community varied quite as much as within Palestine. At Alexandria there was a single and numerous Jewish colony enjoying a high degree of self-government under a single council. In Rome, where there were ~~also~~ also many Jews, they were divided into small communities each with its synagogue, and with little self-government outside the synagogue. Here as nearly as anywhere the councils of Elders must have been ecclesiastical bodies.

Among the Jews of the Dispersion the title "Elder" was not used. In its Greek form, *πρεσβύτερος*, it was ambiguous, for it might refer not only to an office-holder but to any man of mature years. The title *ἄρχων*, "ruler", was therefore preferred.

To return to the Acts of the Apostles, St Luke relates how Paul and Barnabas, spreading the Gospel outside Palestine, preached first in the synagogues of each place they visited. On the mainland of Asia Minor, though not apparently in Cyprus, their mission met with opposition and persecution from the Jews. On their return journey on the mainland the two missionaries appointed in each of the

(1) Schurer II.ii.247 (2) Ibid 249 (3) Acts xiii.5

(1)

Christian societies they had founded a body of Elders. They established those societies, that is to say, as Christian congregations separate from the Jewish synagogues. (2)

Grammatically St Luke's words in Acts xiv.23 require it to be supposed that the Elders of the new Churches in Derbe, Lystra, etc were appointed to office by Paul and Barnabas, but in what sense did St Luke intend it to be inferred that these appointments ~~taxes~~ were made? Did the two Apostles decide that there should be Elders in these Churches, and then choose the men who were to fulfil that office? Or did St Luke mean that Paul and Barnabas acted as the Twelve had acted in the case of the Seven at Jerusalem, taking the initiative in creating the office, but leaving the brethren in these Churches to choose, and perhaps even to lay hands upon, the men whom they wished to hold the office? Cartwright and Travers believed that something like the latter alternative was what St Luke meant. With the case of the Seven in mind, and in view of the manner in which the members of a Jewish presbytery were appointed, it is impossible to be sure that Cartwright and Travers were wrong, just

 (1) Acts xiv.23. Whitgift argued that it was unnecessary to suppose that there was more than one presbyter appointed to each of these Churches, and the passage will bear that interpretation. But considering the nature of Jewish Eldership, it is much more natural to think of a body of Elders in each of the Churches. (2) Paul and Barnabas did not make a return journey through Cyprus. Barnabas went there later without Paul, but St Luke does not say that Christian Elders were appointed there (Acts xv.39). Perhaps he meant that Elders were not appointed in Cyprus because, the Jews being friendly, it was unnecessary to separate the Church from the synagogue. Or perhaps he left his readers to infer that because Elders were appointed on the mainland, they were appointed in Cyprus as well. He certainly left an inference of this kind to be made in the case of Ephesus. No mention is made of the appointment of Elders in that city (Acts xviii.19-21), but the Elders of Ephesus are later summoned to meet Paul, and are named by him ἑπίσκοποι according to their function as overseers of the flock to feed the Church of the Lord. (Acts xix.1 - xx.1, 28)

as it is impossible to be certain that they were right.

If a synagogue model were being closely copied, St Luke might have been expected to use the term ἀρχων for a Christian Elder in the Greek-speaking Churches founded by Paul and Barnabas. Instead he used the term ἑπισκοπος, as the Church at large did when it had Greek for its language. The employment of this term could be taken as perpetuating the usage of the Church in Jerusalem, and that in turn to be an imitation of the title used for similar officials in the Palestine synagogues. But there was a precedent from the time of Moses for the use of the term "Elder", and it was this precedent that the Church consciously followed. In the "Apostolic Tradition" of Hippolytus (written about A.D. 215, but containing the practices of the latter part of the previous century, and perhaps of a much earlier time) there is a prayer to be said at the ordination of a presbyter. In this prayer the origin of the office of presbyter is traced, not to any Jewish usage, nor indeed to the Apostles or to Christ, but to Moses. The organization of the synagogues might in some respects be copied by Christian congregations, but it was copied creatively, with due regard to the conviction that the Church was the New Israel and ought therefore in her institutions to resemble the institutions of the old Israel as they were when the old Israel was under Moses.

(1) Numbers xi.16-25. Incidentally, the account of the appointment of the Seven in Acts vi.1-6 has some reminiscences of this passage.

(2) Dix, The Apostolic Tradition of St Hippolytus, p.14. Kirk, The Apostolic Ministry, p.218. Easton (Pastoral Epistles, p.194ff) points out that there are ordination prayers expressing the same idea in the Prayer Book of Serapion of Thmuis, xxvii, and in the Apostolic Constitutions, VIII.xvi.

III

St Luke's account of the beginnings of the Christian presbytery has been followed up to this point without questioning its historical accuracy. A decision about its accuracy must to some extent be influenced by the category in which St Luke's writings are to be placed. Luke/Acts ought probably to be classified with that well-defined type of early Christian literature the Apology, of which it seems to form the first example. St Luke's primary purpose was to convince the excellent Theophilus that Christianity was a branch and extension of Judaism and therefore ought not to be persecuted but, like Judaism, to be treated as 'religio licita'.⁽¹⁾ With this axe to grind it might well have been a part of St Luke's purpose to show that in organization as well as in teaching there was an affinity between Christianity and Judaism. It is not doubted that when St Luke wrote his volumes there was this similarity of organization. The question is, whether that similarity existed in the Church in Jerusalem as early as St Luke makes out, and whether it was continued in the Churches of St Paul's founding by the appointment of that Apostle. Easton takes the view that, at least as far as St Paul's Churches are concerned, St Luke is historically inaccurate, and roundly accuses him of anachronism in reading Christian presbyteries in the Gentile Churches back into St Paul's lifetime.⁽²⁾

One of Easton's chief reasons for rejecting the idea that St Paul appointed presbyteries to govern his Churches is that there would have been nothing for them to do during the Apostle's lifetime, and

(1) Easton, Early Christianity, 41ff (2) Easton, Pastoral Epistles, 226.

they would therefore have been superfluous. He says,

"The development of the elder-system in the apostolic age proper would be just about inconceivable. A new period of divine revelation had opened through the apostles and prophets and as long as this period continued there was no doctrinal norm to guide judicial decisions - nor were many disciplinary problems in a less fluid state. 'Elders' are, by definition, the guardians and interpreters of the Tradition; but they could not function until the Tradition itself had been established, until the 'faith' had been really 'once for all delivered to the saints'... When the apostles had passed away, the work of the elders began."(1)

With St Paul always available for consultation, Easton thinks, questions of doctrine and conduct could always be referred to him for solution, and therefore there could be no Elders in the
(2)
accepted sense of the word.

This is an over-simplification of the problem of communication between St Paul and the Churches he had founded. It is true that I Corinthians was written in response to the request of a delegation from Corinth to settle some of its problems, and that the epistle
(3)
was written in the presence of the delegation. But there is a strong hint that the delegation had gone to St Paul for support because the majority of the Corinthian Christians had rebelled
(4)
against its authority. Was that authority, perhaps, the authority of an Eldership? But such cases of consultation cannot have been frequent. In the main St Paul could do no other than instruct his converts so far as time permitted, and then leave them to order their affairs in accordance with his teaching, exercising only an intermittent supervision by correspondence and visit. That he did exactly this can be seen from the way in which he wrote to Thessal-

(1) Easton, Pastoral Epistles, 225 (2) Ibid (3) I Cor; xvi.17.

(4) I Cor; xvi.15-18.

onica:-

"We beseech and exhort you in the Lord Jesus, that as you have learned from us how you ought to live and to please God, just as you are doing, you do so more and more. For you know what instructions we gave you through the Lord Jesus". (1)

The Tradition may not have been complete in St Paul's lifetime, but it was there at least partially. A liturgical tradition is mentioned in I Cor;xi.23, and a doctrinal tradition in I Cor;xv.1-8. A tradition of conduct from "the Lord" is given in I Cor;vii.10, and is carefully distinguished from St Paul's own opinions in vii.12, 25. (2) At Corinth then, from the beginning, there was a tradition to be guarded and interpreted, and when St Paul went elsewhere the guarding and interpreting had perforce to be left to the Corinthians, or to some among them.

It is, further, incorrect to say that because St Paul was available for consultation, an Eldership would be superfluous. Each Jewish community had the great Sanhedrin at Jerusalem available for consultation, but could still find work for its local council of Elders in each community.

If, as St Luke says, St Paul's first proclamation of the Gospel in each of the cities he visited was made in a synagogue, and if (as, for example, at Corinth), his Churches were founded by secession (3) from the synagogues, there would be nothing unusual in providing these Churches with a governing body of Elders. This was the form of religious organization in which he had grown up, and the form

(1) I Thess;iv.1-2 (2) It may be that the phrase "the Lord" in this context is a technical term for the Tradition. See J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, 55f. (3) Acts xviii;1-8

with which his converts were familiar. Even if those converts were wholly composed of "Godfearers", uncircumcised Gentile associate-members of the synagogues, they must still have been familiar with government by an Eldership by reason of their connection with the synagogues. What prevents a belief that St Paul did, in fact, supply his Churches with this kind of organization is that, apart from one doubtful case, it is nowhere mentioned in his genuine epistles. This is the real strength of Easton's argument against St Luke's historical accuracy, and although it rests upon negative evidence it is cogent almost to the point of demonstration.

There can be no assembly of human beings meeting to conduct affairs of common interest, ^{and} ~~and~~ succeeding in doing so, without some form of control, however rudimentary. If no-one is appointed to conduct the meeting as president, then the strongest personality will assert himself as leader and take control. It is not to be supposed, however, that St Paul left his Churches in so confused a state. In I Cor;xvi.15f it is apparent that the household of Stephanas had some sort of pre-eminence in the Corinthian Church. St Paul does not refer to them as Elders, as though they held a formal office. Their leadership rests upon their devoted service to the Corinthian congregation, and upon the fact that they had been the first converts in that area. They were not novices in the faith, but older in it than the rest. In that sense they were the elders of the rest, people of longer experience in the Christian tradition and therefore, other things being equal, the people best suited to take the lead.

St Paul bade the Corinthians dispose themselves towards the household of Stephanas, and others like them, in a manner expressed by the verbs $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omega$ (I Cor;xvi.16,18). Arndt and Gingrich hold that the former indicates submission in the sense of a voluntary yielding in love, while the latter indicates a recognition of the merits of the men of whom the Apostle was writing, and therefore of the value of following their advice. There is no suggestion here that Stephanas and his associates were Elders with power to command, but equally St Paul accords them a position of responsibility and expects that they will have the loyal support of their fellow-churchmen. Nor does it seem that the Apostle was giving these men this responsibility for the first time as he wrote his epistle. The way in which he wrote implies that the Corinthians were already aware that they ought to be guided by these leaders.

But although it had leaders, it was the Corinthian Church as a whole that was to expel its incestuous member. There is no sign that some one section of the Church had authority to do this, and so might be taken as constituting a presbytery. ⁽¹⁾ Similarly, St Paul asked the Corinthians if they had no-one among them wise enough to settle a dispute between its members, so that such a matter need ⁽²⁾ not be taken into a heathen court. But a case of this kind was exactly the sort of thing suitable for Elders to deal with, and if there had been an Eldership at Corinth it must be supposed that St Paul would have asked, Has the Church no Elders who could have decided this matter?

(1) I Cor;v.4 (2) I Cor;vi.4-6.

In I Thessalonians v.12f St Paul exhorted his readers

"to respect those who labour among you and are over you
(-πρωϊσταυένους) in the Lord and admonish you, and to
esteem them very highly in love because of their work."

Here there is evident reference to guides and leaders whose qualification corresponds to the service rendered by the household of Stephanas at Corinth and who, St Paul expected, would receive the same willing loyalty that was due to the Corinthian leaders. But what is to be made of the verb *πρωϊστυμι* used in this passage? Arndt and Gängrich allow that it may mean "those who rule over you", but also notice that it may equally mean "those who concern themselves for you" or "those who aid you". There is thus no need to suppose that there was a body of Elders ruling the Church at Thessalonica, although there were certainly leaders known for their labours on that Church's behalf. The pre-eminence of those leaders was recognized and approved by St Paul.

The one possible exception to the general rule that St Paul's genuine epistles show no knowledge of the existence of Elderships in the Churches of his founding is the form of address in Phil;1.1:-

"To all the saints in Christ Jesus who are at Philippi,
with ἑπισκόποις και διακόνοις".

On the assumption that in the New Testament "bishop" and "presbyter" are synonymous terms, it is possible to regard this passage as having reference to a Church governed by Elders. But the nouns

ἑπισκόποις and διακόνοις are anarthrous in this passage, and Easton (1)

(1) Easton, Pastoral Epistles, 224f

takes this to mean that St Paul was using them to describe functions and not offices. Further, he limits the functions covered by these nouns to those performed in one particular action, the collection of the gift which St Paul was acknowledging in this epistle to the Philippian Church. Easton would be prepared to see in these terms two groups of the Philippian Christians, those who had performed the service of collecting the gift, and those who had organized the affair (i.e. the "overseers"). But he prefers the idea that St Paul was thinking of one group only, and was describing as "overseers" those who had served him by collecting the gift and sending it to him. This interpretation, insofar as it connects "bishops and deacons" with the gift, is unconvincing. (1) It is more natural to suppose that St Paul was greeting a group of men who performed all the tasks of leadership in the Church at Philippi and another group who assisted them, or perhaps only one group, those who served the Philippian congregation as its guides. Easton admits that there must have been such leaders in all the Pauline Churches, (2) and there is no reason why St Paul should not have greeted them at the opening of this epistle just as he mentioned them in later parts, and for another purpose, in his epistles to the Thessalonians and Corinthians. Easton may well be correct, however, in thinking that St Paul

(1) The same view of ἑπισκοπῶν καὶ διακόνων in Phil;i.1 is maintained by von Campenhausen in *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. The present author knows this work only through a review of it by Professor S.L.Greenslade in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, new series, vol.iv.pt.2 Oct 1953. pp.259ff. Professor Greenslade describes the interpretation of Phil;i.1 put forward by von Campenhausen as a "tour de force".

(2) Easton, *Pastoral Epistles*, 223.

was not giving these men the titles of "Bishop" and "Deacon", but was referring to the duties they performed unofficially. Otherwise it must be assumed that the Church at Philippi was organized differently from the Church at, say, Corinth. Phil;1.1 may, indeed, be the place which supplied the title "Bishop" as an alternative for those who, later than St Paul's time, held the office of "Presbyter" in the Church, and the title "Deacon" for those who assisted them in a minor office.

There are other indications as late as, and later than, the date of St Luke's works, that there were Churches which lacked government by a presbytery. In the much discussed passage Matt;xviii.17 the aggrieved Christian is directed to complain to the Church as his final way of obtaining redress. No matter how Cartwright and Travers argued to the contrary this can only mean an appeal to the whole of a local congregation and not to any section of it forming a presbytery. If an appeal to a council of Elders had been intended it would have been so easy to say so. In the Church in which this saying took shape, therefore, it must be accepted that there were no Elders. Again, in Tit;1.5 "Titus" was directed to make good what was defective in the Church in Crete by appointing Elders in every city. This can mean nothing else than that the writer of the Epistle to Titus was aware that certain Churches lacked Elders and thought they ought to have them.

Taken at its face value each of St Paul's epistles seems to have been addressed in its entirety to the whole membership of the Church to which it was sent, and not to any particular portion of that Church.

such as a body of Elders charged with the tasks of conducting the worship and administering discipline. Easton adds this circumstance, negative though it is, to his evidence that there were no Elders in the Pauline Churches during the period in which the epistles were written. A.M.Farrer, however, has taken the opposite view of the epistles of St Paul, and claims to be able to find in them large parts which were addressed to an inner circle of Elders, and not to the congregation generally. One of the passages where this "leaps to the eye" is I Thess;v.12-22. Farrer holds that verses 12-13 (which have been quoted above) were addressed to the people, and this is certainly correct for these verses enjoin obedience to the leaders of the Church. But verses 14-22, Farrer holds, were addressed to pastors (i.e. presbyters) directing them in their liturgical and disciplinary duties. Both parts of the whole passage, however, are addressed to the "brethren" without distinction, and in the second section there is not one word which might not suitably have been written to the laity even if there had been a body of Elders ruling the Church at Thessalonica. Farrer admits that it is only by interpreting St Paul's epistles in the light of what St Luke says about St Paul appointing Elders in his Churches that it can be inferred that there were in fact presbyteries in the Pauline Churches when St Paul wrote. But even if this inference is made, it still requires an effort of the imagination to divide up I Thess;v.12-22, and other passages of a like kind, in the way Farrer advocates.

(1) Easton, Pastoral Epistles, 224 (2) Essay in The Apostolic Ministry, ed. Kirk, 152-156 (3) Ibid 155.

Because St Paul addressed his epistles to whole congregations, and not to any official sections of them, it is impossible to define the duties and authority of leaders such as "the household of Stephanas". At Corinth the Church as a whole decided matters of discipline involving excommunication, and any member might act as an arbitrator in a dispute between members. All might join in public worship, contributing a hymn or a prophecy or a lection or an ecstatic speech. On the other hand the order and discipline which St Paul enjoined in public worship cries out for a chairman to administer it, and the assembly which met to decree the excommunication of the incestuous brother must similarly have had its president or it would have broken up in confusion before it had begun its task. Perhaps it was at these points that the household of Stephanas proved its usefulness to the Church at Corinth.

Again, the celebration of the Eucharist demanded a celebrant. How was he chosen? Did the same person celebrate each Lord's Day, or was there a periodical change in the celebrant, each member undertaking the duty in turn? Such questions cannot be answered except by guesswork. Churches may have differed from each other in such matters, and Stephanas and his associates may have had more, or they may have had less, authority than their counterparts at Thessalonica.

We are left, then, with a picture of the Pauline Churches somewhat different from the one provided by St Luke. Leaders of some sort there certainly were, but not Elders within the meaning of the term, although it is apparent that these leaders might easily be

(1) I Cor;vi.5 (2) I Cor;xiv.26 (3) I Cor;xiv.26-33.

transformed into Elders. There was a wide degree of participation in the worship and discipline of the Church by all its members. There was no sign of an ordained ministry, but the leaders had the support of St Paul's authority. There is no evidence to show how the leaders came to be leaders, whether by St Paul's appointment, popular choice, or sheer force of personality and ability. In view of the emphasis on spiritual gifts in I Corinthians the balance of probability is in favour of the last-named process, i.e. those emerged as leaders who displayed the gift of leadership, their gift being recognized and used by St Paul and their fellow-Christians. All gifts of the Spirit were freely exercised, but they were not the monopoly of a few having a "charismatic ministry", for it was expected that all would have something to contribute, even if it was only a hymn or the interpretation of a "tongue". It was expected that all members would voluntarily and lovingly obey their leaders, but it does not seem that obedience could be demanded as of right by any individual official or by any body of officials authorized for that purpose. Members of the Pauline Churches bore more responsibility, and had more liberty, than members of the synagogues, and more than their descendants and successors were to enjoy a few generations later. In short, Cartwright and Travers would not have found their form of Church government in the Pauline Churches if they had lived in them; Robert Browne would have been much more at home in them, but even he would have been uneasy with the supervision exercised by St Paul.

IV.

If St Luke was wrong in thinking that St Paul (at least during the period when he was writing his epistles) provided his Churches with presbyters, he was not alone in his error. The Pastoral Epistles testify to the existence of a belief that St Paul would have approved, to put it no more strongly, of the appointment of presbyters. Similarly, the first Epistle of Clement of Rome openly expresses a belief that all the Apostles had set up the office of presbyter in the Churches they had founded, and that the presbyterate which certainly existed in the Church at Corinth in Clement's time was of apostolic, and presumably of St Paul's, creation.

Writing about the Apostles, Clement said,

"They preached in country and city, and appointed their first converts (τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν) after testing them by the Spirit, to be the bishops and deacons of future believers."(1)

Clement was well acquainted with St Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, and seems here to be referring to the household of Stephanas, described by St Paul as ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας⁽²⁾. To Clement,⁽³⁾ however, bishops were synonymous with presbyters. They held an office in the Church, and a ministry which included the offering of the sacrifices.⁽⁴⁾ All this is much more precise than anything St Paul had to say about Stephanas, and more than is justified by the state of the Church at Corinth as it is revealed in St Paul's epistles.

 (1) I Clem;xlii.4 (2) I Clem;xlvii.1-4 (~~5~~) I Cor;xvi.15.
 (3) I Clem;xliv.4-5. (4) Ibid. I Pet;v.1ff which perhaps pre-dates I Clement assumes that there were Elders in the Jewish Christian Churches (i.1) of Asia Minor (although not necessarily by apostolic appointment). I Peter shows literary dependence upon St Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and was therefore possibly written at Rome even if not by St Peter himself. For the significance of this see below p.716.

These three authorities, Acts, I Clement, and the Pastoral Epistles belong to the sub-apostolic rather than to the apostolic age, and they reflect the beliefs of the age in which they were written about the previous age rather than the actual facts of the previous age. But, except where they can be shown to be wrong, these beliefs deserve to be taken seriously as evidence of conditions in the apostolic age. How then can the belief which they display, that presbytery was an apostolic, and even a Pauline, institution in the Church, be reconciled with what has already been said about the absence of presbyteries from the Pauline Churches at the beginning?

There were two parallel missions conducted at the same time (and not without some mutual hostility) by the apostolic Churches. St Paul wrote,

"James and Cephas and John, who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised."(1)

Where was the line drawn between these missions in the Diaspora? Did St Paul's field include the synagogues with their circumcised members and uncircumcised Gentile fringe, as St Luke said he did, or did he confine himself to the Gentiles who were outside the synagogues altogether? It is natural to suppose that presbyteries would be formed in Christian Churches which began by secession from the synagogues, but rather less natural to think that they would be formed among people who had been converted direct from heathenism. This may be the reason why, at first, there were no presbyters in

(1) Galatians 11.9

St Paul's Churches. But St Paul may, further, have deliberately arranged to keep his converts as free as possible to exercise the gifts of the Spirit, and not to subject them to the restraint which the existence of an official ministry must necessarily impose upon them.

Clement of Rome wrote his epistle as the representative of a non-Pauline Church. The whole tone of St Paul's Epistle to the Romans shows that in his time, if not in Clement's, the Roman Church had a strong Jewish element in it. It was a Church which might well have been founded by secession from the synagogue, and one which might therefore have had in it, from the outset, a presbytery on the Jewish model. It is not known who founded the Roman Church, but there is a strong tradition of association with St Peter, one of the principals of the mission to the circumcision. Clement may therefore be right in believing that, in the case of his own Church, the office of presbyter began by apostolic appointment. He may have known of other Churches, also non-Pauline, of which the same thing could be said. It could, in some sense, be truly said even of Churches which were not themselves of direct apostolic foundation, but which had modelled their organization upon that of the Church at Jerusalem, which was the headquarters of the apostolic mission to the circumcision.

In course of time the institution of presbytery spread into the Pauline Churches. It had certainly spread to Corinth by the time

(1) See, for example, Rom;ii.17ff, iii.9, iv.1. As far as xi.12 this Epistle seems to have been addressed to the Jewish Christians. At xi.13 St Paul turned to the Gentile members of the Roman Church and addressed the remainder of the Epistle to them.

Clement wrote his Epistle, and he assumed that St Paul had planted it there just as other Apostles had planted it, directly or indirectly, elsewhere.

It has already been pointed out that the author of the Epistle to Titus betrays an awareness of a time when there were Churches, conveniently designated as "Crete", which had no Elders and which he thought ought to have them. This is evidence of a transitional period when Churches which were without presbyteries were gradually conforming themselves to the non-Pauline pattern. Further evidence of the same change is to be found in the Didache (or, more accurately, in the ancient material reproduced in the Didache). The Church members to which that document was addressed were told to

"elect for yourselves bishops and deacons who are a credit to the Lord... For their ministry to you is identical with that of the prophets and teachers. You must not, therefore, despise them, for along with the prophets and teachers they enjoy a place of honour among you."(1)

In the Church to which these words were addressed there were already Elders, still appointed by the election of the people, but clearly their office had not yet acquired in the eyes of the people the prestige of the prophets and teachers, otherwise it would have been pointless for the writer to commend them as he did.

Perhaps a memory of another stage in the transition from the Pauline to the non-Pauline form of Church organization is preserved in Acts xiii.1-3. In this passage it is not the whole Church at Antioch which sends out Saul and Barnabas as missionaries, but a

(1) Didache, xv.1-2 (2) In I Clement xlv.3 the Elders are chosen only "with the consent of the whole people".

body of "prophets and teachers" within that Church. This body is not described by St Luke as a presbytery, but it acts corporately as though it were a presbytery, and it also seems to act officially, as though it wielded the authority of the Church at Antioch without having to consult or ask the agreement of that Church. Though not a presbytery, it was well on the way to becoming one. (1)

In the face of this fluid and changing organization of the primitive Church what answer can nowadays be given to the demand of Cartwright and Travers, that the Church should go back to her beginning and re-fashion herself in accordance with the primitive model? The only possible answer is the question, Which beginning, the Pauline or the non-Pauline? Both were apostolic and primitive, but their existence side by side at the beginning shows that neither of them was held in the days of the Apostles to be a form of organization laid down for the Church by Christ, nor a form which might not be changed as circumstances required.

(1) Easton, Pastoral Epistles, p.226, holds that the "prophets and teachers" of Antioch were not Elders. This book was published in 1947. In "The Purpose of Acts" (published in 1936) Easton held that they were Elders. The opinion of 1947 is to be preferred, but what Easton wrote in 1936 about the corporate action of these men is worth noticing; "So anxious is Luke to emphasize this corporate character that he even says that the Spirit's message came to 'them'!" (See Easton's "Early Christianity", p.71). The imposition of the hands of the prophets and teachers upon Saul and Barnabas cannot be taken, as Easton takes it, to be ordination. Saul and Barnabas were already themselves prophets and teachers, and members of the very body which laid hands upon them. They were not being raised to the ministry or to a degree of the ministry which they had not reached before hands were laid upon them. They were being appointed as the representatives of that body to conduct a mission in Cyprus and other places. See Daube, op.cit. p.239f.

V.

Whatever the defects of Thomas Bilson's argument for episcopacy, it has at anyrate this merit, that it pays due attention to the place of the Apostles in the apostolic Church, and to their work for each local congregation after it had been founded. The element of "oversight" by St Paul of the Churches founded by him is so obvious in his epistles as to need no proof. These epistles were written precisely for the purpose of exercising oversight where and when it was needed. ⁽¹⁾

The oversight exercised by St Paul (and presumably by others in the Churches they had founded) must have been a factor conditioning the local congregations in post-apostolic times to the acceptance of oversight from outside the circle of their own local membership, and to the acceptance of the exercising of that oversight by an individual.

Bilson was entirely justified in saying that the monarchical Bishops of the post-apostolic Church, had in fact succeeded to the function of oversight originally exercised by, for example, St Paul. What he was not justified in concluding was the thing that he could not demonstrate, that the earliest Bishops had succeeded to this apostolic function because the Apostles had created their office, had appointed the first holders of it, and had transmitted their function of oversight to them. Nor was he justified in assuming, to

(1) In "Philemon" St Paul exercised oversight of the conduct of an individual Christian, not of a congregation. In "Colossians" he did so over a Church which, though not founded directly by him, seems to have been within the orbit of the pauline Churches rather than the non-pauline. In "Romans", which was addressed to a Church founded neither by St Paul nor by one of his assistants, it cannot be claimed that the Apostle was exercising "oversight"; his tone in this epistle was less authoritative than in the rest.

use his own expression, "singularity in succession". For this he cannot altogether be blamed, for although he had no good evidence for it, he had also none against it. I Clement was unknown to the Elizabethan Church. Had it been known Bilson would have had before him a document written with the purpose of exercising oversight of the Church at Corinth, but the oversight was exercised, not by an individual, but by a Church, or at least in the name of a Church. The true title of I Clement is "The Letter of the Romans to the Corinthians."⁽¹⁾
⁽²⁾

It is a further merit in Bilson that he did not commit the mistake of confusing the titles "Bishop" and "Apostle" when he wrote of the one succeeding to the supervisory function of the other. He carefully distinguished between the Apostles regarded as the unrepeatable rock upon which the Church is founded (as, that is to say, the body of men able to testify at first hand to the facts of the ministry, teaching, and resurrection of Jesus) and the Apostles regarded as exercising episcopal supervision of the Churches. The original purpose of Jesus's choosing of the Twelve out of the larger company of the disciples, as stated by St Mark, was that they were

"to be with him, and to be sent out to preach and have authority to cast out demons."⁽³⁾

That he had been a disciple of Jesus from the time of the ministry of the Baptist and until the Ascension was the qualification needed

(1) I Clement was unknown in England until Codex Alexandrinus was brought here in 1628. See Richardson, Early Christian Fathers, p.40
 (2) I Clement, opening greeting, 65. See ~~Richardson~~ Richardson, op. cit. p.73 footnote 54. (3) Mark iii.15

in the one who was to fill the place in the Apostolate vacated by
 Judas Iscariot. In this matter of first-hand knowledge of Jesus the
 most important point was, for St Paul, the ability to act as an eye-
 witness of the resurrection. This ability was the basis of his own
 claim to apostleship; in the case of the ministry of Jesus St Paul
 had to depend upon the tradition which he had received from others.

Now this first-hand knowledge of Jesus was unrepeatable, as Bilson
 realised. In this sphere the successor of the Apostles is not the
 Church, nor any ministry within the Church, but Holy Scripture. Bil-
 son did not therefore think of the Bishops as new Apostles, but only
 as succeeding them in that part of their function which began when
 their experience of Jesus in his body had ended, the oversight of
 the Churches they founded. They were, in fact, Bishops, not Apostles.

The nature of Apostolic oversight Bilson also seems to have under-
 stood when he designated it as "fatherly". St Paul's position among
 his converts was that of a spiritual progenitor, not that of a ruler:-

"Though you have countless guides in Christ, you have not
 many fathers. For I became your father in Christ Jesus
 through the gospel."(5)

 (1) Acts 1.21f (2) I Cor;xv.8f (3) I Cor;x1.23, xv.3. (4)A.G.Hebert,
 abandoning efforts like that of Bilson to prove that Bishops succeed
 the Apostles in the sense of receiving from them through a chain of
 succession independent of the Church an authority to govern the
 Church, and fully realizing that "the apostolic function of witness-
 ing to the Resurrection is permanently discharged by the New Testa-
 ment", would have each new Bishop regarded "as an actual addition to
 the original apostolic college". (The Form of the Church, pp.124,
 129). Mascall (Christ, the Christian, and the Church, 121-124, Corpus
 Christi, p.21) says much the same thing. But an Apostle was much
 more than a Bishop, and if the title "Apostle" is applied to a Bishop
 this is obscured. Moreover we are left without a suitable title to
 be applied to those who were the witnesses of the resurrection. This
 confusion can be avoided by thinking of a Bishop as a Bishop, and of
 an Apostle as an Apostle. A Bishop should not be made out to be
 what he is not. (5) I Cor;iv.15

Christ, not St Paul, was the ruler of the Church, and this idea controlled the Apostle's relationship with his Churches. Throughout I Cor; vii he carefully distinguished between a command of Christ (to which he required obedience and for which he offered no explanations) and his own advice (which he supported with reasons, which he did not wish to be taken as binding, and which the reader was to apply to his own case and then make the decision for himself):-

"To the married I give charge, not I but the Lord, that the wife should not separate from her husband." (vii.10)

"Concerning the unmarried, I have no command of the Lord, but I give my opinion... not to lay any restraint upon you, but to promote good order and to secure your undivided devotion to the Lord." (vii.25, 35)

The Corinthians were to imitate St Paul.

"I urge you then, be imitators of me." (iv.16)

But this was ultimately an imitation of, and therefore obedience to, Christ.

"Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ." (xi.1)

All this provides the background for estimating the significance of the excommunication of the incestuous Corinthian, which seems at first sight to take away all independent judgment from the Corinthian Church. St Paul pronounced sentence upon this man "in the name of the Lord" (v.3f) and required the Corinthians to do the same at their next assembly. But he did not over-ride the authority of the assembly nor did he consider that it should obey him for any other reason than that his decision was the right one. He recalled them to their obedience to "the Lord" whom he had obeyed in making his judgment of the case.

VI.

Bilson failed to show that the office of monarchical Bishop was an apostolic institution in the Church, but noticing his failure does nothing towards showing how that office could have come into being, and some attempt must now be made to this end.

Assuming that the sub-apostolic Churches were governed (whether by apostolic appointment or by their own imitation of the synagogues is immaterial) by presbyteries on the Jewish model, it is reasonable to assume also that these presbyteries would, in their turn, appoint officers similar to those of Judaism. For each synagogue the Jewish Elders appointed two officers, קָוֵן וְשֹׁרֵט , the ἀρχισυναγωγος of the New Testament, and קָוֵן יָדַי , ὑπηρέτης . These were the lit-

(1) Schurer, op.cit.II.ii.65, 66f, 252. Mark v.22. Luke iv.20. The position of the synagogue "hazzan" is not of direct consequence to the present argument, but since it is possible that his office was the forerunner of that of Deacon in the Christian Church, it will not be altogether out of place to describe it here. The first responsibility of this official was the care of the rolls of the Scripture which he took from their niche and handed to the reader at each service under the direction of the "archisynagogos". After the reading he returned the rolls to their place. The care of the synagogue building fell to his lot. He was apt to be regarded as the man-of-all-work. In Palestine he translated the Scripture-reading into Aramaic as it was read in Hebrew. He might be called upon to read himself in the absence of anyone else qualified or willing to do so. He administered the corporal punishments inflicted by sentence of the Elders. He often acted as school-master. He was not himself an Elder but a starred official, the executive officer of the presbytery outside the synagogue and the attendant and assistant of the "archisynagogos" within it. The Office of Deacon in the early Church resembled that of the "hazzan" in that the primary function was liturgical. In Justin Martyr it was wholly liturgical, the President himself taking charge of the alms (Justin Apol.i.65, 67). In Hippolytus it is emphasized that the Deacon is ordained to the service (ὑπηρέσια) of the Bishop, and for that reason the presbyters are forbidden to lay hands upon him. As Dix translates Hippolytus the Deacon has also to take charge of property, but Easton has challenged this translation in such a way as to leave the Deacon to

urgical officers of the synagogue. The ~~ἄρχισυναγωγός~~ "archisynagogos" presided at the services and exercised control of them. It was he who chose the Scripture-reader, the prayer-leader, and the speaker for each service. Although by virtue of his office he had no authority outside the synagogue, his liturgical authority was considerable. He might himself read, pray, or preach at the services; he was not obliged to do so but circumstances must often have made it desirable that he should. Perhaps he was often himself an Elder, but when he was not he would still have liturgical authority over the Elders, for they might not officiate except by invitation of the "archisynagogos", and under his authorization. He was pre-eminently the overseer of the synagogue worship and of those who took part in it.

 carry out faithfully any duties (undefined) that the Bishop might lay upon him. (Dix, op.cit.15f, Easton, Pastoral Epistles, 183.). Ignatius was aware that Deacons were sometimes occupied in "serving tables" and drew their attention to their liturgical duties as being of greater importance. "Those, too, who are deacons of the mysteries of Jesus Christ must in every way be pleasing unto all. For they are not deacons of meats and drinks, but are servants of the Church of God." (Ad Trall; ii). Under the influence of Acts vi.1-6 with its application of the verb διακονέω to the Seven, it was perhaps inevitable that the office of Deacon should be understood eventually to be the equivalent of the Jewish receiver (and dispenser) of alms, but the examples given above show that this did not happen universally upon the publication of Acts, nor without protest. Perhaps, too, it was the influence of Acts vi which led to the idea in Hippolytus (Dix, op.cit.15) that the Deacon should be chosen by the people and not, as the Jewish "hazzan" was, appointed by the presbytery. It is not intended to imply by all this that it can be demonstrated that the office of Deacon in the Christian Church was a copy of a synagogue original, but only that this theory is at least as plausible as the one which traces the office to the Seven. Such evidence as we have points to the Deacon as the liturgical assistant of the Bishop, and only secondarily as a financial officer and guardian of the poor. In either aspect the Deacon resembled a synagogue official, but the "hazzan" more closely than the almoner. In Justin Martyr he does not resemble the almoner at all, and it is tempting to wonder whether he ever would have done so if St Luke had phrased Acts vi differently.

Two circumstances would tend, in a Christian congregation, to enhance the prestige of a liturgical president above that of his Jewish counterpart. Firstly, less work of a civil nature would fall to the lot of a Christian presbytery. The Elders might settle occasional disputes between members of the flock, but there was no town or village community to be governed. The interest of the Church was mostly in worship, teaching, and morals, and although Church Elders might deal with discipline and finance, their scope was much less than that of Jewish Elders, and the jurisdiction of the liturgical president by comparison the greater.

Secondly, the liturgical duties of a Christian president far exceeded those of a Jewish "archisynagogos", for he had under his control the additional and most important act of worship, the Eucharist. There was no equivalent to this in the synagogues; its equivalent was the offering of the sacrifices in the Temple. It would tend to give the president the status of a Jewish priest in addition to that of "archisynagogos". It does not seem, however, that only the presidents celebrated the Eucharist. Clement of Rome shows that at Corinth the presbyters celebrated. ⁽¹⁾ On the analogy of the "archisynagogos" the Christian president would appoint the celebrant, but would sometimes carry out the duty himself. In this way he would come to be regarded as the equivalent of the Jewish High Priest, and the presbyters as priests serving under him, to the increase of his status and theirs.

(1) I Clem;xliv.4

It has already been pointed out that imposition of hands (in the sense of "leaning" or pressing with the hands) was not used in Judaism except for some of the Temple sacrifices and for the ordination of a Rabbi. It was used, however, by Christians, and when it came to be employed by a presbytery the president must have taken a leading part in the ceremony, for it was a liturgical action. When the Christian equivalent of rabbinic ordination (i.e. the ordination of one person by another individual, and not a corporate imposition of hands) began in the Church it is difficult to say. There is evidence, however, that the admission of a new presbyter to his office was effected at an early time by the corporate laying-on of the hands of the presbytery. In Hippolytus the presbyters present at the ordination were to join with the Bishop in laying their hands on the ordinand, surely a clumsy proceeding unless it were in Hippolytus' time an ancient custom preserving a memory of the time when such an ordination was a corporate act. To be sure, Hippolytus' tradition forbade the presbyters to think that they were ordaining the new presbyter; they had authority only to "receive" him into their number, not to confer order upon him. But why make this prohibition unless there were some who still held the opinion that the ordaining Bishop and the presbyters were not doing two different things by the imposition of their hands, but were doing the same thing corporately? Similarly, in Hippolytus the presbyters were forbidden to lay their hands on a new Bishop at his consecration.

(1) Daube, op.cit.246 (2) Dix, op.cit.13 (3) Ibid 16f (4) Ibid 3.

no-one was doing it, or at least thought that it ought to be done? In short, the "Apostolic Tradition" of Hippolytus shows signs of a period of transition from the corporate imposition of hands by the presbytery upon both Bishops and presbyters to the rabbinic type of imposition of hands where the individual Bishop was thought of as the one who effected the ordination.

Ignatius emphasizes the liturgical pre-eminence of the Bishop:-

"Let that Eucharist be considered valid which is under the Bishop or him to whom he commits it... It is not lawful apart from the Bishop either to baptize or to hold a love-feast. But whatsoever he approves, that also is well-pleasing to God."⁽¹⁾

The presbyters at Antioch were evidently not, however, under the autocratic rule of their Bishop. They formed his council and had some degree of joint authority with him, viz:-

"Do all things in godly concord, the Bishop presiding after the pattern of God, and the presbyters after the pattern of the council of the Apostles... neither act in anything apart from the Bishop and presbyters."⁽²⁾

As late as the fourth century the Roman presbyters were "con-⁽³⁾celebrating" the Eucharist with their Bishop. This practice, by which the presbyters laid their hands along with the celebrant's on the eucharistic elements, must have survived from the time when the celebration of the Eucharist was a corporate action of the Roman presbytery. But the Bishop stood out as the leading figure in this consecration of the Eucharist, and that in itself is a development from first century Roman practice, for throughout I Clement there is no mention at all of a Bishop or liturgical president; it was the presbyters who "offered the sacrifices".

(1) Ad Smyrn; viii. (2) Ad Magn; vi, vii. (3) Hebert, The Form of the Church, p.72f.

VII.

In the time of Hippolytus when a new Bishop was to be appointed, he was consecrated to his office by the imposition of the hands of one of the Bishops of the neighbouring Churches who had been invited to be present for the occasion. At a later date it became customary (1) to employ three Bishops for this purpose, and the custom was turned into a rule at the Council of Nicaea. It is clear that this is something different from the appointment of a liturgical president by a council of presbyters, even if we suppose that the one who was to be consecrated by a Bishop from outside had previously been elected by his own presbyters. (2) The effect of this consecration by a Bishop from outside the community which the new Bishop is to serve is to create a ministry, so far as consecration is concerned, independent of the local Church, much as the Apostles were independent of, and in a sense over and above, any one of the local Churches of which they had oversight. Was this a development of the idea of a liturgical president appointed by his presbytery, a more or less conscious copying of the position of the Apostles in their time by the Church of the late second century, or had this consecration by a Bishop from outside existed from apostolic times by apostolic decree?

The latter of these two alternatives is essentially Bilson's position, and there are those who would still uphold it. Among

(1) Dix, op.cit.3. Hippolytus says first that all the Bishops present at the consecration are to impose hands upon the new Bishop, and then only one Bishop to do so as he says the prayer of consecration. (2) Actually Hippolytus requires that a Bishop shall be elected by the people. See Dix, op.cit.2.

them is Jalland, who writes,

"We know that in the second century "episkopoi" were appointed only by intervention of Bishops of neighbouring churches. How is the origin of this custom to be explained? It certainly was not derived from Judaism. Clement (of Rome) supplies the clue in his allusion to those 'that were appointed by them (sc the Apostles) or subsequently by other men reckoned with them (ellogimon andron)'. Here we find evidence of the survival of the apostolate after the death of the original Apostles, and of the perpetuation of their function in appointing the "episkopoi" of the local churches, since the most probable meaning that can be assigned to "ellogimon" in this context is 'reckoned or accounted along with them', i.e. with the Apostles."(1)

Jalland thinks that such men as Timothy and Titus and the author of III John were in Clement's mind as men who were to be reckoned with the Apostles as having a wider authority than any held by the purely local ministry. In process of time, however, these men and others like them ceased to be peripatetic and settled down as local Bishops, a process which can be observed in the cases of Timothy and Titus in the Pastoral Epistles. They continued, however, (so Jalland believes), to exercise the function bestowed upon them by the Apostles of appointing the local Bishops of other Churches. Thus the apostolate and the episcopate became mingled in their persons, and the two things were finally fused in the monarchical episcopate.

The difficulty about this theory is that it depends upon one possible interpretation of a well-known ambiguity of Clement's. It is by no means certain that ἑλλόγιμος should be translated "reckoned with the Apostles". Elsewhere in I Clement the word refers to "inclusion in Christ's flock" and "inclusion among those who are

(1) Jalland, op.cit. 98.

(1)
 saved". The word is so undefined in the passage to which Jalland
 (2)
 refers that other interpretations can be put upon it with equal
 plausibility. It might very well mean "those already included in
 the presbytery", in which case it would be to the presbyteries they
 had established, and not to ~~surkin~~ ^{certain} individuals, that the Apostles
 had committed the function of appointing the "episkopoi" of the
 (3)
 local Churches. Nothing worthwhile can be built upon so insecure a
 foundation.

But there is another difficulty, quite as great, in the way of
 accepting Jalland's proposition. As already noticed in the passages
 from Jerome and Ambrosiaster so much discussed by the Elizabethan
 controversialists, there was a strong tradition that the appointment
 of the Bishops of Alexandria by their own presbyteries continued for
 long after the time of the Apostles. Jerome claimed that it lasted
 "from the time of Mark the Evangelist until the episcopates
 of Heraclas and Dionysius." (4)

Heraclas began his episcopate in A.D. 231, and Dionysius in A.D. 246.
 The earliest date, therefore, for the change from presbyteral to
 episcopal authorization of the Bishops of Alexandria was, according
 to Jerome, A.D. 231. As late as the fourth century the canon law of
 Alexandria allowed presbyters to join with the Bishop in laying
 (5)
 hands upon a new Bishop at his consecration. There is even a doubt
 whether, at the beginning of the third century, any hands at all
 were laid upon a Bishop of Alexandria, or whether he was appointed
 merely by the election of the presbyters. The obvious authority

(1) I Clem;lvii.2, lviii.2 (2) I Clem;xliv.3 (3) Richardson, op.
 cit.63 footnote 2 (4) Jerome, Ep.146 (5) Ehrhardt, op.cit.134

for this period at Alexandria is Origen, a younger contemporary of Hippolytus. Ehrhardt, who has made a careful study of Origen in this connection, has reached the following conclusions:-

(1)
 "The consecration of bishops is nowhere explicitly dealt with by Origen; but from his casual remarks several probable conclusions may be derived. First, that the rite contained the laying on of hands, the characteristic of the consecration of Joshua, to which he repeatedly referred. Secondly, that presbyters were admitted along with the bishops to perform this rite, because they shared the priesthood with the bishops, although the bishops were granted a spiritual seniority."(2)

Treating these conclusions as though they were certain, they do not necessarily imply that Jerome was wrong in the date that he gave for the change from presbyteral to episcopal consecration of a Bishop of Alexandria if that date is taken to be A.D.231, when Heraclas was consecrated. Origen lived for at least twenty years after 231, and his evidence might well apply to the later period of his life. But if Jerome was wrong in his date, Origen's evidence shows that the participation of presbyters in the consecration of a Bishop, which Hippolytus forbade, was practised at Alexandria. As against Origen, Hippolytus displays a tendency to emphasize the necessity of consecration by a Bishop at the expense of consecration by the presbyters, and the implication is that episcopal consecration was a novelty which had to be emphasized because it was being substituted for an older method of consecration by presbyters alone.

Telfer has tried to show that presbyteral consecration of a Bishop of Alexandria continued until the 4th canon of the Council of Nicea brought all Churches into a uniformity of the consecration

 (1) Ehrhardt, op.cit.132-158 (2) Ibid 157.

of a Bishop by those who were already themselves Bishops, and to produce evidence earlier than Jerome's and more certain than Origen's of Alexandria's pre-Nicene presbyteral consecrations. ⁽¹⁾ Telfer's conclusions have not gone unchallenged, but even after criticizing them Kemp, who rejects them, is nevertheless constrained to conclude himself that

"such evidence as we have that the mode of appointment of the early bishops of Alexandria was unusual is also evidence that there was a carefully regulated succession, albeit a succession through a presbyteral college." ⁽²⁾

Now in all this evidence of early Alexandrine practice in the appointment of a Bishop there is no hint at all that the consecration of a new Bishop by an existing Bishop was an apostolic ordinance, and it is incredible that if it had been a method of appointing Bishops decreed by the Apostles, or even commenced by them, news of that fact should have been so long in reaching Alexandria. This was no isolated Church in a back-water. It was one of the most famous Churches in the ancient world and in constant contact with the other great Churches. Its ignorance of any apostolic arrangement whereby "episkopoi" should be consecrated only by individuals authorized by the Apostles to consecrate them is fatal to the theory that any such arrangement ever existed. Evidence which has come to light since Bilson's time has done nothing to support his theory of the apostolic origin of episcopacy, although it may be conceded that episcopacy preserves in the Church the apostolic function of "oversight".

(1) Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol.III, no 1 (April 1952) pp.1ff (2) Ibid, Vol.VI, no 2 (October 1955) p.142.

VIII.

The position of James "the brother of the Lord" in the Church of Jerusalem is instructive, for it provides an example within the New Testament of an imparity of ministers, even though it does not justify either in title or in function Bilson's claim that James was the first Bishop of Jerusalem.

As St Paul saw him, James occupied the leading place in the Church at Jerusalem after St Peter had vacated it. On St Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion it was Peter whom he visited and with whom he consulted; although he also met James, it was clearly Peter who was at that time the leader of the Church in that city.

"I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas... I saw none of the other Apostles except James the brother of the Lord." Gal;i.18f.

On a second visit fourteen years later James appears to be the leader, for the three whom Paul (with Barnabas and Titus) interviewed on this occasion were "James, Cephas, and John" (in that order). A modus vivendi was reached whereby Paul and Barnabas were to evangelize the Gentiles, and Peter the Jews. This division of spheres of activity was not to be regarded as a schism; *κοινωνία* was to be maintained between the Gentile and Jewish sections of the Church, and the symbol of unity was to be a contribution given by the one and received by the other.⁽¹⁾

The order "James, Cephas and John" might be taken as accidental were it not for the sequel. When Peter and Paul were together at Antioch, Peter consorted with the Gentile Christians until mess-

 (1) Galatians, i.18 - ii.10

engers came from James.

"Before certain men came from James, he ate with the Gentiles; but when they came he drew back and separated himself, fearing the circumcision party." Gal;ii.12.

Easton goes so far as to say about this incident that James issued a command to Peter to withdraw himself from Gentile contacts. Peter appears to have put a construction upon the modus vivendi different from James's, but submitted to James's interpretation when the difference was pointed out to him. What is clear is that the leadership of the Church at Jerusalem was now in James's hands, and not in Peter's. As the accredited missionary of the Church of Jerusalem Peter must have felt himself under an obligation to obey the leader of that Church. He was not the superior of James, nor even his equal; there was an imparity between them.

St Luke provides a rather different picture of St James's place in the Church of Jerusalem. In Acts xv.6ff he is clearly the president of a presbytery which is not dominated by the Apostles nor by him, although it follows his lead. After Peter and Paul and others had spoken, James proposed what must be assumed to be a compromise between the liberal policy of St Paul and the conservatism of those who thought that Gentile converts to Christianity should be circumcised as though they were also proselytes to Judaism. But James's proposal was not a decision until

"it seemed good to the apostles and elders, with the whole Church." Acts xv.22.

In Acts xxi.17ff the "whole Church" does not appear, but the

(1) Easton, Pastoral Epistles, 174 (2) Cullmann, Peter, 225f

presbytery is mentioned. James is singled out by name, but the reader is left to infer that he presided over the meeting of the presbytery which St Paul attended. In xxi.23, as in xv.24 there is a corporate decision expressed by the word "we", not an individual decision by James. But it is difficult to decide the exact force of the imperative "Do as we tell you" in xxi.23. Was it a command, or was it only urgent advice, to St Paul, to act in such a way as to correct the impression that was abroad that he was teaching Jews to desert the law of Moses? In other words, was St Paul "under" the presbytery and therefore also under its president? The question cannot be answered; what is certain is that he did not, Apostle though he was, dominate the presbytery, and neither, it would seem from xv.6ff, did James.

It is a great lack that we have no picture of the Church of Jerusalem at worship at this time. If we had we might learn from it whether James was, in St Luke's view, liturgical president as he was president of the presbytery in matters of administration on the pattern of the Jewish High Priest who was 'ex officio' president of the Sanhedrin. If he was not liturgical president, then he cannot be described rightly as Bishop of Jerusalem, and certainly not Bishop in Bilson's sense of the term unless he had "superiority in ordaining".

In some respects the portrait of James painted by St Paul differs from that provided in St ~~Luke~~ Luke's account. St Paul does not appear to know of any presbytery of which James was the head, but

(1) Easton, Pastoral Epistles, 191.

only James himself, the messengers from James, and "those of the
 circumcision!" He reckons James, however, among the Apostles. There
 had been a special resurrection-appearance to James, and although he
 had not been one of the original Twelve his knowledge of the ministry
 of Jesus must have been considerable for he was "the brother of the
 Lord." On this basis his authority may have seemed to St Paul to be
 personal rather than official. If St Paul is right then we have in
 St James an example of imparity among the Apostles, an authority of
 the Apostle James over the Apostle Peter rather than an authority of
 the president of a presbytery over an Apostle.

IX.

Robert Browne's main emphasis, apart from the stress he laid upon
 the importance of the Church's obedience to Christ, was upon the
 part which every Church member ought to play in the life of the
 Church. To him the authority of the Church was exercised corporately
 in each congregation by every member of that congregation. To Cart-
 wright this authority resided only partially in the total member-
 ship of each congregation, and partially in a tier of consistories,
 synods, and councils; his system was therefore a mixture of demo-
 cracy and aristocracy (under the monarchy of Christ); there was a
 parity among ministers, but an imparity between ministers and the
 rest of the members. But Browne's system was pure democracy (again,
 under the monarchy of Christ). There was a parity among all Christ-
 ians; all the "saints" held Christ's commission as a body.

(1) Gal;1.19 (2) I Cor;xv.7 (3) Gal;1.19.

What justification is there for Browne's conception of the Church? On the face of it many of the elements in our Lord's commission to the Church were delivered to the Apostles rather than to the Church as a whole. This applies, for example, to the command to repeat the Eucharist and to the authority to "bind and loose", to "forgive or retain". Does this mean, as Bilson thought it did, that the Apostles were to form a kind of ministerial aristocracy within the Church, a special type of Christian which might perpetuate itself and its commission by succession in ordination, and which in some sense might be regarded as the Church "par excellence" apart from the laity? Or does it mean that the Apostles received their commission on behalf of the Church and as representatives of the Church, so that Christ's commission belongs to the Church as a whole, and not to any privileged caste within it? In the answers to be given to these questions there is involved the attitude which the clergy of every generation ought to take towards their ministry. Leaving aside their inward call, are they commissioned externally by the whole Church, of which they are the agents, or do they receive their external commission ^{from} ~~in~~ a ministerial caste which is in some measure independent of and above the Church considered as a whole? In either case they receive their outward commission ultimately from Christ, just as they receive their inward call directly from him. What is in question is not the origin of the external commission, but the channel through which it is received.

It is very widely recognized that the precise number of the

(1)
 original Apostles, twelve, was intentionally symbolic. Along with Jesus they resembled the twelve sons of Jacob with their father, the original family of "Israel" from whom, according to the Old Testament, the people of God were descended. By appointing them Jesus symbolically re-founded the holy nation, taking it back, so to speak, to its beginnings in order that he might become a new Jacob, the progenitor of a new chosen race connected with its founder by repentance and faith instead of by physical descent. In this symbolism the Twelve were appointed to represent the new nation re-founded by Jesus upon a better principle than the old.

To pursue the matter further, several of St Paul's epistles were addressed were addressed to "the saints". In I and II Thessalonians, where this title was omitted from the address, it was used in the body of the epistles seemingly with reference to those to whom these epistles were written. (2) This description of Christians as "the saints" has received less attention than it deserves. To take an example at random, Jalland dismisses it in one place in a couple of sentences, treating it as though it meant nothing more than that Christians ought to live holy lives. (3) Does it imply anything more than this?

In I Cor;vi.2 St Paul asks his readers,

"Do you not know that the saints will judge the world? And if the world is to be judged by you..."

In a passing reference Jalland acknowledges that there is a clear connection between this passage and Dan;vii.18, 22, 27 which read:- (4)

(1) e.g. Mascall, Corpus Christi, 14. Jalland, op.cit.63 (2) I Thess iii.13. II Thess;i.10 (3) Jalland, op.cit.62 (4) Ibid.84.

"The saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom... and judgment was given for the saints of the Most High, and the time came when the saints received the kingdom... And the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High; their kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey them."

If these two passages are to be connected (and Jalland is surely right in connecting them), then it is evident that the way in which St Paul thinks of his converts as "the saints" entails more than the somewhat obvious idea that they are to be holy people. Further, as soon as it is realized that St Paul's use of the title "the saints" is to be linked up with Daniel vii, then it must also be taken into consideration that in Dan;vii.13f the saints of the Most High have a collective name; they comprise corporately "one like a son of man".

"With the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man, and he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him. And to him was given dominion and glory and kingdom, that all peoples and nations and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed."

Jalland notices that the title "saints" was used in the later apocalyptic literature for the faithful remnant of Israel, the true inward Israelites who were the people of God in heart as well as by physical descent from Abraham, and that for this reason the title was applied to the members of the new Israel, the Church. ⁽¹⁾ But he fails to point out that along with the title "the saints" there must go its collective equivalent "one like a son of man", or more briefly and simply, "the Son of Man".

During the period in which St Paul was calling Christians "the saint" the traditions of Jesus' words and actions were becoming

(1) Jalland, op.cit.62

fixed in written form, and shortly after St Paul's death the earliest compilation of these written traditions appeared, the Gospel of St Mark. In that book there are numerous references to the "Son of Man", all of them in sayings of Jesus. Thus in Mark xiv.62 Jesus at his trial before the High Priest quotes almost verbatim Dan;vii.13. This occurs in the midst of the Passion narrative, probably the earliest of St Mark's written sources.

In Dan;vii.13f and Mark xiv.62 the title "Son of Man" is employed in a context of dominion and glory, but in many of the "Son of Man" sayings in St Mark the title is emptied of this content and provided instead with the content which properly belongs to another Old Testament collective title for the faithful remnant of true Israelites, the Suffering Servant of God. Thus in Mark x.43-45 Jesus says,

"Whoever would be great among you must be your servant... For the Son of Man also came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many."

There seems to be here a reminiscence of what is said of the Suffering Servant in Isa;53.12,

"He bore the sin of many".

But the connection is clearer between Mark x.33f

"The Son of Man will be delivered... to the Gentiles, and they will mock him and spit upon him, and scourge him, and kill him.."

and Isa;50.6

"I gave my back to the smiters... I hid not my face from shame and spitting."

Many of the "Son of Man" sayings in St Mark's Gospel refer in the first instance to Jesus himself, as though the remnant of Israel was focussed into a single person, and he alone was the true Israel, the

sole embodiment of "the saints of the Most High". Indeed, this idea is required by the whole action of St Mark's Gospel, which is the story of the increasing unfaithfulness of the old Israel and the growing isolation of Christ until he dies absolutely alone, execrated even by those crucified with him. But in the saying quoted above from Mark x.43-45 it is clear that others were to take part in the service rendered by the Son of Man, and the same partaking with Jesus in that capacity is expressed in a saying in which he called upon his disciples to join him on Calvary:-

"If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." Mark viii.34.

Jesus' intention was, then, that "the Son of Man" should be a collective title for himself with his disciples. In the event it became a term for himself alone. But the original intention holds good. The preaching of the Gospel after Pentecost is a call to follow Jesus in faithfulness to God no matter what the cost, and thus to form with him the "Son of Man" in a collective sense. This appears to be a necessary inference from St Paul's use of the title "saints" and of the phrase "called to be saints" as applied to the members of the Churches he had founded.

Now Mark records two sayings of Jesus which refer to the powers of the "Son of Man" rather than to his suffering or his glory. In ⁽¹⁾

(1) T.W.Manson, who was the first to introduce the collective interpretation of the title "Son of Man" (see The Teaching of Jesus, 213-234) interprets these two sayings as though "son of man" in them is not to be regarded as a title but as Aramaic idiom for "man". Taken apart from the context this is permissible enough. Manson will not allow the title "Son of Man" in these sayings because it has Messianic associations, and according to Mark's theory Jesus kept his Messiahship secret, even from his disciples, until the confession at

the passage (Mark ii.23-28) which contains one of these sayings the disciples of Jesus are accused of Sabbath-breaking because they pluck ears of corn on that day. There is no mention of Jesus himself plucking ears of corn, or of being himself blamed for breaking the law of the Sabbath. Although he had, earlier in St Mark's Gospel, performed a healing on the Sabbath day, he has not yet been in personal conflict with the Jewish authorities about this matter. Yet he defends the action of his disciples in gathering the corn on the ground that

"the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath" Mark ii.28.

It appears therefore that the disciples (along with Jesus because he approves and defends their action) are collectively to be taken as the "Son of Man" and are to exercise one of the powers that go with that status.

The second of the sayings under consideration occurs in the passage Mark ii.1-12, where there is an account of the healing of a -----
 Caesarea Philippi (viii.27ff). But in the case of the accusation of Sabbath-breaking Jesus defended his disciples on the ground that David, in his time, had broken the law when he was hungry. This mention of David cries out for a Messianic interpretation. Jesus virtually said "The prototype of your idea of a human Messiah dealt freely with the law; may not the Messiah from heaven do the same?" Manson wrote in 1931 before Form Criticism had begun to influence British Biblical scholarship, otherwise he might have treated Mark ii.1 - iii.6 as a pre-Markan collection of "conflict-stories", perhaps serving as an introduction to a Passion-narrative. Thus the discrepancy with Mark's theory of the Messianic secret is explained. He incorporated this section as it stood into his Gospel, without attempting to reconcile it with the rest of his material. The way is therefore clear to read "Son of Man" in both of the sayings in question as a Messianic title, and many works more recent than Manson's treat it in that way. (For Mark ii.1 - iii.6 regarded as a pre-Markan source see Vincent Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, p.16 etc.).

paralytic to whom Jesus said, Thy sins be forgiven. On the basis of the belief that sickness is a divine punishment of sin, Jesus proved the effectiveness of his words of absolution by removing this man's sickness. In this way he demonstrated that

"the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins". Mk;if.10.

The absolution of the Son of Man, that is to say, corresponds to the will of God, and is ratified by God.

This power of absolution is exactly the authority which Jesus gave to the Twelve in John xx.23. Assuming that "binding and loos- ing" are the same as "forgiving and retaining", it is the authority given to the disciples in Matt;xviii.18. Indeed, if it is taken in the context in which Matthew placed it, it is given to the "Church" mentioned in xviii.17. It is a power given first of all to St Peter (Matt;xvi.19) on the ground of his profession of faith in Jesus as the Messiah, by which profession St Peter showed himself to be one of the faithful remnant and therefore to be among "the saints" and included in the corporate "Son of Man". But these collective titles do not belong to the Apostles alone. St Paul placed the whole me^mbership of each of the Churches to which he wrote in the category of "the saints". Because they were "the saints" it must be inferred that, with Christ, they together formed the "Son of Man" and collectively could wield the Messianic power of absolution. That power, then, is a power of the whole Church, and not of any caste or order independent of the rest of the Church. The Twelve

received it as they were the Church, and represented in their persons the Church of all times, not as they were Church officials and represented a line of succession of officials upon whom the Church must depend for the enjoyment of the powers bestowed by Christ. On this view of the matter any person who pronounces the absolution does so as the representative of Christ-with-his-Church, the "Son of Man", in whom the authority resides and from whom it is derived. And if this is true of that most characteristically ministerial action, it may be inferred that it is true also of other and similar actions, the celebration of the Eucharist, the administration of Holy Baptism, the preaching of the Word.

This is the point of view which Browne was anxious to preserve, and it is worth preserving. In times more ^{ent}rect than Browne's it has come to be expressed as "the priesthood of all believers." There is, however, a hint of individualism about this phrase which is objectionable. The true idea is not that each individual Christian is the "Son of Man" in his own right and in isolation from his fellow-Christians. Browne made that mistake, and his schism was the result; he thought himself endowed with authority to forsake, and therefore to unchurch, every other Christian. The true idea is that the power of absolution belongs to the whole Church with Christ at its head. The authority is in the whole, not in any part except insofar as the part is a part of the whole. It could be exercised individually only by one empowered by the whole to exercise it as the representative of the whole.

X.

The kind of "wholeness" of the Church with which Browne was concerned may be termed a vertical wholeness. There was no top rank of Christians who held all the authority of the Church and delegated it in varying amounts to lesser ranks below. To him the Church was a classless congregation. It was not spiritually classless since the gifts of the Spirit might vary; some might have "the gift" of preaching and others not. But there was a basic parity among all the members of the congregation, and each member had the same responsibility under the covenant which bound them all together; all the Lord's people were "the saints", minister and people alike. But Browne lacked any conception of the horizontal "wholeness" of the Church, that is to say, of the unity of all Christian people and congregations throughout the world. The Church ought not to be thought of as though it were a number of congregations each complete in itself and independent of the rest except to the extent that it might, if it pleased, offer help to, or accept help from, the rest. That would be to emphasize "the Churches" to the exclusion of "the Church". The old Israel might be gathered in many congregations, but it was still one people and one nation, its unity expressed outwardly and visibly in the national institutions. The same principle is to be expected in the new Israel.

Browne was not alone in this defect. His opponent, Bredwell, lacked a sense of the visible "wholeness" (in the horizontal sense) of the Church. True, he had some place for the conception of catholicity for he identified the Catholic Church with the invisible

world-wide company of true believers. But this is not enough. Visible congregations need a visible whole of which they may be the parts. Otherwise, considered as visible congregations, they are not parts of anything, but whole things in themselves. Bredwell's defect, then, was that although he believed in a horizontal wholeness of the Church, he failed to provide for a visible expression of that wholeness.

Cartwright maintained, in theory, a vertical wholeness of each local congregation, for to the total membership of each congregation some important powers had, he believed, been committed by God. Thus each congregation had power to elect its own minister and to decide matters involving excommunication and absolution. But Cartwright also believed that by divine ordinance these powers must be compulsorily delegated to the consistory of ministers and Elders, leaving the rest of the congregation with only the power to assent to or dissent from the decisions made for them. He allowed for a parity between ministers, but in practice an imparity between ministers and Elders on the one hand and the rest of the congregation on the other. He had congregationalist tendencies, however, and although he provided for the horizontal wholeness of the Church by his system of regional and national synods and councils standing above the parish consistory, this was secondary to the basic independence of each congregation. The edges of both types of wholeness are therefore blurred in Cartwright's scheme of Church government.

Hooker saw clearly the need to think primarily of the Church as a visible world-wide body ideally embracing all mankind. He wrote

much about national Churches, but this was forced upon him by the nature of his task. The reformation had not been a reformation of the whole world-wide Church, but only of parts of it. He was concerned to justify the way in which the Church of England had been reformed, and he could only do so by treating of the whole visible Church as it was to be found in its national parts.

The idea that is held of the wholeness of the Church will govern the view that is to be held of the ministry. A single congregation cannot confer a permanent status upon a minister whom it authorizes itself, for as soon as he ceases to be minister of that congregation he ceases to be a minister at all, and must be re-authorized by the next congregation of which he becomes a minister. But if he is made a minister by the whole Church then his status as a minister remains even when he has ceased to minister to some particular congregation, for his authorization has come from a source wider than any single congregation. He is a minister of the whole Church to the whole or to any particular part in which he may serve, and he who ordains him does so, ideally, as the agent of the whole Church, for it is the whole that is the new Israel, the Body of Christ, the holy nation.

In fact, no minister in modern times is authorized by the whole Church, for the visible Church is no longer whole. Ideally he ought to be so authorized, and he would be so authorized even if he were

ordained by or on behalf of a single congregation if that congregation were recognized by the whole Church as its representative for that purpose, and if the ordination were recognized to be an ordination by the whole Church, and therefore a thing not to be repeated.

Followers of Cartwright in times more recent than his have often rebelled against his idea that a minister ceases to be a minister when he leaves the congregation he has been serving. They have deemed him to have a permanent status, a "character", as a minister.

"A Presbyterian minister is, of course, only once ordained."(1) The force of this remark may be illustrated by a quotation from a member of the Church of Scotland:-

"Hill points out the distinction of ordination 'which is the appointment of Jesus Christ, conveying a character by the instrumentality of the office-bearers of His Church, from the election of a minister, which is the appointment of men, applying or limiting the exercise of this character.'"(2)

The Baptist Church, which in matters of Church government is in some measure the pupil of Robert Browne, similarly now gives to its ministers a wider authorization than can be given by a single congregation.

"Many among us hold that since the ministry is the gift of God to the Church... a man who is so called is not only the minister of a local Baptist church, but also a minister of the whole Church of Jesus Christ. Ordination takes place when a man has satisfactorily completed his college training... The ordination service is presided over by either the Principal of his college, a General Superintendent or a senior minister, and is shared in by other ministers and lay representatives of the church."(3)

(1) The Nature of the Church (ed Flew). Article on Presbyterian Churches in Europe by van der Sprenkel, Courvoisier, and Henderson, p.115. It is assumed that this applies to the Presbyterian Church of England. (2) Ibid. Article on the Church of Scotland by Henderson, p.101 (3) Ibid. Article on the Baptists approved by the Council of the Baptist Union, p.160.

From within Congregationalism, which is the direct heir of Browne's ideas, Professor T.W.Manson may be allowed to express current discontent with Browne's conception of congregational independence, discontent resting upon an appreciation of the "horizontal" wholeness of the Church. In his book "The Church's Ministry" Manson quotes some words addressed by Bernard Manning to a congregation on the occasion of the ordination of its minister, viz:-

"You have conferred on him all that the holy Catholic Church can confer... He is a minister not of this but of the universal Church... It is you who ordain. Other ministers present here merely represent you." (1)

Manson comments on this passage as follows:-

"In this account of the matter the universal Church is an intellectual abstraction. It is not represented at the ordination. The other ministers present, we are explicitly told, are the representatives of the local Church. I cannot but think that this is to push the autonomy of the local Church, and its autarky too, beyond anything that is warranted either by the Bible or by the history of the Church. If the minister is ordained to the ministry of the universal Church it follows inescapably that any ministers who take part do so as ministers of the universal Church, which is what they are by their own ordination. To call them the representatives of the local Church is merely to camouflage the fact that they are spectators of a transaction which could be done just as effectively if they were not there. I venture, with great humility, to suggest that there is a serious problem here, which Independents have to solve, the problem whether congregational omnipotence and omnicompetence can survive unmodified along with the real recognition of the existence and effective functioning of the Body of Christ of which all congregations are part." (2)

Manson goes on to quote the fifth of R.W.Dale's "Congregational Principles":-

"By the will of Christ every Society of Christians organized for Christian Worship, Instruction, and Fellowship is a Christian Church, and is independent of external control." (3)

(1) Manson, The Church's Ministry", 91ff (2) Ibid 92 (3) Ibid 98f

To this principle Manson would like to add a sixth:-

"By the will of Christ every Christian Church has an obligation to care for and be in fellowship with other Christian Churches." (1)

The means by which this obligation is to be met is by extending the covenant which binds together the members of a congregation to the County Union of Congregationalist Churches, so that it will bind together the member-congregations of that Union:-

"My concern for a new awareness of the meaning of a covenant is not limited to the local Church. I want to see a covenant for the County Union." (2)

But is not this to put the cart before the horse? The Body of Christ cannot be created by making covenants or by recognizing obligations to other Churches or by forming Baptist Unions or Congregational Unions. The whole Church was visibly present in Christ and his Apostles before there was any other congregation. The "Son of Man" was there in the person of Christ himself even without the Apostles. The unity came before the multiplicity.

This can be no better expressed than in the words of Dr Robinson:-

"For us, starting as we do with our conception of the Body of Christ as a society, the most pressing problem is how the many can be one. The multiplicity is obvious, the unity problematic. For Paul, the difficulty lies the other way round. The singularity of Christ's resurrection body is taken for granted, just as it was by those who saw it on Easter morning. It is the fact that it can consist of a number of persons that really calls for explanation. So we find Paul opening his longest discussion of the Church as the Body of Christ with the words: 'For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ.'" (3)

"It is worth noting how the fact of unity, as the basic

(1) Manson, The Church's Ministry, p.94 (2) The words are actually Principal Cunliffe-Jones's, quoted with approval by Manson, ibid 93.
 (3) J.A.T.Robinson, The Body, pp.58f.

"datum, always stands for Paul in the main sentence; the multiplicity, on the other hand, is expressed by a subordinate phrase or clause with the sense of "in spite of". ... The diversity is one that derives from the pre-existing nature of the unity as organic: it is not a diversity which has to discover or be made into a unity."(1)

In an additional comment on this matter, Dr Robinson refers his readers to Ephesians iv.3f, viz:-

"'Giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit.' The word is *ΤΡΩΞΙΒ*, to watch or keep an eye upon an independently established unity, not to keep up one that will cease to exist unless men create and foster it."(2)

The "horizontal" wholeness of the world-wide Church can best be visibly expressed by a ministry which is a ministry authorized by the whole. This should be a ministry which not only declares itself to be, but is manifestly to be seen to be, a ministry of the whole Church. A priest of the Church of England who claims to be a priest of the Catholic Church disregards the awkward fact that a large part of the Catholic Church repudiates his claim. The Congregationalist minister who claims to be a minister of the universal Church is doing precisely the same thing. All present-day ministries are partial in their authorization, and nothing is to be gained by concealing the fact. But the widest possible authorization is better than the narrowest possible, for at least it does as much as can be done to give expression to the unity of the Body of Christ. Browne showed no awareness of a need to express this unity visibly except by voluntary co-operation by otherwise independent congregations. For him the visible unity and wholeness of the Church was optional; it might, or might not, be created by the Churches as they pleased.

(1) Robinson, op.cit. p.60 (2) Ibid, footnote 2.

XI.

The first impression one gets upon reading Whitgift's searching analysis of Cartwright's argument is that the authority of Scripture is being diminished in the interests of the authority of the Church. But this is a wrong impression. Whitgift was so jealous of the authority of Scripture that he could not tolerate the "reading between the lines" so extensively practised by Cartwright. He regarded this process, and rightly regarded it, as an attempt to win the support of Scripture for the creations of a human imagination and so to give to them the authority which properly belongs only to the Word of God. It is not suggested, and Whitgift did not suggest, that Cartwright realized what he was doing, but only that this was what, in fact, the implication of his attempt to justify the Puritan Church polity from Scripture. It was Whitgift's merit that he swept aside Cartwright's house of cards and enquired what precisely it was that God demanded of his Church. He could find only the holding of the true faith and the due administration of the Sacraments as the things required by God. The silence of Scripture upon other matters was not to be taken as an invitation to make them appear to say what they did not explicitly say, but was to be interpreted to mean that God had left to the discretion of the Church to decide whatever he had not himself commanded. This was not, however, an unfettered discretion. The Church might not use her discretion in such a way as to contravene the law of God or

(1) Holding the true faith ought, of course, to be interpreted as including teaching others to hold it, assuring them of divine forgiveness of their sins by absolution, and so on.

contradict the Gospel. Apart from this restriction the Church was free where God had left her free.

There is here no diminishing of the true authority of the Word of God, but only a refusal to mix with it the inventions of the human mind. The Lordship of Christ in the Church is fully maintained even to the recognition that Christ did not exercise a detailed Lordship outside a limited area of the Church's activity. To this Lordship the authority of the Church was subordinate and inferior. What Christ had laid upon the Church might not be changed, but what the Church had decided for herself could later be changed by the Church as circumstances required. It was, however, to the Church that Christ had left this discretionary power, not to any private individual. It was an authority of the Church over the individual Christian.

Into these conceptions of the authority of Holy Scripture and the authority of the Church Hooker introduced some refinements. He showed that there were commandments of God in Scripture which could be regarded as having only a temporary force, and which in that respect were changeable, and he based the authority of the Church more firmly than Whitgift had done. To the negative idea that what God had left unregulated the Church was free to regulate, Hooker added that God had endowed men with the gift of reason, and with the Spirit to enlighten that reason. The Church's authority was based upon the consensus of the enlightened and inspired reasons of all Christians in every generation. This consensus was sufficient to outweigh the reasoning of any single Christian. The Church's

authority was weighty because it represented a vast accumulation of Christian experience.

It is when Whitgift comes to describe how the authority of the Church should be exercised that he fails to convince. He recognized that in a State whose ruler was not a Christian the authority of the Church must be exercised entirely by the Church herself through her officials. But when there was a Christian ruler it was a part of that ruler's prerogative to be supreme governor of the Church in his State, and to administer a part of the Church's authority.

Two things must be noticed here. First, in Whitgift's theory the Church did not delegate a part of her authority to the "godly Prince" to exercise on her behalf as her representative. Such a ruler was a delegate of God and he exercised his ecclesiastical jurisdiction by divine right, not by a grant of the Church. The accession of a "godly Prince" to the throne of a State previously pagan would therefore make a radical difference to the polity of the Church within that State, and that difference would come about by the will of God, not by the authority of the Church.

Secondly, only a part of the authority of the Church was transferred to the godly Prince. Whitgift did not claim that Queen Elizabeth, or any other ruler, might preach the Word, celebrate the Sacraments or, for example, consecrate a Bishop. He repudiated the idea that she had either the "power of order" or the "power to confer the power of order". Indeed the Queen herself and Parliament repudiated any such idea. What was claimed for her was that

(1) In 5 Eliz.c.1 "An Act for the ~~xxx~~ assurance of the Queen's royal power over all estates and subjects within her dominions." See Davies, Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy, 80ff.

she had power of visitation over the clergy; power to see that they did their work efficiently; power to direct when, where, and in what manner the sacraments should be celebrated; power to determine where, by whom, and how frequently sermons might be delivered; power to appoint those who were to be consecrated Bishops and to require that they be consecrated; "potestas jurisdictionis", in fact, but not "potestas ordinis". Similarly she had "jus liturgicum" which she might exercise after consultation with the Metropolitan. She might exercise her ecclesiastical jurisdiction through a commission, but in practice she normally exercised it through the Bishops.

Now it was open to Whitgift to argue that although the Queen did not claim "jus ordinis", but left that to the Church, it rightfully belonged to her as the Lord's anointed. This had already been put forward as a possible theory by Cranmer.⁽¹⁾ Whitgift's theory of the identity of the Church and the State in a Christian commonwealth logically required him to argue that all the powers of the Church resided in the "godly Prince", who delegated the power of order to the clergy just as she delegated the power of jurisdiction to a commission or to the Bishops. He did not, however, argue in this way, and by failing to do so confessed that the identity of Christian State and Christian Church was not complete. Within the State the Church had a "power" direct from God and held independently of the Queen; in respect of this power, then, the Church was an entity separable from the State and not identical with it.

(1) Davies, *Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy*, 66, 118-120
 Bromley, *Thomas Cranmer, Theologian*, 51f. Cranmer held this opinion hesitatingly, and was not fully committed to it.

By assuming that the Queen was endowed, directly under God, with her ecclesiastical jurisdiction, that she exercised that jurisdiction by divine right so long as she remained a Christian, Whitgift violated one of his own rules for ~~determining~~ determining what God had necessarily laid upon the Church. Nothing was to be regarded as of divine appointment unless it could be shown that it had been explicitly commanded in Scripture. The New Testament was of no assistance to Whitgift in this matter. St Paul, indeed, had taught his converts to hold even heathen rulers in great respect, since their authority came from God; ⁽¹⁾ but he had also taught them to settle their own disputes among themselves, and not to resort to pagan courts. ⁽²⁾ Jesus had taught that the things which Caesar could rightly claim were to be given to Caesar, but had suggested that there were things which only God could rightly claim, and only God might have those things. ⁽³⁾ The lack of definition of the things which an earthly ruler might, and might not, claim inevitably drove Whitgift from these passages to the Old Testament. There he could find examples of "godly Princes" who had exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction. But they were examples only, not laws, and Whitgift would not allow scriptural examples to be given the status of divine law. Even as examples they were not strictly relevant. The basis of the Old Covenant was national; the nation as a whole was the people of God, and therefore the national ruler was deeply implicated in the covenant. The basis of the new Covenant was not birth but faith, not membership of a nation but membership of a

(1) Rom;xiii.1-7 (2) I Cor;vi.1-4 (3) Mark xii.13-17

community bound together by a common belief, and it is not at all obvious that a national ruler, when he is a Christian, has by divine right as ruler any more power of governing the Church in his realm than he would have if he were a heathen, even though it might be convenient to accord him more.

The fact is that Whitgift was trying to maintain something which cannot convincingly be maintained from Scripture at all. Royal supremacy over the Christian Church was unknown until it was first exercised by Constantine I, the first Christian Emperor. As a result of their dislike of "imperium in imperio" earlier Emperors had taken the title of Pontifex Maximus. This did not necessarily involve them in the rites of the heathen religions practised within their territories, but it did give them power to supervise and control the activities of the adherents of these religions. (1) When Constantine became Emperor he assumed the same powers over the Church. No Christian protests were heard; the new regime, indeed, was received with thankfulness and even with adulation, for it meant the end of persecution; Eusebius set about the task of justifying the new order theologically. (2)

Royal supremacy over religion is not specifically a Christian idea at all, and that is why attempts to justify it on biblical grounds are unsatisfactory. It is better to start with the idea of "potestas jurisdictionis" as part of the authority left by God

(1) Jones, Constantine and the Conversion of Europe, 101.

(2) Greenslade, Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius, 10ff.

within the discretion of the Church, and delegated by the Church, at its discretion, to godly Princes. This, in effect, is what Hooker did in his Social Contract theory. The Queen was not so much the representative of God to rule the Church immediately under God, but the representative of the Church as she was of the State, in each case wielding the powers inherent in the body which she represented. It was open to Hooker to argue that the power of ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been handed back to the Church of England by Queen Mary in her Second Act of Repeal, 1554, and returned to the Crown again by the Supremacy Act, 1559. He is, however, quite vague about the time when the Church made over her power of jurisdiction to the Crown, and the Act itself is no help, for it contents itself with asserting that it restores a jurisdiction anciently belonging to the Crown and recently usurped by "foreign power and authority". Hooker's meaning, nevertheless, is quite clear; the Crown exercises ecclesiastical jurisdiction by delegation from the Church, not by divine right over and apart from the Church.

The reason for the vesting of the Crown with the "potestas jurisdictionis" of the Church, and a hint of the difficulties it might create, are contained in some words of "A Declaration of the Queen's Proceedings since her Reign" which was issued after the Rebellion of 1569. The royal supremacy was declared to be

"An office and charge as we think properly due to all Christian monarchs, and princes, sovereigns, whereby they only differ from pagan princes, that only take care of their subjects' bodies without respect to the salvation of their soul, or of the hereafter to come." (3)

(1) Gee and Hardy, op.cit.385ff (2) Ibid 442ff (3) Davies, Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy 82.

This Declaration recognizes that the aims of the Church and the aims of the Crown in a Christian State overlap. That was the justification for uniting the two jurisdictions under one supreme governor. But the identity of aims and the single supreme governor create the danger that the Church might become no more than a department of State unable to speak with any voice but that of the government. In modern England, where the supremacy of the Crown over the Church is retained in theory, it is allowed in practice to ride very lightly upon the Church, and the danger is largely avoided. "Imperium in imperio" is no longer feared as it was in Elizabethan England and in Constantine's Empire, and the Church is allowed to behave in some ways as though she were independent of the State. More could be done in this way than is yet being done. As William Temple said,

"It begins to be recognized in practice, and had better be plainly avowed, that the spiritual function of the State is not to regulate religion but to make free scope for it and to uphold the regulations made for its expression by the religious associations themselves."(1)

Along lines such as these a partnership might grow between Church and State to the mutual benefit of both. But the overlapping of aims would still cause tension. No State, not even a totalitarian State, claims to control quite every activity of its citizens, but the Church seeks to influence the entirety of human life and conduct. If the State is to respect the Church as an element in (to use Hooker's terms) the supernatural laws of God, equally the Church must respect the State as a part of the laws politic which also come from God, and not claim to dominate it but to partner it.

(1) Temple, Citizen and Churchman, 37.

XII.

Out of the foregoing study of the works of the Elizabethan controversialists, and from a comparison of their ideas with the teaching of the New Testament, a doctrine of the Church and the Ministry has emerged. It is that the powers Christ bestows upon his Church are bestowed upon the Church as a whole, and not in the first instance upon any one part or section of it. Among these powers is a wide discretion to determine what Christ has not already determined.

The multitudinous membership of the Church together with the nature of her tasks make it inevitable that the Church should use her discretion to delegate her powers to representatives who will exercise them on her behalf.

It is important to realize what the appointment of representatives of the Church involves. The ordination of a minister is not only the recognition that he has a *Χάρισμα* of the Spirit which makes him a person suitable to be a minister, nor only the acceptance by the Church of the ministration of that gift; it is both these things, and more. It is, as Hooker taught, the conferment of an additional *Χάρισμα* upon the ordinand; the power and authority which Christ bestows in the first instance upon the whole Church is focussed by ordination upon the minister to exercise as the Church's representative. It is not an authorization by the Church alone, but ordination by Christ-with-his-Church. It is not a merely human authorization, for Christ is not separated from his

(1) See above p.590

Church as though he departed from it at the Ascension, leaving it to its own devices. The Church is not a decapitated body, but a body with a head, and when it ordains it does so as ~~itself~~ itself the visible manifestation and representation of its head for the furtherance of his purposes.

Ideally, the authorization of a minister should be an ordination by the whole company of Christ's people throughout the world. Since at the present time this cannot be, it is desirable that authorization should be given on the widest attainable basis. It is necessary, also, to assume that authorization by a part of the whole is valid so far as it goes, otherwise it would be necessary to hold that no minister is, or at present can be, validly ordained. This assumption entails another, that each part of the whole may use the Church's discretionary power to authorize its representatives in such a manner as seems best to it; that is to say, that each part is at liberty to decide whether it shall ordain its ministers through the agency of a Bishop, or of a presbytery, or of a single congregation, or of the representatives of a single congregation, bestowing in each case upon the ordinand that partial authority that is at its disposal to give.

Recognition that the power and authority of Christ belong in the first instance to the whole Church, and not (even though the exercise of them is committed to representatives) to any section of the Church to the exclusion of the rest, involves the idea that the whole membership of the Church has an interest in the way in which

those powers are exercised. As beneficial owner of the powers the Church is concerned to see that her trustees fulfil their trust. In other words, she has the oversight of the powers of Christ as well as the powers themselves, and in this sense she rather than any section of her membership is heir and successor to the Apostles who first exercised that function of oversight. Like the power of order, however, the power of oversight must inevitably be delegated to representatives. It is within the discretion of the Church to delegate this jurisdiction to Bishops, to presbyteries, or to congregations, to a godly Prince, to a godly Parliament, or to a godly National Assembly. What is not tolerable is that any person should claim this jurisdiction as of right and against the will of the Church. That would be to usurp the authority of Christ-with-his-Church.

It cannot be claimed that if the Elizabethan controversialists had sat around a conference-table with this theory of the Church and the Ministry before them any one of them would have agreed with it, although each of them would have found something in it to satisfy him. But if, for the sake of the peace of the Church, they had accepted it, they would then have had to solve many further problems. Chief among these would have been the devising of some effective way of discouraging passivity in the bulk of the members of the Church. It is not enough for the Church to appoint its representatives and then to sit back as a spectator and critic of their activities. By some means that principle must always be kept

in view which the author of I Peter brought to the attention of his readers. He was writing to a group of Churches which had delegated their powers to Elders, but he did not allow them to think that by doing this they had discharged their responsibilities. Addressing them collectively as a single body he told them,

"You are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." I Pet;ii.9.