

Reprinted from *THE AVE MARIA*, for
August and September, 1898.

Ganss, Henry G.
— a City of Confusion
AEF8748 c.2

BX
5095
AEF8748 c.2

A CITY OF CONFUSION

THE CASE OF DR. BRIGGS

BY

THE REV. HENRY G. GANSS

AUTHOR OF "MARIOLATRY: NEW PHASES
OF AN OLD FALLACY."

NOTRE DAME, INDIANA:
THE AVE MARIA.

A CITY OF CONFUSION.

THE CASE OF DR. BRIGGS.

WHEN John Ruskin, in one of his oracular moods, declares that "the English liturgy was evidently drawn up with the amiable intention of making religion as pleasant as possible to a people desirous of saving their souls with no great degree of personal inconvenience,"* we are momentarily at a loss to know whether he is speaking apodictically or lapsing into a bit of satirical pleasantry. All the same, he gives expression to an epigram that almost possesses the force of a truism with ecclesiastical students. The compliant flexibility of the Protestant Episcopal Church, to use its official designation, has not only become the boast of its leading adherents, but, by a common consensus, the distinctive mark of its existence. Its reluctance to yield to the unbending logic of history in its true attitude to the so-called Reformation; its dexterity in minimizing and explaining

* "Letters to the Clergy."



its confessions of faith, "trying to clothe them in an orthodox dress, and to smoothe down whatever bears the look of novelty"; its vagueness and indefiniteness in enunciating its doctrinal formularies—"stammering lips of ambiguous formularies,"—have made it not only a source of amazement and no little suspicion to Protestant investigators, of perplexity not unmixed with mild diversion to Catholic students, but keen anxiety, if not profound sorrow, to sincere Anglicans.

Doctrinal mobility necessarily destroys the foundation of doctrinal certainty; and where doctrinal certainty is imperilled, Christian unity can not exist. "There is one God and one Christ," says St. Cyprian; "and His Church is one and the faith one and the people one, joined in the solid unity of one body by the cement of concord."*

Macaulay may have been guilty of one of those glittering generalizations in which the judiciousness of the reviewer is lost in the brilliancy of the rhetorician, when he claims that it is hard "to endure with patience the spectacle of a hundred sects battling within one church." All the same, he stands on unassailable ground when he premises the assertion that

* De Unitate Eccles., nn. 6-23.

“unity” the Episcopal Church “most certainly has not and never had.” Nor is his logic less irrefragable when he continues “that it is mere mockery to attach so much importance to unity in form and name where there is so little in substance.”*

When illustrious teachers in this Church with imperturbable gravity maintain “that the Church of England had always within herself persons of extreme divergence of faith,” and, to give this anomalous condition at least a shadow of plausibility, explain that this “divergence is a thing as inevitable as having different countenances on different men,”† by a natural mode of inferential reasoning we must conclude that St. Paul’s inflexible and impassioned advocacy of unity of faith was more in the nature of a mental hallucination than in the range of a realizable achievement. Or when another brilliant light of the hierarchy, with some display of petulance, argues that “in all times since the Reformation the people had been allowed to hold extreme doctrines on one side or the other,”‡ evidently no pretence is made that—

* Macaulay’s *Essays*, vol. ii, pp. 288–291.

† Bishop Wilberforce, in *The Times*. London, Oct. 10, 1867.

‡ *Ibid.*

One vast community
 Known by its unity
 Truly divine

was to be an infallible badge of Christ's Church. Or when one of its apologists sees the hand of Providence in this Church, "which never promulgated a doctrine or condemned a heresy," and complaisantly philosophizes, "May we not, then, discover traces of the all-wise Hand in the principles of liberality which are planted in the very bosom of our Establishment, by this adoption of articles that are deemed by different men to countenance their several opinions?"* it would be a blind fatuity not to own that unity of faith is a kind of religious curiosity long since relegated to the top shelf of theological museums. Or when one of its most recent advocates, with unaffected zeal and critical nicety, divides the various shades of belief in his church into divisions and subdivisions, with all the elaborate minuteness with which an entomologist would classify his *metabola* and *hemimetabola*,† one is almost tempted

* Alex. Knox, "Remains," vol, iii, p. 130.

† *The Churchman*, April 9, 1898, p. 529. The High Church is divided into: "1. The Romanizing section (very small); 2. The Ritualists (large and active); 3. The Moderate High (the largest); 4. The High Broad (small, but influential through personal charm)." (*Sic!*) The High Church, which

to admit that our Blessed Lord's universal prayer for unity has been nullified; that the zeal, labors, and trials of the Fathers in defence of it are a chimera; and that we must enter an emphatic denial that "unity is the law of Truth, . . . that evil dissociates and separates, and holiness unites because it draws to God; . . . that unity becomes the evidence of the presence of God, disunion a witness to the presence of evil."*

"The failure of Christianity to realize the ideal of our Saviour," says Dr. Briggs, "can not be any other than sinful. The organization and perpetuation of divisive measures in the Church are sins which should not be condoned."†

But may it not be urged that this "divergence of doctrine," these "extreme views," these "principles of liberality," do not affect the integrity of the Church, influence its *credenda*, or concern its formularies or doctrinal pronouncements?

If Bishop Colenso in confessing that he "could believe and receive the miracles of Scripture heartily, if only they were

* Grant, "Bampton Lectures," p. 65.

† *Reformed Quart. Rev.*, 1896, p. 306.

the writer contends "holds the field," is classified in a more generic way by the *Church Herald* (Nov. 13, 1869), as a party "mainly in the hands of adventurers or directed by brainless sentimentalists."

authenticated by a veracious history," and a shining light of the bishop's church makes the admission that "it is probably true that ninety per cent of our bishops to-day believe and teach the views for which Bishop Colenso was deposed";* if Matthew Arnold is singled out as a champion to whom "churchmen above all should not be willing to ignore their debt of gratitude..., who gave so long and so unselfishly to the defence of the Establishment the noblest resources of his mind and heart,"† and yet the most frenetic infidel never uttered more blistering blasphemies;‡ if the Rev. G. C. Gorham in denying baptismal regeneration, and the highest ecclesiastical tribunal of the church sustaining him; if Frederic Denison Maurice in accepting a public expression of thanks "for questioning and denying eternal punishment"; if Arch-

* Dr. S. D. McConnell in *The Churchman*, Feb. 5, 1898.

† Ibid., March 5, 1898.

‡ Here is his description of the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity: The Father, "a sort of infinitely magnified and improved Lord Shaftesbury, with a race of vile offenders to deal with, whom his natural goodness would incline him to let off, only his sense of justice will not allow it; then a younger Lord Shaftesbury, on the scale of his father, and very dear to him, who might live in grandeur and splendor if he liked, but who prefers to leave his home to go and live among the race

bishop Hampden in being publicly branded by his church organ as being "as well known a heretic as Arius"; if Dr. Littledale in calling the Reformers "utterly unredeemed villains"; if Charles Kingsley in extolling them as providential factors and divinely potential figures in the church; if Lord Halifax, in search of corporate reunion with Rome, insists upon the utter exclusion of all Protestant bodies; if Archbishop Tait, endeavoring to effect a Christian alliance between the Anglican Church and Spurgeon's tabernacle, dismisses the pretensions of Rome and Moscow; if the Church, in setting the seal of public condemnation on the writers of *Essays and Reviews*, as being saturated with deadly heresy, afterward honored its leading contributor as Primate of England; if Queen Victoria, Supreme

of offenders, and to be put to an ignominious death, on condition that his merits shall be counted against their demerits; and that his father's goodness shall be restrained no longer from taking effect, but any offender shall be admitted to the benefit of it on simply pleading the satisfaction made by the son; and then, finally, a third Lord Shaftesbury, still on the same high scale, who keeps very much in the background, and works in a very occult manner, but very efficaciously nevertheless, and who is busy in applying everywhere the benefits of the son's satisfaction and the father's goodness." — "Literature and Dogma," p. 306. London edition.

head of the Church, during her visits to Scotland, with unfailling courtesy, religiously attends the Kirk, and receives the Lord's Supper from the hands of a dissenting minister; or, to come nearer home, if the Rev. R. Heber Newton, at All Souls' Church, New York, assails the authenticity and inspiration of Holy Scripture ("Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation," Art. vi); if the Rev. Arthur Ritchie, at St. Ignatius', in inculcating devotion to the Mother of God ("The invocation of saints is a fond thing vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, . . . repugnant to the word of God."—Art. xxii); if the Rev. T. McK. Brown, at St. Mary the Virgin's, teaches seven sacraments and the Real Presence ("There are but two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel," etc.—Art. xxv. "Christ is figuratively in the bread and wine, and spiritually in them that worthily eat the bread and drink the wine; but our Blessed Lord is really, carnally and corporally, in heaven alone, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead");* if the Rev. A. G. Mortimer, at St. Mark's, Philadelphia, as a sacrificing priest offers up mass and prays for the dead ("Wherefore the

* Cranmer, quoted in Hardwick's "History of the Reformation," p. 209.

sacrifice of the masses,* in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.”—Art. xxxi. “The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory . . . is a fond thing vainly invented,” etc.—Art. xxii); if after allowing Bishop Sessums, of Louisiana, to teach such rampant heresy, “that eighteen Presbyterian, seventeen Methodist, twelve Lutheran and three Baptist ministers” † were compelled to vindicate the common cause of Christianity, irrespective of denominational lines, in a public protest; if Dr. Ewer execrating his ecclesiastical progenitors, the Reformers, for having “slain the Holy Ghost, destroyed the Son,” and calling the glorious Reformation “a ghastly work, . . . the mother of uncomeliness, . . . essential adultery”; if Bishop A. Cleveland Coxe with passionate warmth championing apostolic succession against all assailants; if Phillips Brooks curtly dismissing the same, for the reason “that there is not a line in our Prayer-Book,

* The quibbling over the word “masses” is very weak. The Coronation Oath administered to the sovereign, and until recently to every bishop entering Parliament, reads: “I do believe that . . . the *sacrifice of the mass*, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous.”

† N. Y. *Sun*, May 7, 1897.

there is not a word in our formularies, which declares any such thing,"—*if* all these mutually destructive, hopelessly irreconcilable, eternally incompatible opinions and teachings are mere emotional vagaries, sentimental differences, "divergencies of doctrine and extreme views," in which fundamental truths are not sacrificed, and identity of principles still preserved, then we are confronted by one of the most stupendous and inscrutable enigmas that ever baffled human reason, enough to make the head reel, the mind grow dizzy, the heart faint.

Or must we dismiss what Principal Tulloch eulogistically styles "the comprehensiveness and genial width" of the formularies, with Calvin's caustic estimate that at best they are but "tolerable fooleries"—*tolerabiles ineptias?** Or chuckle at the cynicism of one of the most popular of contemporary writers when he claims that the "Church of England drives with an exceedingly loose rein: you can do anything you like in it, provided you go about it decorously"?† Or must we in sheer exasperation abandon the study altogether because, in the unfilial language of one of its most illustrious sons, the Established Church is "the most

* Epp., p. 28, tom. ix, ed. 1617.

† Harold Frederic, *Cosmopolitan*, May, 1898, p. 37.

absurd and indefensible of all institutions now existing in the world"?*

Who would not look upon it as the height of temerity or a weakness of the human intellect to attempt an irenic fusion of the creed of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Jowett, Archdeacon Denison and Dr. McNeile, Dean Stanley and Baring-Gould, Canon Farrar and Canon Liddon, Dr. Lee and Canon Gore; Father Ignatius, of Llanthony Abbey, England, and Dr. Rainsford, of St. George's Church, New York? Easier to amalgamate the doctrines of John Calvin with those of Gautama Buddha. "And the whole city was filled with confusion." † "For He is not the God of dissension, but of peace." ‡

Strange as it may seem, we have the spectacle of one of the most revered men in the Establishment—a man who left a mark on its collegiate and university life, Dr. Arnold, of Rugby—actually proposing "that all sects should be united by act of Parliament with the Church of England, on the principle of retaining all their distinctive errors and absurdities"; § a scheme that no doubt Charles Kingsley, Dean Stanley, Canon Farrar, and Dean

* Macaulay, quoted in *North Am. Rev.*, Jan., 1858.

† Acts, xix, 29.

‡ I. Cor., xiv, 33.

§ Liddon's "Life of Pusey," vol. i, p. 265.

Elliot would have sanctioned and championed. Did not this church, to use the words of Dr. Schaff, "nurse at her breasts Calvinistic Puritans, Armenian Methodists, liberal Latitudinarians, and Romanizing Tractarians?"* Why hesitate in having a reunion? But would this be the Church of the Fathers, the Church of the Apostles, the Church of Christ—the one, holy, Catholic, apostolic Church?

These reflections become more than ordinarily suggestive—in fact, strut into obtrusive prominence—in the face of an event that has created considerable stir in ecclesiastical circles within the last few months. The reception into the Protestant Episcopal Church of a man whose expulsion from the Presbyterian Church for heresy, and the probable admission of this man as a minister of the Episcopal Church while professedly adhering with unfaltering loyalty to the Westminster Confession and Higher Criticism methods, is an ecclesiastical incident, the progress of which is watched with anxious interest, and the *dénouement* of which may be attended with some unexpected surprises.

The Rev. Charles Augustus Briggs, D. D., the hero of this episode, was appointed to fill the newly endowed

* "Creeds of Christendom," vol. i, p. 598.

Edward Robinson chair of Biblical Theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York, November 11, 1890. Dr. Briggs at the time was one of the most respected, conspicuous and commanding figures of American Presbyterianism. He was also one of the most profoundly learned and daringly original advocates of the Higher Criticism. To sound scholarship and a veritable storehouse of solid erudition he unites a trenchant literary style, dauntless courage, and indefatigable industry. In his biblical studies, following rather in the path broken by Delitzsch, Driver, Davidson, and Cheyne, than in that pursued by Hengstenberg, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, he finally outstripped them all, not only in the novel and startling nature of his conclusions, but in the combative aggressiveness and temerarious boldness with which he championed them. His learning is generally conceded, his piety remains unassailed; his motives have not been questioned nor his sincerity impugned.

His treatment of the Catholic Church is characterized by manly fairness, at times reverential sympathy, always devoid of sectarian animus. In fact, his attitude to the mother Church was so uniformly fair and equitable, the trend of his writings—abstracting, of course, from his Higher Criticism postulates—so provok-

ingly "Romish" as to call down upon him no little measure of reproach from the Protestant press; the prediction being pretty universally indulged that, like Newman, Manning, Brownson, etc., his spiritual problems would find their logical and ultimate solution in Catholicity.

The inaugural address,* which brought matters to a crisis, and brought Dr. Briggs before the Presbytery of New York as an attainted heretic, was delivered January 20, 1891. It is not in the scope of this article, nor, for that matter, has it any relevancy to the subject, to analyze these imputed heresies or follow the protracted and bitterly contested trial through all the stages of ecclesiastical procedure. Suffice it that the action of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, in session at Washington, D. C., June 1, 1893, reversed the judgment of the Presbytery of New York. It finds that "the said Charles A. Briggs has uttered, taught, and propagated views, doctrines, and teachings contrary to the essential doctrines of Scripture... in violation of the ordination vow"; that "the said erroneous teachings, views, and does hereby suspend Charles A. Briggs...

* "The Authority of Holy Scripture," Scribner, 1893.

from the office of a minister of the Presbyterian Church.”*

doctrines strike at the very vitals of religion; ...wherefore this general assembly...

The charges on which Dr. Briggs was suspended cover a wide ground—from maintaining that “the Reason and the Church are great fountains of authority,” to denying the inerrancy and authenticity of Holy Scripture, the authorship of Isaias, and teaching a thinly-veiled doctrine of Purgatory—progressive sanctification after death.

With the brand of a heretic (justly or unjustly affixed concerns us not) fresh upon his brow; with the widespread notoriety of his expulsion from the Presbyterian Church still the subject of public discussion; with his relations as professor in a Presbyterian theological seminary remaining intact; with his biblical doctrines and opinions unmodified and unrecalled; with the avowal that he still clings to the Westminster Confession of Faith in its unimpaired integrity,—he knocks at the portals of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and without further ceremony gains admission and membership. Not only this, but at this moment is preparing for priestly orders.

* “The Defence of Professor Briggs,” part iii, Scribner, 1893.

No wonder the religious world is in a state of feverish expectancy, awaiting the curtain to be raised on the next scene of this strange and bewildering drama. No wonder one of the most conservative and authoritative secular papers* propounds the question, Are Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism interchangeable creeds?

This query of a secular paper inspired the present attempt to prove that Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism were really interchangeable at the birth of the English Reformation; that Protestantism and Episcopalianism were not only convertible terms, but that the ordination to which Dr. Briggs will submit was seldom exacted; that Anglican orders, as now understood, were nothing more than a repristination of pre-Reformation doctrine; and that if ancient Episcopalian precedent were followed, Dr. Briggs would be admitted to exercise the functions of the ministry with as much alacrity as he was to share the privileges of Episcopalian membership.

What makes the status of Dr. Briggs different from that of Saravia, Travers, Calendrin, Allix, Du Moulin, De Laune, De Beauvais, Primrose, the De l'Angle brothers, the younger Du Moulin, and

* The New York *Sun*.

many other Reformed ministers, all of whom were admitted to benefices, treated as "priests," and universally recognized by the primates, bishops, theologians, and universities of the Church of England at its very establishment?

The subject as here treated may form a supplementary chapter to a controversy that has for years aroused much discussion—we mean Anglican orders. But, strange to say, the phase here treated, and which Dr. Briggs' case will revive, was almost totally ignored.

The questions which the following anthology proposes to answer from a purely historical point of view, availing itself of *exclusively Protestant testimony*, are: Was the Anglican Church Catholic or Protestant in its origin? Was the absolute, indispensable necessity of episcopacy, or episcopal ordination to the ministry or priesthood, enjoined by canon, observed by precedent, or uniformly acknowledged in practice?

The evidence adduced represents the verdict of Protestant historians, the consentient opinion of the Anglican hierarchy, and its authoritative exponents contemporaneous and immediately subsequent to the so-called Reformation. The citations are given without note or comment.

MACAULAY.

“The English reformers were eager to go as far as their brethren on the Continent. They unanimously condemned as anti-Christian numerous dogmas and practices to which Henry [VIII.] had stubbornly adhered, and which Elizabeth reluctantly abandoned. Many felt a strong repugnance even to things indifferent which had formed part of the polity and ritual of the mystical Babylon. Thus Bishop Hooper, who died manfully at Gloucester for his religion, long refused to wear the episcopal vestments. Bishop Ridley, a martyr of still greater renown, pulled down the ancient altars of his diocese, and ordered the Eucharist to be administered in the middle of churches, at tables which Papists irreverently termed oyster-beds. Bishop Jewell pronounced the clerical garb to be a stage dress, a fool’s coat, a relic of the Amorites, and promised that he would spare no labor to extirpate such degrading absurdities. Archbishop Grindal long hesitated about accepting a mitre, for dislike of what he regarded as the mummery of consecration. Bishop Parkhurst uttered a fervent prayer that the Church of England would propose to herself the Church of Zurich as the absolute pattern of a Christian community. Bishop Boner

was of the opinion that the word *bishop* should be abandoned to the Papists, and that the chief officers of the purified church should be called superintendents.”*

“The Church of Rome held that episcopacy was of divine institution, and that certain graces of a high order had been transmitted by the imposition of hands through fifty generations, from the eleven who received their commission on the Galilean mount to the bishops who met at Trent. A large body of Protestants, on the other hand, regarded prelacy as positively unlawful, and persuaded themselves that they found a very different form of ecclesiastical government prescribed in Scripture. The founders of the Anglican Church took a middle course. They retained episcopacy, but they did not declare it to be an institution essential to the welfare of a Christian society or to the efficacy of the Sacraments. Cranmer, indeed, plainly avowed his conviction that in primitive times there was no distinction between bishops and priests, and that the laying on of hands was altogether unnecessary.”†

“The King—such was the opinion of

* “History of England,” vol. i, p. 39. Lippincott, 1878.

† Ibid., p. 41.

Cranmer, given in the plainest words—might, in virtue of authority derived from God, make a priest; and a priest so made needed no ordination whatever.* ... In the reign of Elizabeth, Jewell, Cooper, Whitgift, and other eminent doctors, defended prelacy as innocent, as useful, as what the state might lawfully establish; as what, when established by the state, was entitled to the respect of every citizen;... they regarded the Protestants of the Continent as of the same household of faith with themselves.... An English churchman—nay, even an English prelate—if he went to Holland, conformed without scruple to the established religion of Holland.... It was even held that Presbyterian ministers were entitled to place and voice in œcumenical councils.... Nay, many English benefices were held by divines who had been admitted to the ministry in the Calvinistic form used on the Continent; nor was reordination by a bishop in such cases thought necessary or even lawful.” †

GREEN. ‡

“England became the common refuge of the panic-stricken Protestants. Bucer

* Ibid., p. 43.

† Ibid., p. 59.

‡ John Richard Green was himself an Anglican clergyman, and for a time vicar of an East London parish.

and Fagius were sent to lecture at Cambridge. Peter Martyr advocated the anti-sacramentarian views at Oxford.* Even the episcopal mode of government which still connected the English Church with the old Catholic communion was reduced to a form; in Cranmer's mind the spiritual powers of the bishops were drawn simply from the King's commission, as the temporal jurisdiction was exercised in the King's name. They were reduced, therefore, to the position of royal officers, and called to hold their offices simply as royal favors." †

"Hooper, who had been named Bishop of Gloucester, refused to wear episcopal habits, and denounced them as the livery of the 'harlot of Babylon'—a name for the Papacy, which was supposed to have been discovered in the Apocalypse. Ecclesiastical orders almost came to an end. Priests flung aside their surplices as superstitious. Patrons of livings presented their huntsmen and gamekeepers to the benefices in their gift and kept the stipend." ‡ "The government, however, was far from quailing before this division of the episcopate [rejection of the new

* "History of the English People," vol. i, p. 158.

† Ibid., p. 162.

‡ Ibid., p. 163.

liturgy]. Dowdall was driven from the country; and the vacant sees were filled with Protestants like Bale, of the most advanced type.”*

FROUDE.

“The position of bishops in the Church of England has been from the first anomalous. . . . The method of episcopal appointments instituted by Henry VIII. as a temporary expedient, and abolished under Edward VI. as an unreality, was re-established by Elizabeth,—not certainly because she believed that the invocation of the Holy Ghost was required for the completeness of an election which her own choice had already determined, not because the bishops obtained any gifts of grace in their consecration which she herself respected, but because the shadowy form of an election with a religious ceremony following it gave them the semblance of spiritual independence—the semblance without the substance,—which qualified them to be instruments of the system which she desired to enforce. They were tempted to presume on their phantom dignity, till the sword of Cromwell taught them the true value of apostolic descent; and we have a right to regret that the original theory of

* Ibid., p. 164.

Cranmer was departed from; that, being officers of the Crown, as much appointed by the sovereign as the Lord Chancellor, the bishops should not have worn openly their real character, and received their appointments by letter patent without further ceremony.

“The Presbyterians did not resent authority as such, but authority which assumed a divine origin, when resting on nothing but a *cong e d’ lire*. . . . No national object was secured by the transparent fiction of the election and consecration. The invocation of the Holy Spirit either meant nothing and was a taking of sacred names in vain, or it implied that the Third Person of the Trinity was, as a matter of course, to register the already declared decision of the English sovereign. . . . The wisest and best of its bishops have found their influence impaired, their position made equivocal, by the element of unreality that adheres to them. A feeling approaching to contempt has blended with the reverence attaching to their position, and has prevented them from carrying the weight in the councils of the nation which has been commanded by men of no greater intrinsic eminence in other professions. Pretensions which many of them would have gladly abandoned have connected their office with a

smile. . . . The latest and most singular theory about them is that of the modern English neo-Catholic who disregards his bishop's advice and despises his censures; but looks on him, nevertheless, as some high-bred, worn-out animal; useless in himself, but infinitely valuable for some mysterious purpose of breeding." *

HALLAM.

"It is evident, by some passages in Strype attentively considered, that natives regularly ordained abroad in the Presbyterian churches were admitted to hold preferment in England; the first bishop who objected to them was Aylmer. Instances, however, of foreigners holding preferment without any ordination may be found down to the civil wars." † "Cranmer and some of the original founders of the Anglican Church, far from maintaining the divine and indispensable right of episcopal government, held that bishops and priests were of the same order." ‡

CHILD.

"It can be proved beyond reasonable doubt that Episcopal orders were not insisted upon in practice in the Church

* "History of England," vol. xii, pp. 557, 558.

† "Constitutional History of England," vol. i, ch. vii, p. 386.

‡ Ibid., 388.

of England as an indispensable condition to the ministry down to the Rebellion, or in one or two instances after it. . . . We may trace a perfect tradition in the English Church to the effect that the validity of non-Episcopal orders to a whole line of bishops, from Jewell, in the commencement of Elizabeth's reign, through Whitgift, Bancroft, Andrews, Overall, Mirton, and Cousin."*

FISHER.

"There is no trace of such a doctrine [apostolic succession] in 'The Apology for the Church of England,' and in 'The Defence of the Apology,' by Jewell, which has been regarded by Anglicans with just pride as a masterly refutation of Roman Catholic accusations against their system."†

"Near the end of Elizabeth's reign, Hooker, in his celebrated work in defence of the Church of England [Ecclesiastical Polity], fully concedes the validity of the Presbyterian ordination. . . . Even as late as 1618, in the reign of James I., an English bishop‡ and several Anglican

* Child (Gilbert W.), Exeter College "Church and State under the Tudors," p. 293, et seq.

† "History of the Reformation," p. 334.

‡ Bishop Hall: "My unworthiness was named for one of the assistants of that honorable, grave and reverend body."

clergymen sat in the synod of Dort, with a presbyter for its moderator.... The episcopal constitution of the English Church for a long period put no barrier in the way of the most free and fraternal relations between that body and the Protestant churches on the Continent.... Ministers who had received Presbyterian ordination were admitted to take charge of English parishes without a question as to the validity of their orders.”*

BREWER.

“A bishop may make a priest by the Scripture, and so may princes and governors also, and that by the authority of God committed to them. In common with other reformers, Cranmer looked upon all spiritual functions as absolutely dependent on the will of the King, as temporal commissions, like those of any other magistrate.”†

MILLER.

“The theological professors at Oxford and Cambridge were Calvinistic for fifteen years from Elizabeth’s accession. Bucer and Peter Martyr were called by Cranmer to the chair of divinity in Oxford and Cambridge during the reign of Edward. Cranmer, too, in 1552, invited

* Ibid., pp. 333-335.

† “English Studies,” p 333.

Calvin, Bullinger, and Melanchthon to England to aid in drawing up a confession of faith for Protestant churches.”*

GAILLARD.

“The Cranmers, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Jewell, and Hooker, of the days of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth, though persuaded in favor of episcopacy and zealously attached to it, cordially embraced Lutheran churches as sisterly communions.”†

NEALE.

“And here [the ordination of bishops, priests and deacons] it is observable that the form of ordaining a priest and a bishop is the same we [Presbyterians] use, there being no express mention in the words of ordination whether it be for the one or the other office.‡ This has been altered of late years, since a distinction of the two orders has been so generally admitted; but that was not the received doctrine of these times. The committee struck out most of the modern rites of the Church of Rome, and contented themselves, says Bishop Burnet, with those mentioned in Scripture—viz., the imposition of hands and prayer.”||

* Dr. Miller, “The Conflict of Centuries,” p. 93.

† “History of the Reformation,” p. 552.

‡ Burnet, Hist. of the Ref., vol. ii, p. 144; Collier’s Eccles. Hist., vol. ii, p. 290.

|| “History of the Puritans,” vol. i, p. 50.

Summing up the reign of Edward VI., Neale continues:

“Thirdly, that they [the Reformers] believed in but two orders of churchmen in Holy Scripture: bishops and deacons; and consequently that bishops and priests were but two different ranks or degrees of the same order. Fourthly, that they gave the right-hand of fellowship to foreign churches and ministers that had not been ordained by bishops, there being no dispute about re-ordination in order to any church preferment, till the latter end of Queen Elizabeth’s reign.”*

“After these, Mr. Robert Blair came from Scotland to Bangor [1623], Mr. Hamilton to Bellywater, and Livingston to Kilinshy, in the county of Down, with Mr. Welsh, Dunbar, and others. Mr. Blair was a zealous Presbyterian and scrupled episcopal ordination; but the bishop of the diocese compromised the difference by agreeing that the other Scots presbyters of Mr. Blair’s persuasion should join with him; and that such passages in the established form of ordination as Mr. Blair and his brethren disliked should be omitted, or exchanged for others of their own approbation. Thus was Mr. Blair ordained publicly in the church of Ban-

* Ibid., p. 57.

gor; the Bishop of Raphoe did the same for Mr. Livingston; and all the Scots who were ordained in Ireland from this time to the year 1642 were ordained in the same manner; all of them enjoyed the churches and tithes, though they remained Presbyterian and used not the liturgy; nay, the bishops consulted them about affairs of common concernment to the church, and some of them were members of the convocation of 1634.”*

BLAKENEY.

“No one of the Church of England in those days thought of calling into question the validity of the orders and sacraments of the Reformed churches.”†

PRYNNE.

“In July, 1604, hee [Laud] proceeded batchelour of divinitie. His supposition when he answered in divinitie schooles for his degree, concerning the efficacie of baptisme, was taken *verbatim* out of Bellarmine; and hee maintained there could be no true church without diocesan bishops, for which Dr. Holland [then Doctor in the chaire] openly reprehended him in the schooles for a seditious person who would unchurch the Reformed churches beyond the seas, and sow a

* Ibid., vol. ii, pp. 89, 90.

† Dr. Blakeney, Book of Common Prayer, in its Hist. and Interpret., p. 630.

division between us and them who were brethren, by this novel popish doctrine.”*

STRYPE.

“Cranmer ‘sent letters to Bullinger, Calvin, Melanchthon, disclosing to them his pious design to draw up a book of articles, and requesting their counsel and furtherance... that Calvin’ could do nothing more profitable to the church than to write often to the King.”†

“When Archbishop Sandys endeavored to deprive Whittingham of the deanery of Durham because he received only Presbyterian orders, ‘it fell to the ground; the lord president observing with some warmth, before the Archbishop and the other members of the commission, that he could not in conscience agree to deprive him for that; for it would be ill taken of all the godly and learned at home and abroad that we should allow of the popish massing priests in our ministry, and disallow of ministers made in a Reformed church.’”‡

SPOTTSWOOD.

“A question in the meantime was moved by Doctor Andrews, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the

* Breviate of his Life, p. 2.

† Life of Cranmer, pp. 407-413.

‡ Strype’s “Annals,” vol. ii, p. 523.

Scottish bishops, who, as he said, must first be ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Doctor Bancroft, who was by, maintained 'that thereof there was no necessity; seeing, where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed churches.' This applauded by the other bishops, Ely acquiesced; and at the day and in the place appointed the three Scottish bishops were consecrated."*

MACKAY.

"For a century and a half after the Reformation nearly all the most eminent sons of the church, including the High Churchmen, recognized Presbyterian and other orders as valid, though irregular. For one hundred and ten years after the Ordinal was drawn up and the Articles signed, men who had received no episcopal ordination were admitted without further ceremony in the English Church; and this was done by High Churchmen like Bancroft, Cosin, and Bramhall."†

* "History of the Church of Scotland," p. 514 (ed. 1610).

† Angus Mackay, *Westminster Review*, Oct., 1896.

KEBLE.

“Nearly up to the time when he [Hooker] wrote, numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England with no better than Presbyterian ordination; and it appears by Travers’ supplication to the council that such was the construction not uncommonly put upon the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth, permitting those who had received orders in any other form than that of the English Service Book, on giving certain securities, to exercise their calling in England. If it were really the intention of that act to authorize other than episcopal ordination, it is but one proof more of the low accommodating notions concerning the church which then prevailed.”*

GRIFFIS.

“Indeed for a hundred years after the publication of the first English Book of Common Prayer, and for eleven decades after the Reformation, there was no denial in the Anglican Church of the validity of non-episcopal ordination. The highest preferments in that church were open to men on whom no chrism...or bishop’s hands had been laid. Not only were the Reformers from the Continent welcomed,

* Keble, “Hooker’s Ecclesiastical Polity,” vol. i, p. lxxv.

both as equals and teachers, and invited to assist in making the Church of England a true Reformed church, but large portions, probably two-thirds in all, of the form and language of the Book of Common Prayer are borrowed directly from the creeds and confessions of both Calvinistic and Lutheran churches, in which episcopal ordination was unknown and looked upon as an unreformed relic of popery....

“Indeed those who have studied the influence of Luther and Calvin in making the English standards, formularies, and prayer-books, would wonder how there could be any objection to the continental types of Christianity or to their exemplars in the ministry. Cranmer and Coverdale, and the men who compiled the Book of Common Prayer, who translated or adapted page after page and sentence after sentence from Luther’s catechism and sermons, and from Melanchthon’s writings; from Brandenburg-Nuremberg Kinderpredigten, from Osiander; from the books of Calvin, Bucer, Alasco, and from the Strasburg liturgy,—would have smiled at the idea of excluding from the Church of England those to whom they were so much obligated. It would be like the debtor assailing the character of the creditor, or denying the quality of gold he

borrowed. Hooker, the champion of the Anglican Church, practically surrendered the question, and joined with Cranmer, Calvin, Bucer, Alasco, and the common opinion of Reformed Christendom, when he said: 'There may sometimes be very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop....'

"It was the boast of the Church of England that she was a true Reformed church. Her ambition was to be equal in scriptural character to the Reformed churches on the Continent, whose scholars and scholarship, learning and writings, she so freely borrowed that, in the Book of Common Prayer, probably two-thirds of what is not of Catholic origin or from the Bible is Lutheran or Calvinistic."*

POCOCK.

"Of the clergy who had been imprisoned or banished during the reign of her sister Mary, there were two classes who may be roughly designated as Zwinglians and Calvinists. Those who had been imprisoned had such violent altercations that one party refused to communicate with the others, whom they designated as free-willers because they would not commit themselves to all the horrors of

* Dr. Griffis, "Bibliotheca Sacra," Oct., 1893, p. 89, et seq.

an unmitigated Calvinism. They were also at issue about certain minor matters, such as the lawfulness of playing at bowls. Quarrels of a similar kind had originated amongst the exiles, who had been refused admission to all places where Lutheranism prevailed, being designated by the Lutherans as the devil's martyrs because of their supposed adoption of the tenets of Zwingli and Calvin. They had settled in various towns of Switzerland, and in considerable numbers at Frankfort. Here altercations arose, the moderate party being content to abide by the Zwinglian form of doctrine, which, as they thought, pervaded the Second Prayer-Book of the reign of Edward VI.; whilst the more fanatical considered the book as too papistical, and were for a further reformation of it, such as had been contemplated at the time of the premature death of the King. These latter retired in a body to Geneva and Basle. Speaking generally, these were Calvinists and the others Zwinglians.

“The two systems may be sufficiently, though perhaps roughly, described as the one consisting mainly in the disparagement or denial of sacramental grace, the sacraments being regarded as symbols and not instruments of grace; the other pronouncing the sacraments as in some

way efficacious, but only to the elect, by increasing the grace they previously possessed, and from which it was impossible for them entirely and finally to fall away.... Such were the parties from which bishops had to be chosen; and for the most part the preference was given to the Frankfort and Zurich exiles, who adopted the more moderate position, and were likely to give less trouble to the civil power.

“...As to a belief in an apostolical succession in the episcopate, it is not to be found in any of the writings of the Elizabethan bishops. Unmistakable evidence of this as regards Bishop Jewell, of Salisbury, exists in his correspondence with Archbishop Parker with regard to the interference of Lancaster, Archbishop-elect of Armagh, in ordaining priests in his diocese. It seems that Lancaster had taken upon himself to admit diverse persons into holy orders, and amongst them one whom Jewell had for eight years, for what appeared to himself good reasons, refused to ordain. He makes no complaint of the illegality, much less of the invalidity, of the act, but only of the indiscretion of the Archbishop-elect. Now, this letter is dated April 26, 1568; and June 13 in the same year Lancaster was consecrated by the Archbishop of Dublin

and the Bishops of Meath and Kildare. If he is the same person who held the see of Kildare 1550-54, he must have either acted as bishop without being consecrated or else he underwent a second consecration in 1568. There is nothing more wonderful in the whole history of the Church of England at a time when probably not a single bishop was to be found who believed in his own divine commission or in the efficacy of the sacraments; when, almost without exception, they were indifferent to any other consideration than that of promotion and the providing for their own families.

“... Calvinism, which subsequently overran the whole church, was the dominant creed even at the very beginning of the reign of Elizabeth. For though Elizabeth first appointed bishops who were of the Zwinglian rather than the Calvinistic school, the laity, as well as the majority of the clergy who had fallen in with the new learning, were for the most part Calvinists, the tenets of the French Reformer having already been extensively adopted, though their great development in the country belongs to a later date.

“... At Oxford in 1559 a statute was passed—‘The younger members of the University should be instructed either in Calvin’s or in the Heidelberg Catechism;

and they should afterward read the works of the Swiss divine Bullinger, who had succeeded Zwingli as a teacher at Zurich and the Institutes of Calvin."*

SHORT.

"The Church of England first ceased to be a member of the Church of Rome during the reign of Henry VIII.,...but it could hardly be called Protestant till that of Edward VI.... During the short reign of Edward VI. it became entirely Protestant, and in point of doctrine assumed its present form." †

"BRITISH CRITIC." ‡

"The immediate successors of the Reformers, as often happens in such cases, went further than their predecessors did, and were more deeply imbued with the feelings of the day. The episcopate in the first part of Queen Elizabeth's reign were successors of Hooper and Coverdale almost more than they were of Cranmer

* Pocock N. (editor of Burnet's Hist. of the Ref.) in *Guardian*, Nov. 9, 23, 30, 1892.

† "History of the Church of England," p. 593.— In our times Archbishop Campbell [Canterbury] substantially maintains the same: "Everyone knows that we of the Church of England, in the early times of our history after the Reformation, were much more connected with the non-episcopal than with the episcopal communions." ("Present Position of the Church of England," p. 90.)

‡ October, 1842, pp. 330, 331.

and Ridley; indeed it was only her strong Tudor arm that kept them within decent bounds. The greater part of them positively objected to the surplice — including Sandys, Grindal, Pilkington, Jewell, Horne, Parkhurst, Bentham, and all the leading men who were for simplifying our church ceremonial in that and other respects, according to the Genevan [that is Presbyterian] model.”

It is to be feared that this taking of testimony will wear upon the patience of readers who are not controversially minded. But it is necessary to know the position of “the early fathers” of the Episcopal Church on the subject of Orders. Hence we continue the citation of the witnesses.

CRANMER.*

When in 1540 “The Resolutions of several Bishops and Divines” was submitted to the bishops by Henry VIII., Archbishop Cranmer gave the following replies: (10th question.) “The bishops and priests at one time were not two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ’s religion.” (12th question.) “In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a bishop or priest needeth no consecration by Scripture; for election or

* Archbishop of Canterbury (1489–1556).

appointment thereto is sufficient.”* (14th question.) It is not forbidden by God’s law “if all the bishops and priests in a region were dead, that the king of that region should make bishops and priests to supply the same.”

“The ministry of God’s word under his Majesty be bishops, parsons, and such other priests as be appointed by his Highness to that ministration—as, for example, the bishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Durham, the parson of Winwick, etc; all the said offices be appointed, assigned, and elected in every place by the laws and orders of kings and princes. In the admission of many of these offices be divers comely ceremonies and solemnities; and which be not of necessity, but only for a good order and seemly fashion. For if such offices and ministrations were committed without such solemnities, they were, nevertheless, duly committed; and there is no more promise of God that grace is given in the committing of the ecclesiastical office than in the committing of the civil office.”†

“Cranmer and Barlow affirm that the consecration [of a bishop] is unnecessary, and that the designation [or appointing

* Collier’s *Ecclesias. History*, vol. ii, app., p. 15; Burnet’s *Hist. of the Reform.* (Records xxi).

† Burnet’s *Hist. of the Reform.*, vol. i, p. 201.

to office] is sufficient.”* Cranmer wrote “to Bullinger, Calvin and Melanchthon, disclosing to them his pious design to draw up a book of articles, and requesting their counsel and furtherance.” He also appointed John Knox and Grindal to examine it before its adoption; he submitted the prayer-book to Calvin, and wrote him that “he [Calvin] could do nothing more profitable to the church than to write often to the king.” † (March 20, 1552.)

“For you, my Bucer, our kingdom will be by far the safest port, in which, by the kindness of God, the seeds of true doctrine are happily sown. Come therefore to us, and give yourself to us as a laborer in the harvest of the Lord.” ‡

LATIMER. ||

“Minister is a more fit name than priest; for the name of priest importeth sacrifice.” §

GRINDAL. ¶

He applied to the council for a contribution to Geneva “for the relief of

* Courayer “On English Ordinations,” p. 147. (Ed. 1725.)

† Strype's Life of Cranmer, pp. 407-413.

‡ Cranmer to Bucer, Oct. 2, 1548.

|| Bishop of Worcester (1490-1555).

§ “Disputations at Oxford,” p. 264.

¶ Archbishop of Canterbury (1519-1583).

that poor town, which had served for a nursery unto God's church, as well as for the maintenance and conservation of true religion;* he sustained the orders of Morrison, a Scotsman 'according to the laudable form and rite of the Reformed [Presbyterian] Church of Scotland.'" †

WHITGIFT. ‡

"If it had pleased her Majesty with the wisdom of the realm to use no bishops at all, we could not have complained justly of any defect in our church." ||

"Whitgift sanctioned a Calvinist formulary of faith—the Lambeth Articles." §

"The essential notes of the church be these only: the true preaching of the worde of God and the right administration of the sacramentes; for, as Master Calvine sayth in his book against the Anabaptistes, this honour is meete to be given to the worde of God and to His

* Edward VI. in 1551 contributed to the 400,000 dollars raised to defray the expenses for continuing the war in Germany "for the preservation of the Protestant religion." He would "most willingly joyn in alliance with them that were of the same religion with himself." (Burnet's Hist. of the Reform., vol. ii, p. 187.)

† Strype, Life of Grindal, p. 271.

‡ Archbishop of Canterbury (1530-1604).

|| Quoted by Child, "Church and State under the Tudors," p. 293.

§ Child, "Illustrated Notes of English Church History," vol. i, p. 98.

sacramentes, that wheresoever we see the worde of God truely preached, and God accordyng to the same truely worshipped, and the sacramentes without all superstition administered, there we may without all controversie conclude the church of God to be. The same is the opinion of other godly and learned writers, and the judgement of the Reformed churches, as appeareth by their confessions. So that, notwithstanding government, or some kynde of government, may be a parte of the church, touching the outward forme and perfection of it, yet it is not such a part of the essence and being but that it may be the church of Christ without this or that kynde of government; and therefore the kynde of government is not necessarie unto salvation."

JEWEL.*

Calls vestments "theatrical vestments—ridiculous trifles, relics of the Amorites"; satirizes their wearers as "men without mind, sound doctrine or morals, by which to secure the approbation of the people; and who therefore wished to gain their plaudits by wearing a comical stage dress." †

"Therefore we neither have bishops

* Bishop of Salisbury (1522-1571).

† Quoted by Brown, "Puseyite Episcopacy," p. 38. Le Bas, "Life of Jewel," p. 74.

without church nor church without bishops. Neither doth the Church of England this day depend on them whom you often call apostates, as if our church were no church without them. Notwithstanding, if there were not one of them [the clergy who had received their orders from diocesan bishops] nor of us [bishops] left alive, yet will not therefore the whole Church of England flee to Louvain [for orders]. . . . Pious laymen might renew the succession.”*

The “Defence” was a reply to Father Harding. It “was composed,” says Strype, “and written by the reverend Father as his public confession of the Catholic and Christian faith of all Englishmen, wherein is taught our consent with the German, Helvetian, French, Scotch, Genevan, and other Reformed churches.”†

“But what means Mr. Harding here to come in with the difference between priests and bishops? Thinketh he that priests and bishops hold only by tradition? Or is it so horrible a heresy as he maketh it to say that by the Scriptures of God a bishop and a priest are all one? . . . As for matters of devotion, we have pared away everything

* “Defence of the Apology,” pp. 129, 130 (ed 1609).

† Strype’s “Annals,” vol. i, p. 251.

to the quick, and do not differ from your doctrine by a nail's breadth."*

In a letter to Bullinger (April 10, 1559), "he laments the want of zeal and industry in promoting the Reformation; and that things were being managed in so slow and cautious a manner as if the word of God was not to be received on His own authority."†

BARLOW.‡

"If the King's Grace, being supreme head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate, and elect any layman being learned to be a bishop, that he so chosen should be as good a bishop as he is, or the best in England."||

PARKHURST.§

"Oh, would to God, would to God, that now at last the people of England would in good earnest propound to themselves to follow the Church of Zurich as the most perfect pattern!"¶

* Letter to Peter Martyr, ap. Matthews, "Continuity Reconsidered," p. 26.

† Neale, Hist. of Puritanism, vol. i, p. 72.

‡ Bishop of St. Asaph (—1568).

|| Collier, Hist. of the Reform., vol. iv, p. 388.

§ Bishop of Norwich (1564—).

¶ Letter to Gualter, Strype's "Annals," vol. ii, pp. 286-342.

LAUD. *

“In Sweden they retain both the thing and the name; and the governors of their churches are, and are called, bishops; and among the Lutherans the thing is retained, though not the name. For instead of bishops they are called superintendents; and instead of archbishop, general superintendents; and yet even here, too, these names differ more in sound than in sense.” †

COSIN. ‡

“If we renounce all the ministers of Germany, what will become of the Protestant party? If the church and kingdom of England acknowledged them, as they did, why should we, private persons, utterly disclaim their communion?” ||

“I conceive that the power of ordination was restrained to bishops rather by apostolical practice and the perpetual custom and canons of the church than by an absolute precept that either Christ or His Apostles gave about. . . . Therefore, if any minister so ordained [Presbyterian form] in these French churches came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among

* Archbishop of Canterbury (1573–1644).

† History of his Troubles, p. 141.

‡ Bishop of Durham (1594—).

|| Letter to Cordel, Feb. 7, 1650.

us in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have done of late, and can instance in many others before my time), our bishops did not reordain him before they admitted him to his charge; as they would have done if his former ordination in France had been void. Nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received amongst us, and to subscribe the articles established. And I love not to be more wise and harder than our own church is; which, because it hath never publicly condemned and pronounced the ordinations of the other reformed churches to be void, I dare not take upon me to condemn. . . . Thirdly, if we renounce the French, we must, for the very same reason, renounce all the ministers of Germany; and then, we may ask, what will become of the Protestant party?"*

"I would that all the world should know it, I never refused to join with the Protestants. . . . Many of their people have frequented the public prayers with great reverence, and I have delivered the holy communion to them. Besides, I have been to pray and sing psalms with them, and

* Letter to Cordel, ap. Powel's "Apostolic Succession," p. 154.

to hear both the weekly and the Sunday sermons. . . . By the blessing of Almighty God, I have reduced some and preserved many others from communicating with the papists, defending the truth of our own religion.”*

ANDREWS. †

“He is blind who does not see churches existing without it [Episcopalian church government]; and he must have a heart as hard as iron who can deny them salvation.” ‡

USHER. ||

“I asked him [Archbishop Usher] also his judgment about the validity of presbyter’s ordination, which he asserted, and told me that the King [Charles I.] asked him at the Isle of Wight wherever he found in antiquity that presbyters alone ordained any; and that he answered: ‘I can show your Majesty more, even where presbyters alone successively ordained bishops.’” §

DAVENANT. ¶

“We account of them [the Scottish, Irish, and all other forraigne churches of the Reformation] as our brethren in

* Ap. Bradley, “Ritualism,” p. 145.

† Bishop of Winchester (1555–1626).

‡ Respons. ad Secund. Epist. Molinæi, app., p. 35.

|| Archbishop of Armagh (1580–1656).

§ Sylvester, Life of Baxter, book i, §. 63, p. 206.

¶ Bishop of Salisbury (1576–1641.)

Christ, and doe solemnly protest that we entertain a holy and brotherly communion with them.”*

MORTON. †

“The Archbishop of Spoleto, whilst living in England, asked Morton, bishop of Durham, to do some one who had been ordained in the churches beyond the seas the favor of reordaining him presbyter, in order that he might have freer access to ecclesiastical benefices. Morton wrote back to say that such a thing could not be done without very great offence to the reformed churches, a scandal of which he did not choose to be the originator.” ‡

There are other witnesses whose testimony is no less clear and striking than what we have already quoted. Let us hear:—

HALL. §

“It is notorious that the English Reformation uniformly treated the non-Episcopal foreign churches [Lutheran and reformed] as true churches and ministers.” ||

“Blessed be God, there is no difference in any essential point between the Church

* Drury's "Fides Catholica," p. 41.

† Bishop of Durham (1669.)

‡ Hickman, *Apologia pro Ministris*, etc., p. 18.

|| Bishop of Norwich (1574-1656).

§ Hall's "Puritans and their Principles," p. 279.

of England and her sister reformed churches."* "We unite in every article of Christian doctrine, without the least variation, as the full and absolute agreement between their public confessions and ours testifies. The only difference between us consists in our mode of constituting the external ministry; and even with respect to this point we are of one mind, because we all profess to believe that it is not an essential of the church (though in the opinion of many it is a matter of importance to her well-being); and we all retain a respectful and friendly opinion of one another, not seeing any reason why so small a disagreement should produce any alienation of affection." †

"But for those ordinary callings of pastors and doctors (intended to perpetuity), with what forehead can he deny them to be in our church? How many have we that conscionably teach and feed, or rather feed by teaching? Call them what you please, superintendents [that is] bishops, prelates, priests, lecturers, parsons, vicars, etc. If they preach Christ truly,

* Bishop Heber: "Were I to return to Germany, I would again, as before, humbly and thankfully avail myself of the preaching and sacramental ordinances of the Lutheran Evangelical Church." ("Indian Journal Correspondence," vol. ii, p. 249.)

† "Peacemaker," Hall's Works, vol. iii, p. 560.

upon true inward abilities, upon a sufficient, if not perfect, outward vocation, such a one (all histories witness) for the substance as hath been ever in the Church since the Apostles' times, they are pastors and doctors allowed by Christ. We stand not upon circumstances and appendances of the fashion of ordination, manner of choice, attire, titles, maintenances; but if for substance these be not true pastors and doctors, Christ had never any in His Church since the Apostles left the earth."*

"Why, like a true make-bate, do you not say that our churches have so renounced their government? These sisters [the Church of England and the reformed churches] have learned to differ, and yet to love and reverence each other; and in these cases to enjoy their own forms without prescription of necessity or censure." †

STILLINGFLEET. ‡

"Thus we see by the testimony chiefly of him who was instrumental in our Reformation [Cranmer] that he owned no Episcopacy as a distinct order from Presbytery of divine right, but only as a prudent constitution of the civil

* Hall's "Apology against Brownists," sec. 27.

† Ibid., sec. 31.

‡ Bishop of Worcester (1635-1699).

magistrate for the better governing of the church."*

"Then let succession know its place, and learn to vaile bonnet to the Scriptures. The succession so much pleaded by the writers of the primitive church was not a succession of persons in apostolic power, but a succession in apostolical doctrine."†

"The election of pastors by the people is the true and only ordination which God approves of, unless the people do extend their power above the civil magistrate; that notwithstanding, this election can not be made without their consent."‡

BURNET.||

"Not only those who penned the Thirty-Nine Articles, but the body of the church for about half an age after... did acknowledge foreign churches to be true churches as to all the essentials of a church."§ "Neither our reformers nor their successors for near eighty years after those Articles were published, did ever question the constitution of such churches."¶ "Those coming to England

* Stillingfleet's "Irenicum," pt. ii, ch. viii.

† "Irenicum," pp. 297, 303, 322 (ed. 1662).

‡ Dr. Lewis du Moulin's "Short and True Account," p. 52.

|| Bishop of Salisbury (1643-1715).

§ "Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles," Article xxiii.

¶ Ibid.

from foreign churches had not been required to be reordained among us.”*
 “No bishop in Scotland, during his stay in that kingdom, ever did so much as desire any of the presbyters [Presbyterian ministers] to be reordained.”†

FLEETWOOD. ‡

“We had many ministers from Scotland, France, and the Low Countries who were ordained by presbyters only and not bishops, and they were instituted into benefices with awe, . . . and yet were never reordained, but only subscribed the Articles.” ||

ABBOT. §

“There lived in the Church of England many reverend and worthy men which did not reject the Presbytery.” ¶

DOWNAM. **

“The Popish is farre different from that which I hold; for they hold the order and superiority of bishops to be *jure divino*, implying thereby a perpetual necessitie thereof. Insomuch that where

* “History of His Own Times,” vol. i, p. 183.

† Bishop of Sarum’s Vindication, pp. 84, 85.

‡ Bishop of Ely (1655–1723).

|| “Judgment of the Church of England in Case of Lay Baptism.” (Fleetwood’s Works, p. 552.)

§ Bishop of Salisbury (1560–1618).

¶ “Eleutheria,” p. 90.

** Bishop of Chester (1661—).

bishops are not to ordaine they thinke there can be no ministers or priests, and consequently no church. I hold otherwise. Wherefore my opinion being so different from the Popish conceit, who seeth not that the judgment of our divines which is opposed to the doctrines of the Papists is not opposed to mine.”*

TOMLINE.†

“In like manner we often speak of the Church of England, of Holland, of Geneva, and of the Lutheran church; and all these different churches are parts of the visible Catholic Church. It is well known that the Church of Rome considers itself as the only Christian church; but, on the other hand, we extend the name to any congregation of faithful men in which the pure word of God is preached and the sacraments duly ministered according to Christ’s ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. The adherence, therefore, to the fundamental principles of the Gospel is sufficient to constitute a visible church.... Upon the same principle we forbear to inquire what precise additions or defects in the admin-

* Ap. Brown’s “Puseyite Episcopacy,” p. 42.

† Bishop of Winchester (1750–1827).

istration of the sacraments ordained by Christ annul their efficacy.”*

WHITE. †

“The true visible church is named apostolical, not because of local or personal succession of bishops (only or principally), but because it retained the faith and doctrine of the Apostles. Personal or local succession only and in itself maketh not the church apostolical, because hirelings and wolves may lineally succeed lawful and orthodox pastors.” ‡

*The Teaching of the Anglican Fathers
of the Church.*

Remember them that had the rule over you, which spake unto you the word of God: and, considering the issue of their life, imitate their faith.—*Heb., xiii, 7; New Rev. Ed.*

HOOVER.

“For my part, I dare not deny the salvation of the Lutheran churches, which have been the chiefest instruments of ours.” || “Where the church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain, in case of such necessity the ordinary insti-

* Tomline’s “Elements of Theology,” vol. ii pp. 325, 326.

† Bishop of Ely.

‡ Bishop White’s Works, p. 64 (fol. ed.)

|| Serm. on Habak. I. 4, app. to “Ecclesiastical Polity” (Complete Works, vol. ii, p. 307).

tution of God hath given oftentimes and may give place. Some do infer that no ordination can stand but only such as is made by bishops which had their ordination likewise from other bishops till we come to the Apostles of Christ themselves. . . . To this we answer that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop."* "Touching the ministry of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the whole body of the church being divided into laity and clergy, the clergy either presbyters or deacons."† "Seeing that sacrifice is now no part of the church ministry, how should the name of priesthood be thereunto rightly applied? Surely even as St. Paul applieth the name of flesh unto that very substance of fishes which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although it be in nature another thing?"‡

WHITTAKER, DR.||

"I confess that there was originally no difference between a presbyter and a bishop. Luther and the other heroes of the Reformation were presbyters, even

* Eccles. Pol., bk. vii, xiv; sec. ii.

† Ibid., bk. v, sec. 78.

‡ Ibid., v, ch. lxxviii (vol. ii, p., 471, Keble's ed.)

|| Head of St. John's College, Cambridge, 1595.

*

according to the ordination of the Romish Church; and therefore they were *jure divino* bishops. Consequently, whatever belongs to bishops belongs also *jure divino* to themselves. As for a bishop being afterward placed over presbyters, that was a human arrangement (*ordo humanus fuit*) for the removal of schisms, as the history of the times testifies."*
 "Providing their election be lawful, we do not concern ourselves about the ordination of our bishops. Where ordination can not be had, the same persons that have authority to name bishops have also authority to ordain them. Therefore, since all the bishops of those times refused to ordain them [Parker *et al.*], they were forced to seek ordination by some other means."†

WILLET.

"Here is the difference between our adversaries the Papists and us. They say it is of necessitie to be subject to the Pope, and to the bishops and archbishops under him, as necessarily prescribed in the word; but so doe not our bishops and archbishops, which is a notable difference between the bishops of the Popish Church and of the reformed

* Whittakeri Opp., vol. i, pp. 509, 510 (Geneva, 1610).

† Ap. Bradley, "A Gentle Remonstrance," p. 141.

churches. Let every church use that forme which best fitteth its state; in external matters every church is free, not bound one to the prescription of another, so they measure themselves by the rule of the world."

BACON.

"I, for my part, do confess that, in revolving the Scriptures, I could never find but that God had left the like liberty to the church government as He had done to the civil government, to be varied according to time and place and accidents. The substance of doctrine is immutable, and so are the general rules of government; but for rites and ceremonies, and for the particular hierarchies, policies, and disciplines of churches,—they be left at large."*

"Yea, and some indiscreet persons have been told in open preaching to use dishonorable and derogatory speech and censure of the churches abroad, and that so far as some of our men (as I have heard) ordained in foreign parts have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers. Thus we see the beginnings were modest but the extremes are violent, so as there is almost as great a distance now

* "Considerations Touching the Pacification of the Church," etc. Bacon's Works, vol. iii, p. 150.

of either side from itself as was at the first of one from the other.”*

BRIDGES.

“The difference of these things [orders, offices, ceremonies] concerning ecclesiastical government is not directlye materiall to salvation; neither ought to break the bond of Christian concord.” †

FULKE, DR. †

“You are highly deceived,” says he, addressing Catholics, “if [you think] we esteem your offices of bishops, priests, and deacons better than laymen. . . . With all our hearts we abhor, detest and spit on your stinking, greasy, anti-Christian orders.” ||

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

From the foregoing we gather—

I. That “the evidence is simply overwhelming which shows that during the whole period, from 1552 onward, the English Church was considered, by friends and foes alike, to be for all intents and purposes one with the Swiss churches of

* “Advertisement Touching the Controversies,” etc. Bacon’s Works, vol. iv, p. 426.

† Bridges’ “Defence of the Government of the Church of England,” p. 87.

‡ Pembroke College, Cambridge, 1589.

|| Ap. Bradley, “A Gentle Remonstrance,” p. 141.

Zurich and Geneva”;* that “almost all the prominent Elizabethan bishops and divines were in doctrine Zwinglian or Calvinistic; and were at much pains to declare themselves at one with the Swiss reformers, especially with Bullinger and Peter Martyr”;† that “the whole of the lives and writings of the Elizabethan divines, with the single and perhaps doubtful exception of Bishop Cheney of Gloucester, agreed in doctrine with the churches of Zurich and Geneva.”‡

II. That “the popular movement which inspired the enthusiasm of preachers and constancy of martyrs had always been eagerly Protestant, demanding doctrinal as well as disciplinary reform; adopting in early days the Lutheran, afterward the Calvinistic type of belief, and not sparing of dislike and contempt of Catholic usage and worship”;|| that, “in spite of its episcopal consecrations and its pretended priesthood, it was a Protestant institution, and not a Catholic one. The body and appearance might be Catholic: the voice when it opened its lips to teach must be Protestant.”§

* Child, “Church and State under the Tudors,” p. 274.

† Ibid., p. 278.

‡ Ibid., 222.

|| Beard, “Hibbert Lectures,” 1883, p. 327.

§ Froude, “Short Studies of Great Subjects.” Third Series, p. 21.

III. That even if we do not concur with Dr. Arnold that "our church has ever borne the marks of her birth, the child of regal and aristocratical selfishness and of tyranny,"* we can not deny that "the clergy of the Church of England are but ministers and stewards, not lords and masters, in a church which, so far as it is the English Church, because established by the English nation, is created by the law, upheld by the law, paid by the law, and may be changed by the law just as any other institution of the land";† that so absolutely is the Anglican episcopate the child and servant of the State that, in the withering reproach of one of its own apologists, an Anglican bishop, "blasphemously boasting of a power expressly given him by the Saviour of the world, found himself precisely in the position of a lunatic who may fancy that he is the monarch of the universe, but who can not pluck a flower or fill a glass of water without the permission of his keeper. The spiritual authority they boast of is no better than a child's toy or a fool's rattle, until it is charged by the ruling

* "Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold," vol. ii, p. 386.

† Dr. Elliot, Dean of Bristol, "Sermons on Some of the Subjects of the Day," p. 11.

force of society and armed with the sanction of civil penalties.”*

IV. That when Gladstone, more in a tone of elegiac regret than of reproach, confesses that “nothing can be further from the ideal than the English Church has been in its practical development,”† he must have had in mind such confessions as that of the Master Rugby, that “churches should make their bond to consist in a common object and a common practice rather than in a common belief; in other words, that the end should be Good rather than Truth”;‡ or that of the historian of American Episcopalianism when he declares that “after two hundred and eighty years the assembled bishops of the whole Pan-Anglican Communion have recorded their judgment that uniformity in discipline and worship [faith?] is not to be compelled nor expected.”||

V. That as for apostolic succession and episcopal ordination, the Church of England “clearly repudiates it as a fiction altogether, that God has prescribed some action through which orders must be conveyed; or that He has annexed

* Edinb. Rev., July, 1868, p. 135.

† *Nineteenth Century*, Nov., 1888, p. 784.

‡ Introductory Lect. on Mod. Hist., p. 50.

|| McConnell, “History of the American Episcopal Church,” p. 12.

peculiar grace and authority to imposition of hands successively for the Apostles or to any other arbitrary form of ordination whatever."*

VI. Finally, in the words of an eminent American theologian, whose name is even more authoritative in the theological lecture halls of Europe than in those of his own country [we mean Dr. Nevin], we must come to the sad but logical conclusion that the Church of England "since the Reformation has been what Cyprian graphically pictures as a 'sunbeam cut off from the sun, a bough torn from the tree, a stream sundered from the fountain.'"†

Et impleta est civitas confusione!—
 "And the whole city was filled with confusion." ‡ *Non enim est dissensionis Deus, sed pacis: sicut et in omnibus Ecclesiis sanctorum doceo,*—"For God is not the God of dissension, but of peace: as also I teach in all the churches of the saints." §

* Dr. Elliot, *Ut supra*, p. 105.

† Reformed Quart. Rev., 1874, p. 29.

‡ Acts, xix, 29.

§ I. Cor., xiv, 33.



