

THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE

By

ROBERT ELLIS THOMPSON, M.A., S.T.D., LL.D.
¹
of THE PRESBYTERY of PHILADELPHIA



PHILADELPHIA

The Westminster Press

1910

BV670

T5

COPYRIGHT, 1910, BY
THE TRUSTEES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF
PUBLICATION AND SABBATH SCHOOL WORK

Published May, 1910

© Cl. A 265282

218 June 1110

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACADEMIC USAGE THIS
BOOK IS DEDICATED TO THE PRESIDENT,
FACULTY AND TRUSTEES OF MUHLENBERG
COLLEGE IN GRATEFUL RECOGNITION OF
HONORS CONFERRED

PREFACE

The subject of this book has engaged its author's attention at intervals for nearly half a century.

The present time seems propitious for publishing it, in the hope of an irenic rather than a polemic effect. Our Lord seems to be pressing on the minds of his people the duty of reconciliation with each other as brethren, and to be bringing about a harmony of feeling and of action, which is beyond our hopes. He is beating down high pretensions and sectarian prejudices, which have stood in the way of Christian reunion.

It is in the belief that the claims made for what is called "the Historic Episcopate" have been, as Dr. Liddon admits, a chief obstacle to Christian unity, that I have undertaken to present the results of a long study of its history, in the hope that this will promote, not dissension, but harmony. If in any place I have spoken in what seems a polemic tone, let this be set down to the stress of discussion, and not to any lack of charity or respect for what was for centuries the church of my fathers, as it still is that of most of my kindred.

I wish to thank here Rev. Louis F. Benson, D.D., for the encouragement, advice and assistance he has given me in this work. Also to recognize with thanks my obligations to the librarians of Union Theological Seminary, for their kind and prompt aid in my visits to their splendid library, and especially to Mr. Harold Tryon, my former pupil and always friend, who is now an instructor in that Seminary.

PHILADELPHIA,

May 1st, 1910.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. THE NEW TESTAMENT AGE.....	17
II. THE PRESBYTERIAN FATHERS.....	50
III. THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES.....	75
IV. FROM SENATE TO MONARCH.....	101
V. GRADATIM.....	145
VI. FROM PASTOR TO PRELATE.....	165
VII. THE EPISCOPATE OF THE MIDDLE AGES.....	185
VIII. TUDOR ANGLICANISM.....	207
IX. STUART ANGLICANISM.....	233
X. MODERN ANGLICANISM.....	261
XI. OUTLOOK.....	285
APPENDIX.....	292
INDEX.....	311

THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE

INTRODUCTION

In the later history of the American Churches nothing is more gratifying than the decay of the polemic spirit. The men most honored are no longer those who administer the hardest knocks to other communions than their own. The literature in which the different sects used to pay their disrespects to each other is in small demand. The controversies of to-day are not between the different denominations of Christians, as they deal with questions on which there is a difference of opinion within the churches, and thus tend to weaken rather than to strengthen denominational feeling.

There is one exception to this, growing out of the claim put forward by a party within the Protestant Episcopal Church, but not by that Church itself. This party tells us that theirs alone of all the churches called Protestant possesses an authorized ministry and valid sacraments. Nor is this merely an academic thesis. It is proclaimed in sermons, propounded in leading articles, circulated in tracts, and pressed in social intercourse, as a reason why the members of other Protestant communions should abandon these for this favored Church; and every suggestion of a union of the Protestant churches is met with the demand that the pastors of these shall confess their lack of proper ordination, and shall submit to receive this at the hand of their bishops.

This teaching, as has been said, is that not of that church, but of a party within it, which has grown up within the last seventy years, and must be reckoned among the novelties which disturb the peace of a much respected communion. Down to the rise of the Oxford school in England, and the spread of its influence in America, the position of Protestant episcopacy in our country was far from that which has been given it by these new controversialists.

At the first the whole of the English colonies in America were attached to the diocese of London, so that not only ordination but even confirmation was limited to those who could undertake an ocean voyage lasting several months, and exposing passengers to perils of storm, war and pestilence, such as no longer exist for those who cross the Atlantic. At the same time, in spite of the appointment of Episcopal commissaries with powers of visitation, there was no possibility of keeping the clergy of the Church of England in America under due discipline, and the lives of some were a scandal to their cloth.

The hardships of the situation were not unfelt in England and three several attempts were made to transport the English episcopate to America. The first of these was set on foot by Archbishop Laud, but was thwarted by the outbreak of the civil war. The second was due to the zealous churchmanship of the Earl of Clarendon, but came to an end with his expulsion from the chancellorship and banishment from England in 1667. The third grew out of the revival of zeal for the Church in the reign of Queen Anne. The papers were about to pass the great seal, and a house for the bishop had been secured in Burlington, N. J., when the queen's death transferred the English monarchy to a family of Germans, who cared nothing for the matter. The accession, however, of the third

king of the house of Hanover seemed to offer a favorable opportunity for the appointment of an American bishop. George III was proud of his position as a British sovereign, and loyal in his way to the Church of England. Archbishop Secker and Bishop Porteous of Chester—the latter a native of Virginia—were friendly to the proposal.

The difficulty in the way was the indifference of English statesmen to Church interests, and their reluctance to take any course for such an object which ran the risk of exciting extensive opposition either at home or in the colonies. And in both there was opposition enough. The British and Irish nonconformists resisted the proposal to extend the influence and power of English prelacy beyond the seas. The colonists, not excepting the Episcopalians in Virginia, objected to the coming of a bishop who might bring with him the prelatie courts, with their jurisdiction over marriages, wills and other matters, which lasted in England until 1857, to say nothing of the peril of having Parliament enact a general tithe or tax upon all the colonists for the support of the bishop and his clergy.

To propitiate this opposition, Dr. Thomas Bradley Chandler, of Burlington, published *An Appeal to the Public in Behalf of the Church of England in America* (New York, 1767), in which he set forth the hardships attending the dependence of the Episcopalians in the colonies on an English bishop, and assured his countrymen that nothing more was intended than the erection of an American diocese with jurisdiction over the clergy and people who voluntarily submitted to its bishop. The good faith of Dr. Chandler and his associates was not called in question; but it was pointed out that they could give no assurance that the British Parliament would not follow up this step by levying a general tithe and erecting

a bishop's court with powers similar to those exercised by English bishops. In fact, the proposal brought into light the perils to religious equality which attached to the connection with the mother country, and thus helped to bring on the war for independence. It led to annual conferences of the Puritan churches of New England with the Presbyterians of the middle colonies, and to correspondence with the English dissenters, with a view to watching the movements of the friends of an American bishopric.

For these reasons the war wrought disaster to the Church of England in the colonies. Although Washington and other laymen of that communion, and William White and others among its clergy, were on the patriotic side, yet it lost heavily in membership through the emigration of the loyalists to other parts of the British Empire and the withdrawal of patriots to other communions. Dr. Chandler gave good reason for believing that it was the strongest Christian communion in America before the war; but it certainly was far outnumbered by several others after its close, and to this day ranks below four other Protestant churches in point of membership. For this reason, and because independence had removed the peril of an established church, the opposition to the transplanting of Protestant episcopacy to America ceased. Opposition was disarmed, and the representative of our government at the Court of St. James took part in the negotiations to secure the consecration of bishops for a church which was now content to take its place among the Christian communions of America.

Outside the diocese of Connecticut, the bishops and other clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church assumed an attitude of great moderation in their presentation of the merits of episcopacy. In the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, as adopted by the General Convention

of 1789, a reference is made to the attempts to revise the prayer book of the Church of England in 1689, and it is said:

But this good work miscarried at that time; and the Civil Authority has not since thought proper to revive it by any new commission. But when in the course of divine Providence these American states became independent with respect to civil government, their ecclesiastical independence was necessarily included; and the different religious denominations of Christians in these states were left at full and equal liberty to model and organize their respective churches, and forms of worship, and discipline, in such manner as they might judge most convenient for their future prosperity; consistently with the constitution and laws of their country.

Very similar in spirit is the language used by President Washington, in reply to an address from the General Convention of that year. "On this occasion," he wrote, "it would ill become me to conceal the joy I have felt in perceiving the fraternal affection, which appears to increase every day among the friends of genuine religion. It affords edifying prospects indeed, to see Christians of different denominations dwell together in more charity, and conduct themselves with respect to each other, with a more Christianlike spirit than they ever have done in any former age, or in any other nation."

Bishop William White, who on his title-pages describes himself as "Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Pennsylvania," and not (like his successors) "Bishop of Pennsylvania," was the most outstanding and the noblest figure in the newly organized Church. Seven years before his writing of the preface he had been moved by the miseries and decay of the Episcopalian churches, under a war which seemed interminable, to write a pamphlet: *The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered* (Philadelphia, 1782). He proposed that, without waiting for the action of English

bishops, there should be chosen a number of bishops or superintendents to take charge of the churches, and to ordain and confirm with episcopal authority. The proposal would have met the approval of Drs. Bancroft, Andrews, Bramhall, Cosin and Hooker, on that ground of necessity which they recognized as existing for the Reformed churches of the Continent. He puts the case for the episcopal form of government by saying that "the opinion that episcopacy was the most ancient and eligible, but without any idea of divine right in the case, this author believes to be the sentiments of the great body of Episcopalians in America, in which respect they have in their favor, unquestionably, the sense of the Church of England, and, as he believes, the opinions of her most distinguished prelates for piety, virtue and ability."

Bishops Provoost and Madison, who shared with him the direction of their church in its opening years, were of the same mind. The former showed his recognition of other than episcopal orders by having Dr. William Linn, of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, take a prominent part in the funeral services of an American general in Trinity Church, in the presence of President Washington and of both houses of Congress. Bishop Madison proposed active negotiations with "Christians of other denominations" for the restoration of Christian unity among the Protestants of America, in terms not unlike the Lambeth proposals of our own time.

In Connecticut the churches and clergy were converts from the Puritan churches; and they justified Bishop Hobart's humorous saying, that "those who get episcopacy by infection have it worse than do those who inherited it." They were all Tories in the war for independence; and at its close a number of their clergy invited Dr. Samuel Seabury to proceed to England to obtain consecration as

bishop. As he had been highly useful to the British commanders during the war, and was a pensioner of the British Government to his death, because of his serving as chaplain to one of its regiments, it might have been expected that his application would have been received with favor. But the legal difficulties in the way of consecrating an Anglican bishop who should take no oath of supremacy and allegiance to the King of England were found insuperable in this case, and this champion and pensioner of King George had recourse to the nonjuring bishops in Scotland who rejected the House of Hanover and, until 1790, refused to pray for its kings. From them he received consecration at Aberdeen in 1784, and returned to America without any recognition of his episcopacy from the Church of England. Bishop Provoost declined to admit the validity of this consecration, and Bishop White showed no zeal to bring about a union of Connecticut with the rest of the church. "This may oblige me," wrote Dr. Seabury, "to establish the Scotch succession from the reorganization of Charles II, to what is called the Revolution."

In 1789, however, and in the absence of Bishop Provoost, Dr. Seabury was recognized and admitted to the General Convention, to which he brought the element of exclusive episcopacy. In one of his sermons Bishop Seabury thus states his view of the ministry of the church: "Since the Holy Apostles did, in obedience to Christ, and under the direction of the Holy Ghost, transmit to others the powers received from him, constituting bishops, presbyters and deacons, as three orders of ministers in his church; it is the duty of all Christians to submit to that government which they, the Apostles, have instituted, and not to run after the new-fangled scheme of parochial episcopacy, of which the Bible knows nothing, and of which the Chris-

tian Church knew nothing till a little more than two centuries ago."

Even before the influences of the Oxford movement reached this country, this anti-Puritan churchmanship of Connecticut began to exercise an influence in some parts of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Bishop Hobart of New York (1811-1816) and Bishop Ravenscroft of North Carolina (1823-1831) were notable instances, and both confirmed the former's epigram as to the zeal of converts to episcopacy. But William White remained the type of "sound churchmanship" for the church at large, and to be a "prayer book churchman" was enough for even those who called themselves high churchmen. An appeal has been made to the Eleventh Canon of the Protestant Episcopal Church, adopted in 1792, as implying that the orders of episcopally ordained clergy alone are valid. But this canon was aimed not at the ministers of other Christian churches, to exclude them from an occasional exercise of their ministry, but against "persons not regularly ordained" who "assume the ministerial office and perform any of the duties thereof in this church." At the date of its enactment the churches of America were plagued with pretenders, who put themselves forward as ordained ministers of the gospel, and found too easy an acceptance in congregations destitute of pastors. This was the interpretation put upon the canon by Dr. John Croes, the first Bishop of New Jersey, and by Bishop Onderdonk of Pennsylvania, who said to Dr. Richard Newton that "this canon had not reference to ministers of other denominations."

Other than episcopal orders were recognized in the missionary work of the church. In the mission at Sierra Leone Rev. Messrs. Rennig and Harting, and afterwards Rev. Messrs. Nylander, Butscher and Prape, were ac-

cepted as missionaries, although they had no orders but those of the Lutheran Church of Germany. For this there was a colonial precedent. When Rev. Evan Evans, rector of Christ Church in Philadelphia, visited England in 1707, Dr. Tiffany says, "his place was supplied by a Swedish clergyman, the Rev. Andrew Reedman; an incident which, like many other instances of interchange and good offices, shows the kindly relations of the two churches." Yet Swedish episcopacy has not the hallmark of an apostolical succession.

Besides the presence of Dr. Linn in Trinity Church, already mentioned, there were other instances of the recognition of the ministry of other churches. In earlier times, indeed, the practice was so common that the House of Bishops in 1820 sent a statement to the House of Deputies, saying: "The bishops have found by experience that such ministers, in many instances, preaching in our churches and to our congregations, avail themselves of such opportunity to inveigh against the principles of our communion." Through the growth of the Anglo-Catholic party it could not occur now without creating an extensive disturbance. The whole trend of ecclesiastical legislation within this church has been in the direction of increasing exclusiveness, since the year 1840.¹

I presume it is true of our Protestant churches generally, as it is of our Presbyterian Church, that these vagaries of opinion have been regarded with equanimity. Wholly satisfied as to the apostolicity of its orders, assured of the divine presence in its worship and the lives

¹ For the facts relating to the earlier history of the Protestant Episcopal Church I am indebted to *A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, by Charles C. Tiffany, D.D., Archdeacon of New York (New York, 1895); *The Protestant Episcopacy of the Revolutionary Patriots Lost and Restored*, by Mason Gallagher (Philadelphia, 1883); and a communication to *The Church Witness and Advocate* (Boston) in an issue for September, 1868. See also *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies*, by Arthur Lyon Cross (London, 1902).

of its people, conscious of special access to God in the sacraments of the Master's appointment, and rejoicing in the harvest it has gathered on the mission field both at home and abroad, it has felt no anxiety to vindicate its position against the assumptions of either the Church of Rome or the Church of England. It has kept a notable silence in the presence of depreciatory criticism from the champions of both.

Our only regret is in observing one of the great sisterhood of the Reformed churches abandon its place in that illustrious company and seek fellowship with the Latin and Greek churches rather than with its sisters nearer home, and once far nearer to its heart. We have looked for nothing else than the rebuff from both those alien communions, which has rewarded those efforts by the repudiation of its claim to stand apart from other Protestant churches either in the validity of its orders or the "catholicity" of its doctrines. We watch with slight interest the continuous and voluminous attempts to vindicate "Anglican orders," but are struck with the fact that so often the authors of these defences end by submission to the papal authority (Newman, Allies, Rivington, etc.), and are led to wonder whether any of them indicate anything but a tormenting uncertainty about the matter in hand.

The proposals for Christian reunion emanating from the American House of Bishops in 1886 made the question one of living interest to the Presbyterian Church, and led our General Assembly of 1887 to appoint a Committee on Church Unity, to confer with the commission appointed by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church the year before. After some preliminary correspondence, the committee conveyed to the commission the hearty acceptance by our church of the three first

articles proposed as the basis of a possible reunion, that is, the Scriptures as the revealed word of God, the Nicene Creed, and the two sacraments. As to the fourth—"the historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his church"—the committee wrote:

The Presbyterian Church holds, and always has held firmly, to what we believe to be the genuinely historic episcopate as this is set forth in the New Testament and in the practice of the early Church, so far as it did not swerve from apostolic models and directions. It finds the presbyter-bishop in all ages of the Church, in unbroken succession until the present day. At the same time we are not disposed to constrain others to adopt our interpretation in this matter. We shall feel no difficulty in uniting with those who interpret the bishops of the New Testament and of the primitive Church differently from ourselves, provided our own liberty of interpretation is not infringed. We can unite with those who think bishops to be a superior order of the clergy, provided we are not asked to abandon our own conscientious conviction that bishops as instituted by the Apostles are not of superior rank, but that all who are ordained to the ministry by the laying on of hands of the presbytery, and are intrusted with the care and oversight of souls, are bishops.

Acting under the instructions of the General Assembly, the committee put forward the statement that "mutual recognition and reciprocity between the different bodies who profess the true religion is the first and essential step toward practical church unity." They afterwards suggested as an expression of this the interchange of pulpits by the clergy of the two churches. On this point the commission declared its incompetency to act; and as the General Convention of 1896 took no notice of the suggestion, the negotiations were suspended. The reason for this was stated in a report adopted by the General Assembly of 1896:

The Presbyterian Church cannot with self-respect, and a proper regard for the honor of their divine Lord, who has called them into the communion of his visible Church, negotiate on the

subject of Church unity with another Christian body except on terms of parity, and unless they are explicitly acknowledged to be a church of Christ, and to possess a divinely authorized ministry, which he has both summoned to his service by the direct call of his Holy Spirit, and has sanctioned by the gifts and graces bestowed upon them, and by his abundant blessing upon their labors. In presenting this to our Episcopal brethren as a necessary preliminary to all negotiations for church unity, we ask nothing more than they should unhesitatingly grant. . . .

With all her conscious weaknesses and imperfections, the Presbyterian Church, in no spirit of boasting or self-exaltation, but with humble and grateful loyalty to her divine Head, must insist that she is entitled to the name and the prerogatives of a true church of Christ, and that her ministry and ordinances are entitled to be regarded as genuine and valid.¹

The essential reasonableness of this action has been admitted by Bishop Doane of Albany, who says: "To approach the great Protestant churches of the world with the statement that their ministries are unlawful, is to propose, not reunion, but absorption; not consideration but contempt. If one may quote, not irreverently, the vulgar saying of the lamb and the lion lying down together with the lamb inside, it is just this and nothing more, and leaves us in an attitude of antagonism and isolation, which is perfectly hopeless and futile."²

Bishop Doane quotes with approval a suggestion made by Dr. Palmer, Bishop of Bombay, that the whole question of the "origin of episcopacy and of holy orders" should be reopened for discussion in an impartial spirit. "What I desire to emphasize," says Bishop Palmer, "is that while the views of learned men are divided so widely on the history of the origin of episcopacy, it is impossible to find language about it which all those whose reunion we desire to see could join heartily in using. Now

¹ *Church Unity: The Progress and Suspension of the Negotiations Between the Protestant Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches* (Philadelphia, Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1899). See also *Church Reunion Discussed on the Basis of the Lambeth Propositions of 1838*. Reprinted from *The Church Review* for April and October, 1890 (New York, 1890).

² *The Churchman* (New York, November 21, 1909).

it lies with men who can be content to retract their own past asseverations, if they turn out untenable,—who are willing to approach the question in the spirit of scientific history,—who can die to themselves, their opinions, and (if they are so unhappy as to belong to one) their party, and give themselves up to the truth—it lies with such men, I say, to provide a basis for reunion by studying over again the whole question of the origins of episcopacy, with its bearing on the validity of ministry and sacraments, and by presenting to the church a dispassionate, scientific, scholarly statement of the whole subject.”

It is just in this faith that the present situation of the Christian Church calls upon us to reëxamine the question in the new light which documentary discoveries and scholarly investigation have thrown upon it, that this book has been written. Its author does not claim that he walks on the summit heights of utter impartiality, which Dr. Palmer describes. He writes with the consciousness that he belongs to and in some degree speaks for a great Protestant communion, which has a very vital interest in this subject. But he writes also in the hope that he will contribute something to the coming of the day of Christian reunion, which will be effected on the basis of Scripture, history and Christian insight into the essential things of the Church. “The inquiries,” says Dr. William Sanday, “which have of late been made in the early history of the Christian ministry seem to me to result in an eirenicon between the churches. The dove returned with an olive branch in her mouth.”¹

Before coming to the points of difference, I shall try to state those on which we are agreed, as to the history of the matter. These I believe to be:

1. That our Lord Jesus Christ founded a visible church,

¹ *The Expositor* for November, 1886.

gave it sacraments as a manifestation of its existence and unity, as well as means of grace to its members; and that he committed the government of it to his Apostles, who were the chosen witnesses of his resurrection.

2. That the Apostles, in gathering local churches in the name of their Master, committed the care of these to two classes of officers, namely, presbyters or bishops, and deacons; and that the former had charge of the spiritual interests of those churches (preaching the word, teaching, discipline and the care of souls), and the latter of the temporal.

3. That in the churches thus organized there was a plurality of both classes of officers, and the care of a local church was not committed permanently to any single person resident with it.

4. That from about the middle of the second century of the Christian era the local churches generally are found under the direction and care of a single person, called a bishop, with the presbyters (no longer called bishops) and the deacons both in subordination to him.

The questions in dispute are as to when, through whom, and why this change took place, and whether it was in harmony with the teaching of our Lord and his Apostles as to the proper state of a Christian church.

Four theories have been put forward in modern times as to the origin of this monarchic episcopate by those who regard it as the normal order of the Christian churches.

1. Richard Rothe, a German Lutheran theologian, in his remarkable book, *The Beginnings of the Christian Church and its Constitution (Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung, Wittenberg, 1837)*, starts from a statement made by Eusebius (A. D. 325) that the surviving Apostles and kinsmen of our Lord met in synod after the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70). Dr. Rothe

supposes that, in view of the loss of the visible center of unity, they agreed to set up the monarchic episcopate as a link of communication between the churches, and thus unite them into an undivided catholic church. None of the Fathers refer to such a decision.

2. Bishop Lightfoot substitutes for an apostolic synod the activity of the Apostle John, who lived on into the reign of Trajan (A. D. 98-117), and who made Ephesus the center of his later labors. Irenaeus of Lyons (A. D. 180-189) speaks of the Apostles having made Polycarp bishop of Smyrna; and Tertullian (A. D. 200) asserts that this was done by John, and that "the order of bishops, if it be traced to its source, will be found to stand in John." Clement of Alexandria (A. D. 190-215) describes John as visiting the churches in Asia, and appointing them bishops.

3. Dr. George Salmon thinks it possible that Paul anticipated John in this work in Asia, and that the Diotrophes of the Third Epistle of John was a Pauline bishop, who resented the intrusion of John's messengers into his jurisdiction, as an encroachment on his authority. With this Dr. Charles Gore substantially agrees.

4. Dean Stanley and some others, who do not insist on tracing episcopacy back to the apostolic age, regard its evolution as a providential direction of the Church's development, and as possessing the authority which grows out of its inherent fitness to the needs of the Christian Church. Dr. Gore, recognizing the imperfection of the evidence for monarchic episcopacy in the apostolic age, seems to fall back upon this conception of an evolution under providential direction. It was anticipated by Dr. Newman in his *Essay on Development* (1895). "When the church was thrown upon her own resources" by the death of the Apostles, he says, "first local disturbances

gave exercise to bishops, and next ecumenical disturbances gave exercise to popes.”

I shall consider first the presumptions we may draw from the Gospels and the Epistles, as to the likelihood that the Apostles gave their sanction to the monarchic episcopate.

CHAPTER I

THE NEW TESTAMENT AGE

On two notable occasions our Lord discussed the desire for preëminence in the kingdom he was about to establish. The first was when the question arose spontaneously in the minds of the Apostles; and the desire of preëminence was marked by him as coming of and tending to evil. He bade them see in the simplicity and contentment of an unspoiled child the model of conduct for men. (Matthew xviii: 1-5; Mark ix: 33-41; Luke ix: 46-50.) The second was when the mother of James and John asked for the place of honor for her two sons; no doubt on the ground of their near kinship to our Lord. The proposal angers the other Apostles, each of whom thinks he has as good a claim as the sons of Zebedee, if not better. Our Lord again warns them against this spirit as alien to his kingdom, pointing them this time to the rulers of the Gentiles as the type of what they are to avoid. (Matthew xx: 20-28; Mark x: 35-45; Luke xxii: 25.) The scene of the feet-washing at the last supper (John xiii: 1-17) may be taken as a third lesson in the same sense, which is that in the kingdom he came to establish honor comes by service, and he stands highest who serves the most widely and the most humbly. For at the head of that kingdom is One who serves the most widely and the most humbly of all.

It is true that in all these cases our Lord is rebuking the thoughts and intents of the heart, rather than any external thing or act. True that all his commandments

must be kept by the heart. But the new wine of the kingdom calls for new bottles, fitted to its nature. The kingdom will ultimate itself in a social order, in which the preëminence of one over another will have no recognition or place.

The Apostle Paul enunciates the same principles largely and diffusely in his sermon to the elder-bishops of Ephesus (Acts xx: 17-35), in his Epistles to the Romans (xii: 6-10, 16; xv: 1-7), Corinthians (1 Corinthians ix: 12-23; 2 Corinthians x: 1-16), Ephesians (iv: 11-13), Philippians (ii: 3-16), and to Timothy (iii: 1-13). He applies the principles of meekness, humility and desire to serve rather than to rule, to the practical needs of the churches he founded. And he, like his Master, treats the conversion of sinners and the edification of saints as the end for which the Church and the apostolate itself existed. He knows no higher work for himself or for anyone.

The Apostle Peter makes a more direct application of our Lord's teaching about preëminence, to the order of the churches:

The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who am also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight [or episcopate], not of constraint, but willingly, according to the will of God; nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves an ensample to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not. (I Peter v: 1-4.)

The perils the Apostle sees before the pastors of the churches are those of changing the sweet reasonableness of Christ into a yoke of constraint; of the desire for gain rather than service as the end of their labor; and of the desire for a distinction within the Church which corresponded to that possessed by rulers in the world. And it

is notable that the Apostle places the eldership in such close proximity with the apostleship: he is an elder like themselves, although the chosen witness of the sufferings and the glory of Christ.

The Apostle John also begins his third Epistle by describing himself as an elder: "The elder unto Gaius the beloved, whom I love in truth." After praising Gaius for his hospitality to the messengers the Apostle had sent, he proceeds:

I wrote somewhat unto the church: but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preëminence among them, receiveth us not. Therefore, if I come, I will bring to remembrance his works which he doeth, prating against us with wicked words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and them that would he forbiddeth, and casteth them out of the church.

That in the acts of this seeker of preëminence, who excommunicated all who held with the Apostle, we have something like the beginnings of an episcopacy, we need not argue, as Dr. Salmon has recognized it for us. "It is remarkable," he says, "that John appears to have found the form of government by a single man already in existence; for Diotrephes singly is spoken of as excommunicating those who disobeyed his prohibitions. Bishop Lightfoot is disposed to attribute a principal share in the establishment of episcopacy to the action of John in Asia Minor. But if the view taken here is right, John did not bring in that form of government, but found it there; whether it was that Paul had originally so constituted the churches; or that, in the natural growth of things, the method of government by a single man, which in political matters was the rule of the Roman Empire, proved to be also the most congenial to the people in ecclesiastical matters. It is impossible for us to say whether the rejection of John's legates was actuated solely

by jealousy of foreign intrusion, or whether there may not have been also doctrinal differences. Diotrophes may have been tainted by that Docetic heresy against which the Apostle so earnestly struggled."¹

In this interesting statement two things are overlooked. The first is that the head and front of Diotrophes' offending is his seeking a preëminence, which exalted him into a monarchic position in the church; and that this calls down upon him the censure of that Apostle whom Bishop Lightfoot supposes to have been the authorizer of episcopal preëminence. The second is that the Apostle says not a word that hints that Diotrophes is doctrinally tainted, and charity forbids us to charge that upon even a bishop without proof. "It seems very clear," says Mr. Purchas, an Anglican clergyman in New Zealand, "that if St. John was the author of these short Epistles, he must have opposed or discouraged the beginnings of the episcopate, and as a quiet protest, called himself 'the presbyter.'"

Besides these statements of principle from our Lord and his Apostles, the New Testament tells us of the actual practice of the latter in the selection, installation and classification of the officials of the ecclesias² they gathered.

First, of course, comes the church in Jerusalem, which enjoyed the presence and the direction of the Apostles for years after Pentecost, until divine Providence led the way to their labors among the peoples represented at the first great outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Acts ii: 9-11). Even before that event, the disciples, at the suggestion of Peter, had proceeded to fill the place left

¹ *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 273. Bishop Gore follows Dr. Salmon in this suggestion as to Diotrophes in his work *The Church and the Ministry*, saying: "We shall be inclined to see in Diotrophes, with his ambitious self-exaltation, and his power 'to cast out of the church' brethren who had come to him from St. John, one of these local bishops, who was misusing his power."

² I follow Dr. Hort in the use of the original Greek term, in order to avoid the ambiguities which attach to "assembly" and "church" in modern usage. See his notable book, *The Christian Ecclesia* (London, 1897).

vacant by the apostasy of Iscariot, by selecting a twelfth Apostle. They put forward two disciples whom they judged fit for the place, and, as the Spirit was not yet given them for a decision through prophecy, they called upon God to make the decision through their casting lots. Matthias, on whom the lot fell, "was numbered with the Apostles," but received no ordination from the Eleven. God's choice of him was found sufficient.

After the gathering of the first Christian ecclesia at Pentecost, we hear for a time of no officials except the Apostles themselves, whose proper vocation made it impossible that they should fill that place permanently. The analogy of the Jewish synagogue, and the subsequent history of this and other ecclesias, suggest that elders were set forward as the responsible leaders of the ecclesia. But it is not until the eve of the persecution by which were scattered so many of the church, that the elders of the ecclesia emerge into notice, as the recipients of the money sent from Antioch for the relief of the poor saints in Jerusalem. Archbishop Whately suggests that those elders of the synagogue who had accepted the gospel became elders of the church without any other election or ordination. This harmonizes with the general desire at this time to maintain the continuity of the two organizations.

In this interval the daily care of the poor became a tax upon the time of the Apostles, and the Jews of the Dispersion resident in the city complained that their widows were overlooked. So the Apostles called upon the ecclesia to choose men for this service, whom they would put in charge of it. The whole ecclesia made the choice of seven men, and presented them to the Apostles, who prayed and laid hands upon them. Nothing is said of prophets aiding in the selection; but this does not prove that it was not done, as in later cases. Nor is any name

given to the office of the seven. The title of deacon never occurs in the Book of the Acts. But as the work over which they were placed was called a *diakonia* before they were chosen to it, and as the description of it corresponds to that of the deacons of the churches in a later time, they have been called "the seven deacons"; and quite rightly.

The next occurrence which casts light on the subject was at Antioch. In that great city of northern Syria, once the capital of western Asia, and noted equally for its wealth and its viciousness, a church of Hebrew Christians had been gathered by brethren, who went down from Jerusalem. Then believers from Cyprus and Cyrene, coming to Antioch possibly on business, spoke of the Way to Gentile Greeks, possibly their business acquaintance. "The hand of the Lord was with them," and their faithfulness resulted in gathering many to Christ. This opened up the whole question of missionary work among the Gentiles, and the ecclesia in Jerusalem sent down Barnabas to learn and report upon the facts. He summoned Saul from Tarsus to help in the work, and they labored together for a whole year in a mixed ecclesia of Jews and Greeks. On this ecclesia the duty of mission work among the Gentiles must have pressed heavily. They appear to have held "a solemn meeting expressly with reference to a project for carrying the gospel to the heathen" (Hort), and received the answer to their prayers from the Holy Spirit, who, through prophets in the ecclesia, said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Then with fasting and prayer, hands were laid upon these two, either by the prophets, or by the whole ecclesia (Hort), and they went forth. Neither of the two, so far as we know, had received "the grace of orders" from the Twelve. Paul's

language to the churches of Galatia shows that he could not have accepted any such ordination from the Twelve without giving up his claim to stand on the same ground with them. This special ordination, commanded by the Holy Spirit, is effected either by the ecclesia of Antioch, or by Symeon, Lucius and Manaen—prophets indeed, but not Apostles in any sense (Acts xiii: 1-3).

On Paul's first missionary voyage he and Barnabas seem to have been absorbed in evangelistic work on their way out, from Perga through Pisidian Antioch to Derbe. It was on their return over the same route that they took steps to establish responsible leaders in each of the ecclesias they had gathered. So "having appointed for them elders in every ecclesia, and having prayed for them with fastings, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed" (Acts xiv: 23).

The second missionary journey was clouded at its outset by the disagreement of Paul and Barnabas as to taking John Mark with them, and they parted company. Paul went on to the churches in which he had appointed elders. In that of Lystra a young man had risen to prominence as a fit implement for a great service. Prophecy seems to have designated him as a proper companion for the Apostle himself, and to this he was set apart by laying on hands, not by the whole ecclesia of Lystra, but by its body of elders (or presbytery). Paul specified the presbytery as acting, in his first Epistle to Timothy, whose purpose is to teach him his relations to "the ecclesia of God"; but speaks of the imposition of his own hands in the second, which is more private and personal (Hort). In both he mentions a "gift" (*charisma*), bestowed on Timothy at that time. Some regard this as a supernatural endowment of some sort, like the "gift of tongues" or the "gift of healing." Dr. Hort thinks it means rather a

personal endowment, fitting a man for service, like the "pounds" and the "talents" of our Lord's parables.

Between the first and the second of Paul's missionary journeys came the council at Jerusalem, and in Luke's narrative of this we see the outstanding position and responsibilities of the presbyters of that ecclesia. Although requested by the ecclesia at Antioch to go up to Jerusalem "unto the Apostles and presbyters," to vindicate his methods of missionary work against the fault-finding of the Judaizing party, he went with reluctance, and only after being directed by a vision. He and his companions were received in Jerusalem "by the ecclesia, and the Apostles, and the presbyters." In the council itself "the Apostles and the presbyters" are said to take part; but the narrative shows that it was held in the presence of "the whole ecclesia," which also acquiesced in the decision reached. If that ecclesia had at its head an official who was something else than an Apostle or a presbyter, Luke does not seem to have known it.

We are asked, however, to observe the part taken in the council by James the Lord's brother, who is said to have been neither of the Apostles of that name. This last assertion is based on the statement of the fourth Gospel that our Lord's brethren "did not believe on him" (John vii: 5) up to the close of his Galilæan ministry, while the selection of the Apostles occurred nearly a year earlier, and of course included James the son of Alphæus. After the resurrection they and his mother are found in the company which awaited the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Acts i: 14). The question is a difficult one. Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, Augustine and Chrysostom are of the opinion that the James of the council, the "James the Lord's brother" of Galatians i: 19, was James the son of Alphæus, one of the Twelve. This implies that

Paul uses the word "brother" either as synonymous with "cousin," according to the usage borrowed by the Septuagint translators from the Hebrew, or in a vague sense of preëminence of likeness to our Lord—more probably the former. The statement of the fourth Gospel cannot be pressed to exclude any one of our Lord's "brothers"; since such expressions are often used in the Scriptures to cover a class generally rather than numerically. And Paul's expression to the Galatians means that James was one of the twelve Apostles. The admission of his epistle into the canon grew out of the conviction of the Church that it was one of the apostolic epistles. Luther's opinion that this James was not the Apostle he alleged in justification of his rejection of its authority.

The relation of James to the church in Jerusalem is alleged by many episcopalian writers as the case "of a church being presided over by a single resident ruler, . . . whose attitude towards the local church, his renunciation of missionary work, and his remaining with the holy city, point him out as the first true and proper bishop."¹

If James was an Apostle, as the great fathers held, and as Paul twice fairly asserts, his connection with the church in Jerusalem proves nothing for episcopacy. No one disputes that the government of the churches was committed to the Apostles, and that it was within their power to assign any of their number for permanent exercise of his office to the mother church in Jerusalem. In that capacity James may have stood at the head of the ecclesia in the holy city, without more being implied for the permanent government of the churches than was involved in the appointment of Apostles at any rate.

The proofs of his special connection with that ecclesia from the New Testament are neither numerous nor cogent.

¹ *The Infallibility of the Church*, by Dr. George Salmon (London), 1888, p. 350.

Not one of them is specially related to the affairs of the ecclesia, or concerns its government. The first is that when Peter was delivered from the prison into which Herod had cast him, he told the company at the house of Mary of Gethsemane, "Tell these things unto James, and to the brethren." For which of twenty possible reasons the message went to James, we are not told, nor yet why "the bishop" of the ecclesia was absent when so "many were gathered together and praying" for Peter's deliverance.

Three years after Paul's conversion he "went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and tarried with him fifteen days. But other of the Apostles saw I none, but only James the Lord's brother. . . . Then after the space of fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem. . . . And when they perceived the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars" of the ecclesia, "gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision." Here twice James is mentioned among the Apostles, and even the "pillar Apostles," and included in the number of those who had a mission to the Hebrew people, on which he, no less than Peter and John, was to "go." Yet Dr. Salmon, on the authority of Ebionite documents, thinks he stood apart from the others in a "renunciation of missionary work." And the things about which Paul satisfied James and the other two are not the affairs of the church in Jerusalem, but the broad field of apostolic labor.

The council at Jerusalem was occupied with questions of equal breadth, and was not a meeting of a single ecclesia, or about the affairs of that ecclesia. The inference, from James being the last speaker, that he presided in the council, is hasty; nor would his presidency have been appropriate in a "Bishop of Jerusalem." The significance

of his action is due to the fact that he stood for the desire and purpose to emphasize the intimacy of the relations between the law and the gospel, and to avoid stress on their differences. When he agreed to a settlement which would be acceptable to Paul and Barnabas, the basis for peace was reached. "Guardian of the honor of Israel as he was in the ecclesia, he throws his voice on the side of liberty" (Hort), and carries with him even "those of the sect of the Pharisees" who had wanted to insist on the circumcision of Gentile converts.

Paul's third missionary journey brings us to the memorable scene at Miletus, with the elders of the ecclesia in Ephesus, whom he had summoned to meet him. He had stayed longer at Ephesus than at any other field of apostolic labor, Corinth not excepted. In that great center of idolatrous influence he had gathered the most important of the Gentile churches, and that which evoked from him the most profound of his epistles. Yet Luke has said nothing of the appointment of elders for that church, and we learn of it only when Paul sends for them. His wonderful address to them, Meyer calls "a mirror of the pastoral office"; and it abounds in that noble egotism which does not offend us in those who know that what is great or good in them is of God, and not of self. The passage which concerns us here runs: "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock [*poimanion*] in which the Holy Spirit has placed you overseers [*episkopous*], to shepherd [*poimainein*] the ecclesia of God [or, of the Lord], which he hath purchased with his own blood."

The term rendered "overseers" is that used in later times as the title of an office; that of bishop, is here employed as descriptive of a function. It is the pastoral function, "the cure of souls," which the Holy Spirit has committed to these elders, who are to shepherd the

whole flock. It has been given to them with the same solemnity as marked Paul's own appointment to missionary labor at Antioch. Through the prophets the spirit has called upon the Apostle and the ecclesia to "separate these men" to this office.

We know that Ephesus afterwards was for a time the residence of Timothy as an evangelist; and that John spent his last years there, toward the close of the century. But we have no record that either Timothy or John saw any reason to set aside the church order which the Holy Spirit had established there, or to commit the oversight to any single person, instead of the presbytery set up by him at the first. Writers at the close of the second century—Ireneus, Tertullian, and by implication Clement of Alexandria—tell us that John appointed a single person with the title of bishop to the pastoral charge of that church, thus setting aside the arrangement which Paul regarded as having the sanction of the Holy Spirit. But none of them can tell us his name. For that we have to go to spurious writings of a later time, and even these do not agree. Pseudo-Hippolytus and Pseudo-Dorotheus give us the names Phygellus and Caius; the constitutions and canons of the Holy Apostles say it was another John than the Apostle.

The Pauline Epistles present the matter in the same light as does the Book of the Acts. They are generally addressed to the churches Paul gathered and furnished with elders for their guidance. But they much more concern the acts of the ecclesias themselves than the duties of any officials. They show them to have been intensively active societies, busy with the personal needs of their individual members, with the discipline of the unworthy, and with the propagation of the gospel by example and word within the cities in which they sojourn. The elders

and deacons have no standing apart from the ecclesia. They are the organs of its life in their own sphere of action; but that life is far too varied and abundant to be bounded by their activity.

In three notable passages—1 Corinthians xii: 27-30; Romans xii: 4-13; Ephesians iv: 3-12—the Apostle speaks of the manifold functions with which the Spirit has endowed the members of the ecclesia for its upbuilding in numbers, wisdom and grace, but without professing to exhaust the subject. In view of the picture of the ecclesia they offer, sociologists must classify it as the highest form of human society known to history, as it was one of the greatest complexity of organization and function—a body in which every member had his gift and his use for it. Paul starts, of course, from Jesus Christ, who to the ecclesia was not a theory, or a doctrine, or a memory, but the living head, ruling its activities, “from whom the whole body, jointed and knit together through every juncture of service, according to the measure of the energy of each several part, maketh increase of the body to upbuilding itself in love.” Among these manifold activities those of rule and government, and the preaching of the word, hold their proper place, but not the whole field of service. And their object is “the perfecting of the saints unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ.”

Of his earlier epistles, only that to the ecclesia in Philippi makes any distinct reference to the officers who guide it. He sends greeting “to all the saints, with the *episkopois* and *diakonois*.” Are these terms titles of office or descriptions of function? Our translators think them titles of office, and render them “bishops and deacons.” Dr. Hort thinks them descriptive, and would translate “with them that have oversight, and them that

do service." Polycarp, writing to the same ecclesia in the next century, speaks of its officers as "presbyters and deacons"; and Dr. Hort thinks these were the actual titles in Paul's time. This shows that the church leadership and authority set up in the first days of that church had remained unaltered after the death of all the Apostles.

The Pastoral Epistles to Timothy and Titus belong to the last years of Paul's life. The first to Timothy was written that he might "know how men ought to behave in the house of God, which is an ecclesia of God, a pillar and a prop of the truth." It therefore deals more fully than does any other with the ecclesiastical problems of that and of all times. He quotes with approval the saying that "if a man reaches after oversight, he desires a good work," and proceeds to describe the graces and gifts which are required in him who exercises pastoral oversight in an ecclesia. He must be a teacher, hospitable, sober, prudent, and above all else a good ruler of his own house. Not a word suggests either a monopoly of any function, or a necessity for such itineracy as fell to the Apostles and the evangelists. Then comes a statement of what is required in deacons, male and female, ending with the statement that those who have rendered this service splendidly "gain to themselves a good degree" (R. V., "standing"). Upon this slender foundation has been built the justification of the practice of treating the diaconate as a first step to the position of presbyter, in the Roman Catholic and the Anglican churches. But the New Testament diaconate is a lifelong office, and not a step to another office.

What is said of elders in the opening of chapter v, applies manifestly to seniors in years. Not so with verse 17: "Let the elders who preside [*proestotes*] well be held worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in discourse

and in teaching." The reference here is to the two kinds of church service, taken from the usage of the synagogue. At the first, in the forenoon, prayer, praise and the preaching of the word were chief. At the second, called by the Jews the *beth-ha-midrash* (or "house of instruction"), teaching took the place of preaching, and was in the hands of the best instructed members of the assembly, by preference the elders. Questions were asked and answered freely on some subject of general interest and profit. It was in such an assembly that Mary found her son, "sitting in the midst of the teachers, both hearing them, and asking them questions" (Luke ii: 46).¹ It is to this part of the work of the ecclesia that reference almost invariably is made when the word "doctrine" (R. V., "teaching") is used in our English Bible.

Paul here recognizes only one sort of elder, but three functions connected with the office, in which they did not equally excel. Some presided well in the meetings of the ecclesia; some found their best scope in preaching the word of reconciliation in the forenoon service; and some excelled in the still harder work of teaching the Scriptures to the people. Paul's ideal elder is the one who does all three in the best way. This, however, does not give him any preëminence but that of usefulness, and possibly a larger provision for his personal support, as such work must make a larger demand upon his time and strength. He has not even a title of office different from that of less effective men.

The Apostle proceeds to instruct Timothy as to the duties of his position as an evangelist (2 Timothy iv: 5) or apostolic delegate in a Christian ecclesia. He is not to spare those elders or deacons whose faults of life or

¹ See Dr. Henry Clay Trumbull's *Yale Lectures on the Sunday School*, Philadelphia, 1888.

conduct are proven, that a wholesome fear may affect the rest. But he is to exact the same degree of proof in these cases as Jewish law required. That he is to "lay hands on no man suddenly," does not concern ordinations, but—as the words which follow show—the restoration of penitents after excommunication. Neither of these epistles indicates that ordination is one of his responsibilities, or that the presbytery of the Ephesian ecclesia was debarred from doing what had been done in Timothy's own case by that of Lystra.

The Second Epistle is more personal to its recipient, and has its worth in indicating what, in the Apostle's view, was the work of an evangelist. He charges Timothy "in the sight of God," to "preach the word; be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and teaching. . . . Be thou sober in all things, suffer hardship, do the work of an evangelist, fulfil thy ministry." Here also we have the cure of souls put forward as the great work of the Christian minister of whatever degree, as it was that of the Apostle himself.

The Epistle to Titus tells us that this evangelist had been left in Crete to "set in order the things that were wanting, and to appoint elders in every city" where an ecclesia had been gathered by the Apostle himself. To him also the Apostle states the qualifications of an elder, again using of that officer the term *episkopos*, thus describing him as one who has a share in the oversight of the ecclesia. This is the fourth time the Apostle uses the term, and always as descriptive of the pastoral labors of the elders of the ecclesia (Acts xx: 28; Philippians i: 1; 1 Timothy iii: 1; Titus i: 7).

The Epistle to the Hebrews bids the unknown ecclesia to which it was addressed to "remember them that had the rule over you [more exactly "your guides"], who spoke

to you the word of God. . . . Be not carried away by divers and strange teachings. . . . Obey them that have the rule over you ["your guides"] and submit, for they lose their sleep for the sake of your souls, as having to render an account" (Hebrews xiii: 7, 9, 17). As Jerome points out, the ecclesia thus addressed is under a plurality of teachers and pastors, of equal rank and responsibility. It has a church order identical with that described in the Acts and the Epistles of Paul.

The Epistle of James is of especial interest here, as the work of "the Lord's brother," the alleged "Bishop of Jerusalem." As it is addressed to the Christian believers of the Jewish Dispersion, it would have suited its author well to have called himself by a title which connected him honorably with the holy city. But he describes himself only as "a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ."

The epistle bears out the description Dr. Hort gives of James, as desiring to keep unbroken the bond between his Jewish brethren and the Christian ecclesia. He alone of all the New Testament writers uses the word "synagogue" for a meeting of the Christian ecclesia (ii: 2). In one passage only he refers to church order: "Is any among you sick? let him send for the elders of the ecclesia; and let them pray over him, anointing with oil in the name of the Lord" (v: 14). Did the "Bishop of Jerusalem" forget what was due to his brother bishops when he wrote this direction? Or did Jerusalem, with the Apostles at hand, need a monarchic Bishop so much more than did these outlying churches that James was the only example of that office?

Revelation gives us a picture of the Church in heaven, which reflects as in outline the Church upon earth. The seer beholds a "great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation and of all tribes and peoples and

tongues, standing before the Throne and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes, and palms in their hands; and they cry with a great voice, saying, 'Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb'' (Revelation vii: 9, 10). "And around the throne thrones four and twenty, and upon the thrones four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white garments, and upon their heads crowns of gold." They it is who respond to the ceaseless adoration of the four living beings, casting their crowns before the throne, and joining in the endless song of heavenly praise (Revelation iv: 4, 8-11). Heaven has its celestial presbytery, whose lesser thrones encircle the throne, second only to its majesty. From their number comes the interpreter, who comforts the seer by the assurance that the Lamb can open the book of prophecy. This is not the symbolism a Cyprian or a Laud would have employed to express that heaven's order reflects itself in the Church on earth.

Such is the account the New Testament gives us of the procedure of the Apostles in establishing a ministry in the ecclesias of God. Nor have we anywhere a suggestion that this was an imperfect order, and that it was to be replaced by another during or after their time. The instructions given by the great Apostles manifestly imply its permanence, since they contemplate the existence of but two offices, with a plurality of each in every church. These are the only ordinary and local officers the New Testament knows of. The apostolate everywhere is connected with the personal testimony to the resurrection of our Lord, so that it could not outlast the generation of the first witnesses. As for successors to them, that was made unthinkable by the general expectation that he would return in some visible way to resume visible rule over his Church, before that generation had passed away.

“We all shall not sleep,” says the Apostle, “but we shall all be changed.” Every year they looked for the advent of the Lord to judgment. Paul found the Thessalonian Christians distressed about those who had fallen asleep before the great event (1 Thessalonians iv:13; cf. Dr. Salmon’s *Introduction*, p. 363).

From Clement of Rome, or whoever was the author of the epistle from the church in Rome to the church in Corinth, we learn that the Apostles themselves came to contemplate a longer delay in that matter than they did at the first:

The Apostles brought us the Good Tidings from the Lord Jesus Christ. . . . Through regions and cities proclaiming this, they appointed their first fruits, after testing them in the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who should believe, . . . and then gave them a farther injunction to the end that, if they fell asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministry.

The reputed and probable author of this statement certainly had known one, and possibly two, of the Apostles. When he wrote they all were dead; but he has learned nothing of that threefold ministry which was to supersede the ministry of “bishops and deacons” the Apostles had established. He did know, he says, that they had been forewarned by their Lord that there would arise a strife in the churches over the “oversight”; and this he finds fulfilled in the expulsion of certain presbyters in Corinth from their office.

Many, if not most, of the asserters of divine right for the monarchic episcopate admit that the institution cannot be traced back to the period which is described in the New Testament. They seem to claim that it arose, with apostolic sanction, in the period between the writing of the parts of the New Testament I have quoted, and the expiry of the apostolic college, or between the overthrow

of Jerusalem and the reign of Trajan (A. D. 70-98), and that this is proved by the existence of monarchic episcopacy in Asia early in the second century, as shown by the Ignatian epistles, and by the positive testimony of Hegesippus, Tertullian and Ireneus at the close of the second century. The value of this evidence I shall discuss in the next chapters.

They also claim that the principle of episcopal authority and oversight finds recognition in the New Testament (1) in the relation of James to the church in Jerusalem; (2) in the authority conveyed to Timothy and Titus by Paul; (3) by the mention of "angels" as ruling the seven churches of the Revelation.

(1) Of the claim as to James, I have spoken already. It is noticeable that not even the Ebionite authorities, whom Hegesippus has used, give him the title of bishop, and we have seen that he does not use it himself, and takes for granted the presbyterial government of the churches to which he writes his Epistle, and no recorded act or saying of his is concerned with the government or direction of the ecclesia of Jerusalem.

(2) "The New Testament itself," says Dr. Lightfoot, "contains as yet no direct and indisputable notices of a localized episcopate in the Gentile churches, as distinguished from the movable episcopate exercised by Timothy in Ephesus and by Titus in Crete."¹ Even Cyprian would have been puzzled by the phrase "movable episcopate," however natural it may seem to an English or American Anglican, with the huge sees of their churches in mind, and "a railway pass for a pastoral staff," as Dr. Hugh Miller Thompson, afterwards "Bishop of Mississippi" (47,156 square miles), once said. As both Timothy and Titus, however, were called away by the

¹ *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. ii.

Apostle from those fields of labor, the adjective is expedient, that no precedent might be furnished for non-resident bishops of later days.

Paul, in writing to the Ephesians, says of the gifts wherewith our Lord has enriched his Church, "He gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." To Timothy he writes, "Do the work of an evangelist, fulfil thy ministry." As evangelists Timothy and Titus were doing a work which came nearer to that of the Apostles than did the local minister of any church, whatever his title or rank. The mission of the Apostles was world-wide, to "all the nations" (Matthew xxviii: 19). It was aggressive, as carrying the good news to cities not reached. It was foundational, as establishing ecclesias and providing them with the equipment which would enable them to grow in numerical strength, deepen their spiritual life and perpetuate their own existence. Where the Apostles, especially Paul, found men fit to share in this work, they took them as coworkers. Barnabas, Silvanus (Silas), Timothy, Titus, Apollos, Aristarchus, Crescens and Philip of Cæsarea are names of men we know to have been thus employed as evangelists, and doubtless there were others in that age.

After the death of the Apostles this class of itinerant workers went on until the third century. They continued the Church's aggressive work, and were sometimes honored with the name of apostles, but more commonly known as evangelists. The goal of their labors, like that of the Apostles, was to establish self-supporting and self-perpetuating churches, to intrust them to faithful elders, and to commit them to the Lord's grace. Eusebius adds the name of the prophet Quadratus to the list of evangelists, and says of them:

There were many others noted in those times, who held the first rank of the succession from the Apostles. And these, as goodly disciples of such men, everywhere built upon the foundations of the churches laid before by the Apostles, enlarged the preaching of the word, and scattered the saving seed of the kingdom of heaven throughout the inhabited world.
 Withdrawing from their own country, they accomplished the work of evangelists to those who had not as yet heard the word of faith. And they, having laid the foundations of the faith in strange places—that alone being their work—and having appointed pastors for others, and committed to these the care [tillage] of those who had just been brought in, went on to other places and peoples with the grace and the help of God. It is impossible for us to enumerate by name all who became pastors and evangelists in the first succession from the Apostles in the Church throughout the world.¹

In the early Christian literature it is the *Teaching [Didache] of the Twelve Apostles* at the opening of the second century which tells us most of these “successors of the Apostles.” It gives them the name of apostles, and says:

As to the Apostles and Prophets, do according to the ordinance of the Gospel; and let every Apostle that comes to you be received as the Lord. And he shall not remain beyond one day; but if there be need, the next also. But if he remain three days, he is a false prophet. And let the Apostle, when departing, taking nothing but bread to last him until he reach his next stopping place; and if he ask for money, he is a false prophet.

Besides this we have references to such apostles in Hermas, in Ireneus, in Tertullian and in Origen.

The need for such a class of unlocalized workers lessened when churches had been gathered in all the cities of the empire, and placed under pastors by these itinerants. The office always had been hard to keep within the bounds of proper responsibility. It was claimed by many who had no fitness for it, but who enjoyed the prestige and the authority it conferred. Paul writes to the church of Corinth of “false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ” (2 Corinthians xi: 13);

¹ *Eusebii Historia Ecclesiastica*, Lib. III, Cap. 38.

and our Lord in Revelation thus praises the church in Ephesus: "Thou canst not bear evil men, and didst try them which call themselves apostles, and they are not, and didst find them false" (Revelation ii:2). We have seen the warnings of the *Didache* against those who used the pretence of being apostles to live off the churches. Tertullian asks, "Who are false apostles, unless spurious evangelists?" So this class of workers ceased from the service of the church, but not until the true men among them had accomplished great things for their Master's kingdom. Nobody of that age connects them with the monarchic bishops, as their duties and their fields of labor were altogether different.

(3) That the "angels" of the seven churches of Asia were not monarchic bishops we have reason to assume after seeing the picture of the Church in heaven with its presbytery, drawn in the same book. Nor did anyone in later days use the title "angel" for a bishop of any sort, until the rise of the Catholic Apostolic Church in 1831-1835. No later bishop of these seven churches calls himself, or is called, an "angel." Where the word is used of a church officer, it is applied to a deacon who serves as a messenger to other churches. Drs. John Lightfoot, Albrecht Bengel and George B. Winer think these angels of the Asian churches were no more than such deacons; but the tone in which they are addressed implies something higher and more responsible than this.

Jerome and others of the fathers take them to have been members of the angelic hierarchy, who exercised a special guardianship over these Asian churches, after the fashion of the "princes" who in the Book of Daniel exercise such a guardianship over the nations. But the language of personal censure used to most of them excludes this interpretation.

“The language used concerning them,” says Dean Stanley, in his *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolical Age*, “compels us to regard them not as individual ministers, but as the churches themselves, personified in their guardian or representative angels.” It is the language of the Jewish apocalyptic, which constantly personified bodies of men as an individual. This is shown by the close of each address (or epistle): “He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches.”

We may dismiss, therefore, the three supposed suggestions of the monarchic episcopate in the New Testament, as having no pertinence to the matter in hand. The apostolic records know of no permanent and local officers in the churches higher than the presbyter-bishops, of which each church has a plurality. It knows of no successors to the Apostles, unless it be the class of evangelists, which afterwards died out when its work was done. It knows of no inequality among the presbyter-bishops of the local church, by which one of these is entitled to preëminence above the rest. It warns the churches against the growth of an unchristian ambition for preëminence. And the last of the Apostles warns his contemporaries that that ambition was already at work in men like Diotrephes.

Before bringing to a close this review of the principles and the practices of the churches in the New Testament, it is necessary to say something of the two terms *presbuteros* and *episcopos*, commonly rendered “presbyter” (or “elder”) and “bishop” (or “overseer”). It is immaterial to the argument whether we take the latter term as the title of an office at this time, or (with Dr. Hort) as descriptive of a function of the office of elder. “In the second century,” he says, “the word was certainly used as a title, though for a different office; and it was already

in various use as a title in the Greek world. But against this we must set the fact that both in the Bible (Septuagint, Apocrypha and the New Testament itself: 1 Peter ii: 25) and in other literature, including Philo, it retains its common etymological or descriptive meaning, 'overseer.'"

The term "elder" takes us back to the history of the Jewish people. As early as the time of Joseph (Genesis 50: 7) we find the local rulers of the people called "elders" (*zikenim*). Seventy elders were associated with Moses to relieve him of the burdens of government (Numbers xi: 16, 17). In later days "the elders of the cities" were the responsible rulers, who might be called to account for any disorder that arose (Judges viii: 14; 1 Samuel xi: 3; xvi: 4; xxx: 26; 1 Kings xxi: 8, 11; 1 Kings x: 1; Ezra x: 14; Lamentations ii: 10; 2 Maccabees xiv: 37).

The rise of the synagogue as the local center of weekly worship, instruction and discipline, dates from the period after the return from the Exile. It was ruled by a Sanhedrin of elders, who exercised the power to "cast out" or excommunicate those who sinned against the law or the traditions. One (or more) of these was invested with the title of "Ruler of the Synagogue" (*archisunagogos*), and seems to have presided at the Sabbath worship, and to have called upon suitable persons to read, pray or exhort (Mark v: 22; Luke iv: 16, 17; viii: 49; xiii: 14; Acts xiii: 15; xviii: 8, 17). It is noteworthy that no such distinctive title is given to any of the elders of the Christian ecclesia, although Paul recognizes in some of them an especial fitness to preside (1 Timothy v: 17).

The term *episkopos* is found in the Septuagint Greek version of the Old Testament, as rendering of *pakid* ("overseer") in several places. But the office of overseer, whether of the work upon the Temple, or of various classes

of officials, seems to have been obsolete in New Testament times,¹ and never to have had such currency as did the title "elder." As the term is used four times by the Apostle to the Gentiles, it is natural to seek a Greek source for its church use. But the data for this are extremely scanty.

Dr. Edwin Hatch believed he found the clue to its use in the Hellenistic and Gentile churches in two inscriptions, which employ this word as a title of the financial officers of a pagan temple in northern Syria, and of a pagan association in the island of Thera. He thinks this is confirmed by the Greek version of the Old Testament made in the second century by Symmachus, an Ebionite Christian. In this the officers appointed by Pharaoh, at Joseph's suggestion, to buy up corn in the years of plenty (Genesis xli: 34) are called *episkopoi*. He traces the rise of a monarchic episcopacy to the influence which naturally accrued to the presiding member of the council of the elders of the ecclesia, to whom the offertory was brought, and who was "primarily responsible for its distribution." He regards "the seven" of the Acts (vi: 3; xxi: 8) as a body of officials for general utility, afterwards differentiated into bishops and deacons.

It is Dr. Hatch's view that the presbyters were not so much possessors of an office, as members of a class, whose age secured them a veneration buttressed by long tradition, and recognized in both Gentile and Jewish usage. As such, they had the duty of arbitrating between Christians who quarreled, and of passing upon cases of moral offence. But they had no share in the management of

¹ Clement of Rome seems to think its use in the Church was foretold by Isaiah (lx: 17), of which he gives the rendering: "I will establish their overseers [*episkopous*] in righteousness and their ministers [*diakonous*] in faith." The Septuagint rendering is: "And I will give thee rulers [*archontas*] in peace and thy overseers [*episkopous*] in righteousness," which comes much closer to the sense of the original Hebrew.

church finance, and were not charged with preaching or the direction of worship.¹

These positions are irreconcilable with both the language of the New Testament and that of early Christian writers. The statements found in the Acts about Barnabas and Paul appointing presbyters in the churches of inner Asia, and that employed by Paul as to Titus appointing presbyters in Crete, both imply that these were not a class which attained their distinction from the body of the ecclesia through their advance in years and the respect for age. So what Paul says of presbyters who labor in discourse and in teaching, and in presiding at the meetings of the ecclesia, certainly is inconsistent with the view that they dealt only in arbitration and discipline. And the language used by Clement of Rome in the next generation, as we shall see, cannot be reconciled with Dr. Hatch's hypothesis.²

Dr. Hatch, indeed, never quotes either Acts or the Pastoral Epistles on this point. Probably he agreed with the Tübingen school in regarding both as written for a controversial purpose, in the second century. Dr. Adolph Harnack, who translated Dr. Hatch's work into German, and who accepted his theory in the main, took this view of their date and character at that time. But even if this were true, it would not impair the force of their testimony, but only make it bear upon a later time

¹ See *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches; the Bampton Lectures for the Year 1880*, by Edwin Hatch, D.D. Fifth edition (London, 1895). See on the other side *The Christian Ecclesia*, by Dr. F. J. A. Hort (London, 1897); and *The Church of the Sub-Apostolic Age*, by Dr. James Heron (London, 1888).

² Dr. Döllinger (*Hippolytus and Callistus*, pp. 313-317) sees in the title of presbyter a distinct reference to the teaching function: "It has long ago been remarked that the name presbyter was, at the end of the second century, still used of bishops. It has been rightly remarked that (in Ireneus) the notion of what is ancient and honorable is associated with the word, and that the name *presbuteros*, even when given to a bishop, was a title of honor; but unmistakably something further must have been implied in this title, viz., the authority to teach, the *magisterium*. Bishops or others are called presbyters primarily as the holders and teachers of ecclesiastical tradition and knowledge." This is in harmony with the Jewish use of the word, for the elders of the synagogue were mainly teachers of the people.

than the age of the Apostles. At whatever date the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles were written, at that time the ordination of presbyters of the ecclesia must have been usual, and they also must have been taking a share in the worship and teaching of the ecclesia, which Dr. Hatch denies them. Now that Dr. Harnack has been brought to see that the book of the Acts is the work of Luke, he may revise his views as to the eldership.

Dr. Hatch thinks that the primitive bishop corresponded more to the treasurer of a beneficial society than to anything else in modern usage. The evidence alleged for this chiefly financial character comes mainly from the third and fourth centuries. At that time great stress was laid upon the management of the income of the churches and much complaint was heard of abuses in the administration of charity. But this is not the impression created by the literature of the second century, with the exception of Cyprian. The statements in Clement of Rome and Polycarp coincide with the language of Acts xi: 30 in placing this matter, apart from the actual distribution of relief to the poor, in the hands of the presbyters of the ecclesia.

We find in Dr. Hatch's theory no real explanation of the use of the term *episkopos* (overseer) to describe one of the functions of the presbyter, and presumably the most important function. Was it not to emphasize the difference between the Jewish elder and that of the Christian Church? The duties of the Jewish elder, like those of the modern rabbi, were discharged within the four walls of the synagogue.¹ They never exercised that cure

¹ My friend, the late Simon Stern, once told me of hearing a Jewish rabbi of Philadelphia replying from the pulpit to the complaint of his flock that he did not visit them in their homes, as Christian ministers visited their people. "Why should we?" he replied; "we are not your pastors; we have no cure of souls, such as the Christian minister has. You would not welcome us if we came among you on that footing. And for us to come for mere social visits would be waste of our time and of yours also."

of souls which is so distinctive a work of the Christian ministry. They were not shepherds or pastors of the people, but readers of the law, teachers of the traditions. They had no direct and personal responsibility for the conduct and spiritual growth of those who waited on their ministrations.

Peter very rightly traces the new character of Christian ministry to our Lord himself, calling him "the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls." He was such to the Twelve in his careful oversight of their thoughts and acts, and his training of them for a similar service to others. He still is such to his people, partly through his ministers, and still more through his Spirit. How new and unusual this was escapes us. The very idea of it was wanting to the Judaism of his time. When he looked upon the people, "He was moved with compassion for them, because they were distressed and scattered, as sheep not having a shepherd." He placed himself in a relation to them more intimate and helpful than any they ever had known; and he established this relation as a permanent element of his kingdom. He gave discipleship a new meaning, and he sent out the Twelve with the commission to make such disciples of "all the nations." They were to create throughout mankind a ministry of such intimacy and helpfulness as had existed in him toward them.

"Shepherd and Bishop of your souls!" Peter unites the two terms as if mutually explanatory. There are three things which go to make up the work of the shepherd, as our Lord describes it. The first is that the shepherd has the sheep on his mind, as his sheep, known to him by name, needing his thoughtfulness and foresight to supply their daily needs, requiring even that he may have to lay down his life for them in time of peril. The second is the willing response of the sheep to this care, as they

know the shepherd's voice, and are led to the pasture or the fold by him—not driven, for he goes before them. The last is the exercise of a constant direction by loving pressure on this side and that of their lives, so that they acquire the habits of wisdom and goodness from his training. And all this enters into the conception of the pastoral work of the Christian presbyter-bishop, who takes up the work of his Master in the cure of souls.

So Peter writes: "The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who am also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Tend [shepherd, *poimnate*] the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight, [bishops, *episcopountes*]¹ thereof, not of necessity, but according to the will of God; nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away." (1 Peter v: 1-5). Peter, as he wrote this, must have been recalling the morning at the lakeside, and the Saviour's three injunctions to himself: "Feed my lambs; shepherd my sheep; feed my sheep." It is one of the many reminiscences of the gospel story in this great Epistle.

The descriptive term "bishop" (*episcopos*), like that of "shepherd" or "pastor," emphasizes the especial

¹ Westcott and Hort omit *episcopountes* from their text, on account of its omission from the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. But it is found in the Alexandrian MS. and many others, and in the old translations, and is retained by Lachman, Tregelles and Tischendorf, as also by the revisers of the English Bible. Drs. Westcott and Hort were of the company of the revisers, and exerted a great influence in determining the text on which the revision was based; but at this point their associates parted from them, and retained the word, while stating on the margin that "some ancient authorities omit" it.

As Dr. Heron points out, if it be an interpolation, it must be as early as the first half of the second century, when the oversight of the churches was still exercised by presbyters. No interpolator would have inserted it after that duty had been assumed by a separate class called *episcopi*. It seems most probable that it was omitted after that change by some scribe, who sought to separate the presbyters as far as possible from the episcopal function.

calling of the Christian presbyter to care for the spiritual growth of the Christian people, or what is called "the cure of souls." It is given them because they are to "watch" [or, "lose their sleep"] in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account" (Hebrews xiii: 17). Its rightful symbol is the shepherd's crook (crozier), now unmeaning in the hand of an official so busy with matters of ecclesiastical administration as to be obliged to delegate the transcendent, Christlike work of shepherding the people to his subordinates in office. The pastoral bishop is the successor of the Apostle.

Dean Stanley has observed that, in the earliest of the Roman catacombs, the only symbol of Christian faith is the figure of the Good Shepherd, "with a crook or a shepherd's pipe in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries and holds with the other hand"; and that this "continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as these burial places were used." "On the other hand, there is no allusion to the Good Shepherd (with one exception) in the writers of the second century, and very few in the third; hardly any in Athanasius or in Jerome. If we come down much later, there is hardly any in the *Summa Theologiæ* of Thomas Aquinas, none in the Tridentine Catechism, none in the Thirty-nine Articles, none in the Westminster Confession. The only prominent allusions we find to this figure in the writers of early times are drawn from that same undercurrent of Christian society to which the catacombs themselves belong." "What was the popular religion of the first Christians? It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the grace, the love, the beauty of the Good Shepherd was to them, if we may so say, prayer book and articles, creed and canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed

to them all that they wanted.”¹ If this was true, it was because the figure recalled to them all the Good Shepherd was to them in living guidance and the shaping of character.

John Ruskin, while not always a first-rate authority in expounding the Scriptures, states rightly enough the apostolical conception of the bishop’s pastoral office. In *Sesame and Lilies* (1865) he says: “Their office is not to rule, though it may be vigorously to exhort and rebuke; it is the king’s office to rule; the bishop’s to oversee the flock, to number it, sheep by sheep, to be ready to give full account of it. . . . Down that back street, Bill and Nancy knocking each other’s teeth out!—Does the bishop know all about it? Has he had his eye upon them? Can he circumstantially explain how Bill got into the habit of beating Nancy about the head? If he cannot, he is no bishop—he has sought to be at the helm instead of the masthead; he has no sight of things. ‘Nay,’ you say, ‘it is not his duty to look after Bill on the back street. . . . That is not our idea of a bishop.’ Perhaps not; but it was St. Paul’s, and it was Milton’s.”

In his *Time and Tide, by Weare and Tyne* (1867), he says of these statements: “The reviewers in the ecclesiastical journals laughed at them, as a rhapsody, when the book came out; none having the slightest notion of what I meant (nor do I well see how it could be otherwise!). Nevertheless, I meant precisely and literally what is said there, namely that a bishop’s duty being to watch over the souls of his people, and give account of every one of them, it becomes practically necessary for him first to give some account of their bodies. Which he was wont to do in the early days of Christianity by help of a person

¹ *Christian Institutions: Essays on Ecclesiastical Subjects* (London, 1831), pp. 253–255.

called 'deacon' or 'ministering servant,' whose name is still retained among preliminary ecclesiastical dignities, vainly enough! Putting, however, all question of forms and names aside, the thing actually needing to be done is this—that over every hundred (or some not much greater number) of the families composing a Christian state, there should be appointed an overseer, or bishop, to render account, to the state, of the life of every individual in those families . . . with the patient and gentle watchfulness which true Christian pastors now exercise over their flocks; only with a higher legal authority of interference on due occasion.”

In an earlier work, *Notes on the Construction of Sheepfolds* (1851), Mr. Ruskin insisted on the reunion of the Churches of England and of Scotland, and says this is to be done “by keeping to Scripture. The members of the Scottish Church have not the shadow of an excuse for refusing episcopacy. It has indeed been abused among them—grievously abused; but it is in the Bible, and that is all they have a right to ask.” We have not the shadow of an excuse for rejecting such an episcopacy as we have seen Mr. Ruskin describe. That sort is in the Bible, and it, or something very like it, is in the Church of Scotland; but it is not what the Church of England and her daughter churches call episcopacy.

CHAPTER II

THE PRESBYTERIAN FATHERS

From the records of the apostolic age in the New Testament, I pass to those of the sub-apostolic age in the early Christian literature, to about the middle of the second century; and I shall try to quote every passage which bears upon the question. In doing so I shall distinguish between the plural episcopate of the first age, and the monarchic episcopate, which we find in possession of the field after A. D. 150. I note here that Sir William M. Ramsay puts this date at A. D. 175.¹

The documents of this period are:

- (1) *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (so called).
- (2) *The Shepherd* of Hermas of Rome.
- (3) The epistle of the church in Rome to the church in Corinth, which bears the name of Clement of Rome.
- (4) The Christian homily, of unknown authorship, generally known as "The Second Epistle of Clement."
- (5) The epistle of Polycarp of Smyrna to the church in Philippi.
- (6) The Syriac version of the Scriptures, called the Peschitto or "Simple."
- (7) The first Apology of Justin the Martyr.

¹ Adolph Harnack says that "about the year 140 the state of the organization of the congregations seems to have been still very various. Here and there, no doubt, the suitable arrangement of appointing but one bishop had been carried through, although probably there had been no important elevation of his functions, and the prophets and teachers still had control of the teaching. On the other hand, in other congregations there still may always have been a plurality of bishops, while the prophets and teachers usually no longer played an important part." (*Dogmengeschichte*, I, 183.)

(8) The epistles ascribed to Ignatius of Antioch.

The first seven are harmonious witnesses to the government of the sub-apostolic churches by a plurality of officers, called sometimes presbyters (elders) and sometimes bishops (overseers). They are reinforced by the accounts of the rejection of the heretic Noetus at Smyrna, the heretic Marcion at Rome, and the fanatical Montanists at Ancyra, by the presbyters of those churches. These accounts have been preserved for us by Hippolytus of Rome, Epiphanius of Salamis, and Rhodon (quoted by Eusebius).

The eighth of the series, the epistles ascribed to Ignatius of Antioch, offer what Dr. Lightfoot calls "the most perplexing problem which confronts the student of early Church history." They will be treated in a separate chapter.

(1) A book called *The Teaching (Didache) of the Twelve Apostles* is mentioned by a number of the fathers, but reached us only in quotations, until it was discovered by Philotheos Bryennius in an eleventh century MS., in a library at Constantinople, and was published in 1883. It has, of course, no claim to apostolic origin, although its style corresponds more closely to that of the New Testament writers than does any other piece of sub-apostolic literature. "The work," says Dr. Salmon, "bears every mark of great antiquity; and it has been commonly accepted as belonging to the beginning of the second century, if not to the latter part of the first."¹ It is the general conclusion that it originated in either Egypt or Syria, the lands nearest to the cradle of the church. It is probably the oldest of the post-apostolic documents, and the first witness to the order which existed in the churches after the death of the Twelve. At the time it was written

¹ *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 555.

the offices of apostle and of prophet were still recognized in the churches. The former designated a class of itinerant ministers, elsewhere called evangelists; and the *Teaching* gives tests to distinguish the true from the false. As to the regular and ordinary officials of the church, the *Teaching* represents the Apostles as saying:

Choose for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men meek and not avaricious, and true and proved; for they too perform for you the work of prophets and teachers. Therefore despise them not, for they are they who are honored among you along with the prophets and teachers.

The work was afterwards expanded and interpolated in the seventh book of the so-called *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles* in the third century, in accordance with the system of monarchic episcopacy which then had come to prevail.¹

(2) A prophet of the class recognized in the *Teaching* was Hermas, who was resident at Rome in the opening years of the second century. The *Muratorian Fragment*, written between A. D. 170 and A. D. 180, has confused the chronology of his life by making him the brother of that Pius who is said to have been Bishop of Rome about the middle of the century. This is impossible, in view of the position assigned to his work the *Shepherd* as inspired scripture by Ireneus, Tertullian (in his orthodox period), Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Nor can it be reconciled with his picture of the church in Rome, and his reference to Clement of Rome. "A careful examination of the *Shepherd* of Hermas," says Dr. Salmon, "has convinced me that, instead of being a work of the middle of the second century, it dates from its very beginning."²

¹ An exhaustive discussion of the *Didache* is given by Rev. James Heron in *The Church of the Sub-Apostolic Age: Its Life, Worship, and Organization, in the Light of "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles."* (London, 1888.) Mr. Heron's scholarship does honor to the Irish Presbyterian Church.

² *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 46.

The general opinion is that it was written about A. D. 100-110.

The work is divided into three books, respectively of Visions, Mandates and Similitudes. It is written in a simple and popular style, makes free use of the apocalyptic literature, especially Daniel, and claims prophetic authority. Its title is one of the two allusions which Dean Stanley finds to the Good Shepherd in the early Christian writers; and he describes it as "the once popular book of devotion, the *Pilgrim's Progress* of the Church of the second century, which was spread far and wide from Italy even to Greece, Egypt and Abyssinia, namely, the once universal, once canonical, once inspired, now forgotten and disparaged, but always curious book." It is a summons to the Church to return to her first love, and to maintain the high standard of Christian living upon which her usefulness depends. At the close of his second vision, the Church, in the form of an aged woman, addresses him:

There came to me the aged woman and asked me if I had already given the book to the presbyters. I denied that I had given it. "You have done rightly," she said, "for I have words to add to it. But when I have finished all the words, they shall be made known through thee to all the elect. Thou shalt write, therefore, two little scrolls, and send one to Clement, and Clement shall send it to the cities abroad; for that is what has been intrusted to him. But Grapte shall admonish the widows and the orphans. But thou shalt read it to this city, along with the elders who are over the church."

This Roman Clement may well have been the good man who is the reputed author of the epistle of that church to the church in Corinth, and who is made by various traditions the first or second or third or fourth "Bishop of Rome." If it be, it will be seen that Hermas recognizes no such preëminence, but seems to assign him what in modern times would be called the corresponding-secre-

taryship of the church, "the organ by which it communicated with foreign churches" (Salmon), and puts him somewhat on a line with the deaconess Grapte, who had care of the widows and orphans. Hermas knows nothing of a monarchic episcopate in Rome. "The episcopal office, properly so called," says Dr. Lightfoot, "had not been constituted in the district in which the author lived." Quoting the statement of the *Muratorian Fragment*, which describes Pius as "sitting in the chair of the church of the city Rome" when Hermas wrote, Dr. Salmon adds, "But in Hermas the honor of 'a chair' is not confined to a single person." This is shown in another passage, in which the aged woman, "when we were alone, said to me, 'Sit here.' I say to her, 'Lady, allow the elders (*seniores*) to be seated first.' 'Do what I tell you,' she says; 'be seated.'" Yet there were already in the church of Rome some who aspired to this monarchic distinction, and in another vision Hermas is bid to say to them:

Now therefore I speak to you who are over the church, and who love the foremost seats. Be not like the mixers of drugs, for they carry their drugs in boxes, but ye carry your drugs and poison in your heart, and ye will not purge your hearts. . . . See to it, my sons, lest these dissensions of yours should rob you of true life. How are you to edify God's elect, when you keep not order yourselves? Admonish, therefore, one another, and be at peace among yourselves, that I also, standing before your Father, may render an account for you to the Lord.

This passage seems to mean that harmful dissensions had arisen in the church, through the ambition of some presbyters to mount above the rest; and the prophet declares he is bidden to rebuke this desire as poisonous to their spiritual life.

(3) The epistle of the church in Rome to the church in Corinth is the most valuable monument of the earliest Church literature. It is mentioned by Hegesippus and by Ireneus as written "in the episcopate of Clement," but

the authorship is not ascribed to him by either, and Dionysius of Corinth (A. D. 170) is the first who ascribes it to him. It probably was his work, not as "Bishop of Rome," but as corresponding secretary of that church; and the individuality of its authorship is unmistakable. It also was accepted as part of the New Testament as late as the time of Clement of Alexandria. Origen thought this Clement was the one whom Paul mentioned to the Philippians as his coworker (Philippians iv: 3). If so, he certainly did not grasp the trend of the Apostle's teaching as to law and gospel, as indeed did none of the fathers of this second century. Yet the epistle resembles those of the New Testament in its theology of facts, its warmth of feeling toward our Lord, and even its vocabulary.

The epistle forms a most interesting supplement to the Apostle Paul's two Epistles to the same church, and shows that to have been, in the second generation, the same over-busy and troublesome ecclesia that it was when Paul gathered it. As so frequently happened in Greek cities in earlier times, and had threatened in this church in the New Testament time, a sedition had sprung up among them, starting with a few, and then gathering head until almost the whole congregation was involved. The epistle appeals to the examples of Apostles and martyrs, to those of the Old Testament saints, and to our Lord's warnings, as incitements to unanimity, humility and obedience. It shows that the trouble in Corinth had taken the shape of attacks upon some of the presbyters of the church, made by persons of instability and inexperience. There is no indication that any doctrinal controversy lay behind the quarrel, or that it was a survival of the party-work which had threatened to tear the church to pieces in Paul's time. The quarrel was personal,

and the promoters of the dissension were animated by an exaggerated opinion of themselves; but the whole church is rebuked for allowing them to assume the leadership, to the displacement of the rightful authorities of the church:

The church of God sojourning in Rome to the church of God sojourning in Corinth, elect, sanctified in the will of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Grace be multiplied unto you and peace from almighty God, through Jesus Christ. Because of sudden and successive disasters and accidents which have come upon us, we have turned our attention the more slowly, beloved brethren, to those things which you asked of us, and to the unclean and unholy dissension, alien and strange to the elect of God, which a few rash and daring persons, inflamed to such a degree of insolence that your honorable and well-reputed name, worthy of general affection, is greatly blasphemed. For who that has dwelt among you has not honored your virtuous and firm faith? . . . For ye have done all things without respect of persons, and walked in the laws of God, being subject to your rulers, and bestowing fitting honor upon those who are your elders. You enjoined upon the younger, things moderate and honest; you instructed the women, to care for all things with a blameless, honest and chaste conscience, showing fit affection to their husbands. You taught them to keep within the rule of obedience, and to manage their household affairs honestly, being always discreet. Ye were all humble-minded, boastful in nothing, subject rather than subjecting others, giving more gladly than getting (Chapters I and II).

All things should be done in order, which the Master has commanded us to observe at the appointed times. The offerings and ministries to be observed, he did not command to be done heedlessly or out of order, but at the times and hours appointed. Where and through whom he wishes them to be observed, he himself has defined with most exalted purpose, in order that all things being done holily in his good pleasure, they may be acceptable to his will. Those, therefore, who make their offerings at the times appointed are accepted and blessed; for they who follow the laws of the Master do not go wrong. For to the high priest were assigned his own ministries, and to the priests was prescribed their own place, and upon the Levites were imposed their proper services. The layman is bound by lay injunctions. Each of you, brethren, in his own order, give thanks to God, in a good conscience, not transgressing the prescribed rule of his ministry, in honesty. Not in every place, brethren, are offered the continual sacrifices, or those growing out of vows, or those for sins and trespasses, but in Jerusalem alone; nor even there is offering made in any place whatever, but in the court of the Temple, at the altar, when the victim has been strictly examined by the high priest and the ministers

already mentioned. Whoever does anything contrary to what was agreeable to his will, receives the punishment of death. You see, brethren, the greater the knowledge we are thought worthy of, the greater the danger to which we are exposed (Chapters XL and XLI).

The Apostles brought us the good tidings from the Lord Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ from God. Christ was sent from God, and the Apostles from Christ. Both therefore took place in right order from the will of God. Accepting the injunctions, and being fully persuaded through the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and confirmed in faith by the word of God, they went forth with the good tidings that the kingdom of God was about to come. Through regions and cities proclaiming this, they appointed their first fruits, after testing them in the spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who should believe. Nor was this novel, for long before this there had been written of bishops and deacons. For thus somewhere saith the Scripture: "I will appoint their overseers [*episkopous*] in righteousness, and their ministers [*diakonous*] in faith" (Isaiah lx: 17). (Chapter XLII).

And the Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there will be strife over the name of the episcopate [oversight]. For this reason, having received perfect foreknowledge, they appointed those before mentioned, and thereafter gave them a farther injunction, to the end that, if they fell asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministry. Those, therefore, who were appointed by them, or afterward by other excellent men, with the consent of the whole Church, and who have ministered without reproach to the flock of Christ, with humility, quietly and decorously, and have had a good report for a long time from all,—those, we think, not justly have been cast out of the service. For a sin, and not a small one, it will be for us, should we cast out of the oversight [*episkopes*] those who have brought the gifts blamelessly and holily. Blessed are the elders [*presbuteroi*] who have gone before, who have attained a fruitful and perfect departure, for they fear not lest some one may remove them from their appointed place. For we see that you have displaced some, who behaved rightly and blamelessly, from the service honored by them (Chapter XLIV).

. . . . Shameful, yea very shameful things we have to hear of you, and unworthy of the manner of life which is in Christ, that the church of the Corinthians, firmly established and ancient, because of one or two persons, revolts against its presbyters. And this report comes not only to us, but to those who are aliens to us, so that blasphemies are offered to the name of the Lord because of your folly, and danger is created for yourselves (Chapter XLVII).

Who then among you is generous? Who is merciful? Who is filled with love? Let him say, "If on my account faction and dissension and schisms have arisen, I will depart, I am gone whithersoever you wish; and what the whole assembly have

commanded, that alone I will do. Let the flock of Christ live in peace with its appointed presbyters!" He who does this will procure for himself great glory in the Lord, and every place will welcome him (Chapter LIV).

You, therefore, who have laid the foundation of faction, submit yourselves to the presbyters, and be instructed unto repentance, bending the knees of your hearts (Chapter LVII).

These are the passages of this remarkable epistle which cast any light on the constitution and government of the churches at the time of its composition. As it speaks of the church in Corinth as having lost by death the presbyters appointed by the Apostles, and also some of those who had been appointed by these in coöperation with the congregation of believers, it hardly can have been written before the beginning of the second century. It seems to look back to what the Church had suffered under Domitian, whose reign ended A. D. 96.

It is noteworthy that it assumes the existence of the same church order in Rome as in Corinth, as it lays down general rules of duty and specific applications of these, as binding upon all Christians. It is therefore a witness not only to what existed in the large and busy church of Corinth, but also to what was to be found or not found in the still larger and more important church of Rome.

In neither did there exist a monarchic episcopate, or a threefold ministry of bishop, presbyters and deacons. The double ministry of bishops and deacons is mentioned at one place, as established by the Apostles; and nothing is said of any alteration in this, either by the Apostles or by the church itself. In other passages the higher class of rulers are called presbyters repeatedly, and the duty of rendering them honor and lawful obedience is insisted upon. They are spoken of as exercising the oversight (*episkope*) in the church. It is distinctly stated that they were duly appointed to the presbyterate, so that they did

not possess it, as Dr. Hatch thinks, by virtue of their age and the respect paid to this. "Though Clement has occasion," says Dr. Lightfoot, "to speak of the ministry as an institution of the Apostles, he mentions only two orders, and is silent about the episcopal office. He still uses the word 'bishop' in the older sense, in which it occurs in the apostolic writings, as a synonym for 'presbyter' (*Philippians*, p. 216).

The trouble in the church of Corinth arose from the expulsion of certain presbyters from the oversight (*episkope*) of the church. The exhortation is to restore these to their ministry (*leitourgia*) by way of maintaining the apostolic order of the church.

Clement, if he be the author of the epistle, as seems most probable, had known one, and possibly two, of the Apostles. No other writer, even of this early time, had such advantages for describing their arrangements for the future of the churches. He tells us that they directed the bishops and deacons they themselves had appointed to have others chosen to succeed them if they fell asleep. And although the men appointed by the Apostles had passed to the Church triumphant when this epistle was written, and even those they in turn had appointed must choose yet others to keep up the succession, yet no change had taken place from the plural episcopate to a monarchic episcopate in these two great churches.

Dr. Liddon, indeed, would have us understand the language of Chapter XLIV, "that if they fell asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministry," as meaning the Apostles themselves, and not the presbyter-bishops and deacons of the churches. He infers this from the use of the word "if" (*ean*) instead of "when." Were the Apostles less likely to die than were the bishops and deacons? He makes a distinction by inserting the

words "before the presbyter-bishops"; but for this he has no warrant. We must remember that in the first age of the Church there was a general expectation of the second advent, and that with regard to this the Apostle wrote to this church of Corinth: "We all shall not sleep, but we shall be changed" (1 Corinthians xv: 51). I know of no other scholar, Roman Catholic or Protestant, except Richard Rothe, who takes Dr. Liddon's view of the passage. Dr. Lightfoot rejects it. Bishop Gore, who is sufficiently zealous for episcopacy, says that "it is quite true that in Clement's epistle presbyters are called bishops, and that there is no local authority in the church at Corinth above the presbyters. Clement's language about submission to them postulates this. It may also be acknowledged that it is an unwarrantable hypothesis that the see of the chief pastor was vacant when Clement wrote."¹

Roman Catholic scholars have a very lively interest in the interpretation of this epistle. If there was no monarchic bishop in Rome in the first decade of the second century, what becomes of that succession to Saint Peter, on which so much rests in their system? In view of this Konrad Thönissen in 1841 wrote a dissertation on *The Existence of a Dogmatic Difference of the Episcopate from the Presbyterate Provable from the Scriptures and the Fathers*.² But he rests his case on the language (a) of Chapters I and XXI, where "rulers" and "elders" are mentioned as two separate classes; and on (b) Chapter XL, where "high priests," "priests" and "Levites" are enumerated as having each their own duties to perform.

¹ *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 322. Dr. Liddon's statement is from a sermon preached at the consecration of two English bishops.

² Zwei historisch-theologische Abhandlungen: *Ueber die Authenticität und Integrität des ersten Briefe des Clemens von Rom an die Corinthien:—und Ueber das Erweisbarkeit eines dogmatischen unterschieds des Episkopats vom Presbyteriate, mit Rücksicht auf die heiligen Schriften und den Vatern der Vier ersten Jahrhunderten.* Von Konrad Thönissen. Trier, 1841.

(a) Any attentive reader of Chapters I and XXI will see that the epistle is not speaking here of church government, but of faithfulness in the relative duties of the Christian life; that the rulers in question are the civil authorities and magistrates; and that the elders are not the occupants of an office in the church, but men of advanced age, to whom reverence naturally is due. In both passages the mention of "elders" is followed immediately by a mention of "young" men (*neous*).

(b) The enumeration of high priests, priests and Levites in Chapter XL is part of an extensive illustration of Christian duty from the Old Testament, which makes up the greater part of the epistle. Of the chapters I have not quoted, thirty-eight are taken up, more or less, with quotations from the Old Testament, or the narration of the lives of the Hebrew saints, as bearing on the troubles in the church of Corinth, while only eight are occupied mainly with the New Testament. For the Christians of that day the Old Testament was still *par excellence* the Scripture. So the mention of three orders in the service of the Jewish Temple implies no such triplicity in the Christian ministry. In two sentences farther on similar use is made of the fact that the Old Testament offerings could be made only in Jerusalem, and at the altar in the court of the Temple; but no one would infer that Christians have but one place on earth for the acts of their worship.

Monsignor Duchesne finds it necessary to take a different ground in maintaining an apostolic succession which shall connect the modern Roman Catholic hierarchy with the rulers of the church in apostolic and sub-apostolic times. He elevates the presbytery of the early church into a "college of bishops," and says that "whether they had one bishop at their head, or whether they had a college of several, the episcopate still carried on the apostolic

succession." "If the system of government by a single bishop represents in some respects a later stage of the hierarchy, it was not so unknown in primitive days as it might appear" (*Early History of the Christian Church*, pp. 66-67).

(4) Annexed to every MS. of the epistle to the church in Corinth is what has been called "the Second Epistle of Clement." It cannot have been written by Clement of Rome, and it is not an epistle but a homily, written to be read to a church. Dr. Lightfoot thinks it was the church of Corinth, and Dr. Harnack that of Rome. The theology of the author harmonizes with the writers of the first half of the second century; and so do his references to church order. It belongs to the period before the rise of the monarchic episcopate, for its references are to the presbyters as having spiritual responsibility for the congregation:

Let us not think to give heed and believe only now, while we are admonished by the presbyters, but likewise when we have gone home, let us remember the commandments of the Lord.

The unbelievers shall behold his glory and his power, and they shall be amazed when they see the kingdom of the world given to Jesus, saying, "Woe unto us, for thou wast, and we knew it not and believed not, and we obeyed not the presbyters when they told us of our salvation."

This homily has its value as showing that Dr. Hatch's theory that the presbyters took no part in preaching is not historic.

(5) The epistle of Polycarp of Smyrna to the church in Philippi is an interesting supplement to the great Apostle's epistle to the same church. Polycarp is one of the noblest figures in the history of the sub-apostolic Church, and is said by Ireneus, who in early youth knew him, to have been a disciple of the Apostle John, and "by the Apostles appointed in Asia bishop in the church in Smyrna."

In the *Epistle of the Church Sojourning in Smyrna to the Church Sojourning in Philomelium*, describing his martyrdom, Polycarp is mentioned but once by any title: "Bishop of the Catholic Church in Smyrna." The phrase "Catholic church" suggests an interpolation, as that was evoked by the controversies of a later age. Mr. F. C. Conybeare, in his *Monuments of Early Christianity* (p. 4), points out that in the Armenian translation of Eusebius—who quotes the letter at length—the phrase is not found. The epistle addressed to Polycarp in the Ignatian series designates him as "Bishop of the Church of the Smyrnæans." None of these make him "the bishop" of that church, and a presbyter-bishop of it he certainly was. We have three "traditions" as to the succession of (monarchic) bishops in that church. Pseudo-Hippolytus gives us Apelles (probably Ampeles), as first. That in *The Constitutions of the Holy Apostles* specifies (1) Ariston I; (2) Strataias, son of Lois; (3) Ariston II. That preserved by Suidas (tenth century) begins with Bucolus. None of them mentions Polycarp.

Of the fourteen chapters found in the old Latin translation, only the first nine of the epistle have been preserved in Greek.

Polycarp and the presbyters who are with him, to the church of God sojourning in Philippi, mercy and peace from almighty God and the Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour, be multiplied unto you.

I rejoiced greatly with you in our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye received the patterns of true love, and brought on their way, as belongs to you, those who were bound in chains worthy of saints, which are the crowns of those who are truly chosen of God and our Lord; and that the firm root of your faith, preached from old times, remains until now, and bears fruit to our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . (Chapter I.)

I have not taken upon myself, brethren, that I write to you these things concerning righteousness, but as you yourselves first requested it. For neither I nor anyone like me can attain to the wisdom of the blessed and renowned Paul, who, coming

among you, in the presence of the men of that day, taught exactly and firmly the word of truth; and who, departing from you, wrote to you an epistle, if you look into which, you can be built up in the faith which has been given you (Chapter III).

Knowing that "God is not mocked," we ought to walk worthy of his command and judgment. Likewise the deacons blameless in the presence of his righteousness, as the ministers [*diakonoï*] of God and of Christ, and not of men; not slanderers, nor double-tongued, free from covetousness, temperate in all things, heedful, walking according to the truth of the Lord, who became the minister [*diakonos*] of all. . . . Likewise let the young men be blameless in all things, above all careful for chastity, bridling themselves back from all evil. For it is a good thing to be cut off from the desires of this world. . . . It is necessary therefore that we withhold ourselves from all these things, being subject to the presbyters and deacons as to God and Christ (Chapter V).

And let the presbyters be compassionate, merciful to all, reclaiming the wandering [sheep], looking after all who are weak, not neglecting the widow or the orphan or the poor man, . . . abstaining from all wrath, from respect of persons, from unjust judgment; far removed from all love of money; not swift to believe against any; not severe in judgment, as knowing that we all are debtors of sin (Chapter VI).

I exhort you all, therefore, to obey the law of righteousness, and practice all patience, which also ye saw with your eyes, not only in the blessed Ignatius and Zosimos and Rufus, but also in others from among yourselves, and in Paul himself and the rest of the Apostles; being persuaded that these all did not run in vain, but in faith and righteousness, and that they are at the place due them with the Lord, with whom also they suffered (Chapter IX).

I am very sorry for Valens, who was once made a presbyter among you, that he so misknew the place which was given to him. I admonish you, therefore, to abstain from avarice, and be chaste and true. Abstain from all evil. How shall he, who is not able to govern himself in these things, prescribe this to another? . . . I, however, have neither perceived nor heard of any such thing in you, among whom the blessed Paul labored, who are [mentioned] in the beginning of his Epistle. For he boasts of you in all the churches, which then alone knew God; but we did not yet know him. Truly sorry, then, am I for him and for his wife, and may God give them a true repentance. Be ye therefore moderate in this, and "consider not such as enemies," but recall them as suffering and erring members, that ye may save your whole body (Chapter XII).

Both you and Ignatius have written to me that, if anyone should happen to set out for Syria, he should carry thither your letters also; and this I will do if I find a convenient opportunity, either I myself, or through some one else, whom I will send as a messenger for you also. The epistles of Ignatius,

which he sent to me, and all the others we have, I have sent to you, as you bade me; and these indeed we subjoin to this epistle. From these you will be able to derive much fruit. For they contain faith and patience and all edification relating to our Lord. And what ye know more certainly of Ignatius himself, and of those who are with him, make known to us (Chapter XIII).

The ninth and twelfth chapters are quoted here because of their bearing on the authenticity of the Ignatian epistles.

From the fifth and sixth chapters we learn what was the church order in Philippi at the time Polycarp wrote. Here, as in Rome and Corinth, we find no trace of a three-fold ministry in the church, made such by the erection of a monarchic bishop above the presbyter-bishops of the apostolic period. As Paul called the officers of this church "bishops and deacons" (Philippians i: 1), so Polycarp calls them "presbyters and deacons." Had there been a single bishop over the church, would he have been ignored in the directions given as to the case of Valens? Why the omission?

It has been pleaded that the church of Philippi was a vacant see at this time. Why, then, does Polycarp express no sympathy with the church in this bereavement, and give no directions as to the steps to be taken in the choice of a fit man for the place? Why has he nothing to say of their duties toward their bishop when they got one? Bunsen, who was not unfriendly to the Episcopalian theory of early church history, bluntly says, "The Philippians he is addressing are Presbyterians."¹

Dr. Lightfoot thinks that the church in Philippi lingered behind the development of church order general in the churches of Asia, and clung to an antiquated and unsuitable form of church government, after those churches had

¹ *Hippolytus and His Age* (second edition), i, 226.

adopted the monarchic episcopate with apostolic sanction.¹ Yet there was not a church in the world better placed for learning what was the general movement of affairs in the churches of Asia on the one hand, and those of Greece and Italy on the other. It was animated, as both Paul and Polycarp show us, by a lively interest in the general concerns of the kingdom of Christ. It was the church which earned the Apostle's praise for its large-heartedness, and was especially enjoined by him to go on to perfection. Yet in Dr. Lightfoot's general scheme of things, it figures as a church lagging behind its contemporaries, of whose doings it well knew. And Polycarp, now called "the Bishop of Smyrna," writes to them with full knowledge of what was necessary to the well-being of a church, if not to its very being, and has not a word of either reproof or suggestion on the subject.

The fact is that Polycarp was as Presbyterian as Bunsen finds those to whom Polycarp wrote. His letter implies that the order he describes in Philippi was that of the churches generally—was that of the church in Smyrna, of which he was a presbyter-bishop. Somewhat later in this second century a member of the church in Smyrna, called Noetus, began to spread the notion that the Father and the Son are so identical that the sufferings of Christ are those of the Father also. Hippolytus of Rome, evidently following some early account of this, says:

The blessed presbyters having heard this, calling him before the church, questioned him. But he denied it, saying at first that he did not think so. But afterwards, lurking among some and procuring for himself those who shared his wanderings, he wished to set up the dogma as correct. The blessed presbyters, having again called him before them, refuted him. But he withstood them, saying "What evil am I doing in glorifying Christ?" And the presbyters answered him: "We also know

¹ *Essays on the Work Entitled "Supernatural Religion"* (London, 1889), pp. 107-108.

in truth one God; we know Christ; we know the Son suffering as he suffered, dying as he died, and rising again the third day, and being at the right hand of the Father, and coming to judge the quick and the dead. And these things which we have learned, we say." Then, having refuted him, they cast him out of the church. And he was carried to such a pitch of pride that he set up a school.¹

Some church historians transfer this account to Rome, but with no warrant for this in the text of Hippolytus, who seems elsewhere to say that Noetus never went to Rome, and that his heresy was carried thither by his disciple Epigonus (circ. A. D. 200). In any case it is not the order of procedure which would have been followed in a church governed by a monarchic bishop. Nor is it without parallels. Dr. Salmon tells us that in the account "which Epiphanius, evidently drawing from an older writer, gives us of the intercourse of Marcion with the church of Rome [after A. D. 140], the dealings of Marcion are represented as being entirely with the Roman presbyters; and it may be doubted if Epiphanius found in his authority the solution which he suggests, that at that time the see was vacant."²

A third instance of the defence of a church by its presbyters against the inroads of error is found in the Galatian church of Ancyra. It was in that Asian region where Dr. Lightfoot believes monarchic episcopacy to have been the established order at the beginning of the second century. A writer quoted anonymously by Eusebius, and called Rhodon by Jerome, explains his writing against Montanism on this wise:

Having been lately at Ancyra of Galatia, I learned that the church of that place was greatly agitated by this new "prophecy," as they call it, but much rather, as shall be shown, false prophecy. As I was able and by help of the Lord, we dis-

¹ Migne's *Patrologie Grecque-Latine*, Tome x, 803-20.

² *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 520, n. Migne's *Patrologie Grecque-Latine*, Tome xli, 696.

coursed for several days in the church, both about these very things, and whatever else was brought forward; so that the church was made glad and confirmed in the truth, but its adversaries were put to flight and its opponents grieved. And the elders of the church asked me to leave some memorial of what was said in discourse against the opponents of the truth, —Zoticus Otrenus, our fellow-presbyter being also present— we did not do this, but we promised to write from hence, and, the Lord assisting, to send it to them with urgency.

Rhodon also speaks of “men approved and bishops, Zoticus of the village of Comana and Julianus of Apamea, whom Themiso and his followers muzzled, and did not allow the false and seductive spirit to be refuted by them.” That is, the Montanists would not allow them to exorcise their prophets as demoniacs.¹

In all three cases, it will be observed, the presbyters of the churches of Smyrna, Rome and Ancyra served as a breakwater to keep false teaching out of the churches, without recourse to that monarchic episcopate which Dr. Lightfoot thought necessary for this end. On the other hand, the church of Thyatira, one of the seven which the Apostle John is supposed to have furnished with the safeguard of a bishop (or “angel”), was completely effaced by the spread of Montanism (Epiphanius, li: 33).

(6) The exact date of the old Syriac version of the Bible, which is called the Peschitto (“simple”), is in dispute. It was the official version of the very ancient church of Syria, and was used by all Christian sects of that province. Ephraim Syrus in the fourth century found some of its terms obscure and antiquated. Jacob of Edessa, in the seventh century, records a tradition that it dates back to the early age of the Church. The version of the Gospels it contains is probably younger than the two discovered by Mr. William Cureton and Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis. As Mr. F. Crawford Burkitt, in

¹ *Eusebii Historia Ecclesiastica*, Lib. V, Cap. 16.

his *Early Eastern Christianity* (1904), shows, this probably was due to the primitive use of the combined Gospels (*diatessaron*) of Tatian in the early Syrian church. When Rabula of Edessa, in the fifth century, substituted the separate Gospels for this harmony, he based the text upon the versions recently discovered, but conformed it to the Greek text accepted at Antioch.

The question of the antiquity of the Old Testament and of the Acts and Pauline Epistles in the Peschitto stands apart from the problem presented by the Gospels. Mr. Burkitt thinks the former may have been made even before the Christian era for Jewish use; the date of the latter he leaves an open question. That it was earlier than the second half of the second century seems to be proved by the fact that its terminology belongs to the period before the evolution of the monarchic episcopate. Mrs. Margaret Gibson, the sister and coworker of Mrs. Lewis, to whom I submitted this point, writes to me as follows:

Your letter has called my attention to a fact of which I was not previously aware. I have looked at all the passages in the Peschitto, in which the words "bishop" or "bishops" are to be found, and it is just as you say. In Philippians i: 1 the word is *Casheesha*, "elders." In 1 Timothy iii: 1 it is "the office of the *Casheeshouta*," "eldership." In 1 Timothy iii: 2 and in Titus i: 7 it is *Casheesha*. In 1 Peter ii: 25 there is a different word, *Sa'oura*, which means an "agent" or "factor." I next looked up every passage in which "elders" occurs, and found the word to be invariably *Casheesha*. This is an additional and very strong argument for Presbyterianism. The Syrians evidently thought *episkopos* and *presbuteros* to be synonymous.

I have looked at the old Arabic version of the Acts and the Catholic Epistles, which I edited from a Sinai codex, and I find that in 1 Peter ii: 25 the word for "bishop" is translated *Mudabbir*, which means "agent" or "factor," evidently a rendering of the Peschitto *Sa'oura*.

(7) About the year A. D. 148 Justin Martyr addressed his first *Apology for the Christians* to the Emperor Anto-

ninus Pius. He was a native of Samaria, but a heathen by birth and education, and came to the knowledge of the gospel after a search for the truth through the schools of philosophy. He was converted in the east, possibly at Ephesus; but he came westward to Rome, where he became a sort of lay preacher in the philosophic schools, matching his wits against the popular teachers of the day, in defence of Christianity as an intelligible view of the world and of life. He was familiar with Christian usages of both east and west, but especially with Rome, which he had in mind when he addressed the emperor as a brother philosopher in defence of his brother Christians. As abominable lies had been told about the conduct of the Christian assemblies, he is particular to describe their object and their manner to the emperor. After describing the baptism of a convert, he proceeds:

But we, after thus purifying him who has been persuaded and has given his assent, lead him to those who are called brethren, where they are assembled to make common prayers both for themselves and for him who has been enlightened, and for all others everywhere, with fervency, that we, who have learnt the truth, may be accounted worthy to be found good citizens and keepers of the commandments; that we may be saved with the everlasting salvation. We greet one another with a kiss, when we have ceased from prayers. Thereafter is brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of water and wine; and he, taking it, offers up praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and makes thanksgiving at length for our being counted worthy of these things by him. And when he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present give their assent saying, "Amen." The "Amen" in the Hebrew tongue means "So be it." And the president having finished the thanksgiving, and all the people having expressed their assent, those who are called deacons among us give to each of those who are present a share of the bread and wine and water of the thanksgiving, and carry them to those who are not present (Chapter LXV).
. . . And on the day which is called Sun-day, there is a meeting of all of us who are living in cities or rural districts; and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time allows. And when the reader has ceased, the president by a discourse admonishes and exhorts

to the imitation of these excellent things. Thereupon we rise together and all offer our prayers; and, as I said before, when we have ceased from prayers, bread is brought and wine and water, and the president in like manner offers up prayers and thanksgiving, according to his strength, and the people give assent, saying "Amen." And the distribution and reception of what has been thanked for, occurs to each, and their share is sent to those who are not present, through the deacons. Of those who are prosperous and willing, each according to his purpose gives, and what is collected is deposited with the president. And he it is that succors orphans and widows, and those who are in want through sickness or other cause, and those who are in bonds, and the sojourners who are strangers, and in a word he is provider for all who are in need (Chapter LXVII).

Justin, of course, is avoiding technical terms and unnecessary details in addressing the emperor. He calls the elders of the church "the brethren," and gives to the one of them who has charge of the weekly worship no more than the title given by Paul in writing to Timothy. He is the *pro-estus*, the elder who presides well (1 Timothy v: 17), not over the elders but the meetings of the church.

It will be seen that the president already has obtained control of the weekly offertory, which in apostolic times fell to the elders collectively. Thus he approaches the conception of the functions of a bishop offered us by Dr. Hatch, who compares him to the treasurer of a modern beneficial society. It is noteworthy that Justin seems to make the eucharist precede the offertory, whereas in the earliest time the offertory came first, was the central act of worship, and furnished the materials of both the eucharist and the *agape* (love-feast).

It is also noteworthy that Justin implies the meeting of the entire congregation of the Roman Christians in one place for the observance of social worship. It must have been a large body, as in the next century we read of its forty-six presbyters and seven deacons, the latter number being the limit set for this and every church, as there were seven in the mother church of Jerusalem (Acts vi: 3;

xxi: 8); and as seven was one of the mystic numbers of Scripture (Proverbs xxiv: 16; Revelation i: 4; xv: 7; etc.). Yet the whole church met in a common celebration of the eucharist every Sunday.

Justin is the last of our four witnesses as to the presbyterial character of the church order in Rome during the first half of the second century. The most authentic account of its origin, as Dr. Sanday points out in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (1895), is that given by Ambrosiaster (probably the Presbyter Isaac of Rome), who shows a familiarity with Roman conditions which suggests a Roman nativity. He says the church owed its foundation to no Apostle, but was originally on the footing of a Jewish synagogue, keeping the law but accepting the Messiahship of Jesus. It was to this church that the Apostle wrote his great Epistle, by his silence indicating that no Apostle had visited it, and finding no fault with the church order, which was so destitute of apostolic succession. Nor have we any contemporary evidence of a change made in it during the lifetime of the Apostles, or the generation which succeeded them. That the monarchic bishop does not emerge in its early history, is admitted by Episcopalian divines of judgment and erudition.

“In fact it is remarkable,” says Dr. George Salmon, “how all through the first two centuries the importance of the Bishop of Rome is merged in the importance of his church. Dionysius of Corinth writes to the church of Rome, not to Soter, its bishop. Ignatius, when on his way to suffer at the wild beast shows at Rome, writes to deprecate intercession likely to be made there for his release; and he addresses the church, not the bishop. And it is curious that from this writer, who is accounted the strongest witness for episcopacy in early times, we

could not discover that there was any bishop in Rome. No mention is made of the Bishop of Rome in the *Shepherd of Hermas*. And in the account which Epiphanius, evidently drawing from an older writer, gives of the intercourse of Marcion with the church of Rome, the dealings of Marcion are represented as being entirely with the Roman presbyters; and it may be doubted whether Epiphanius found in his authority the solution which he suggests, that at that time the see was vacant. At the very end of the century, when Victor attempted to enforce uniformity of Easter observance, it was still in the name of his church that he wrote, asking that provincial councils should be assembled in order to report upon the matter. This is evident by the plural *exiosate* in the reply of Polycrates."¹

Victor's attempt to coerce the Asiatic churches into conformity with the church of Rome in the observance of Easter called forth a remarkable protest from Ireneus, Bishop of Lyons, in which he says: "The presbyters preceding Soter in the government of the church which thou dost now rule—I mean Anicetus and Pius, Hygenus and Telesphorus, and Sixtus—did neither themselves observe it, nor allowed this to those who were with them." Canon Robert Bruce remarks on this: "Although at the date of his writing the letter (A. D. 190–194) the episcopate must have become as distinct at least from the presbyterate in Europe as it had become in Asia in the days of Ignatius, yet there is no trace in the letter that it had become so in the days of Anicetus at Rome (A. D. 150) . . . Ireneus, though he writes as a bishop to the Bishop of Rome, speaks of no bishop, only of presbyters, in Rome in the days of Anicetus; as if there were no higher

¹ *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 519–520, note. Migne's *Patrologie Grecque-Latine*, Tome xli, 696 (Epiphanius, Tome I).

officer in question there. The presbyters, moreover, are spoken of in terms which imply that the exercise of discipline belonged to them.”¹

“The later Roman theory,” says Dr. Lightfoot, “supposes that the Church of Rome derives all its authority from the Bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter. History inverts the relation, and shows that, as a matter of fact, the power of the Bishop of Rome was built upon the power of the Church of Rome. . . . A very few years later than the date of Clement’s letter Ignatius writes to Rome. He is a staunch advocate of episcopacy. Of his six remaining letters one is addressed to a bishop as a bishop, and the other five all enforce the duty of the churches whom he addresses to their respective bishops; yet in the letter to the Church of Rome there is not the faintest allusion to the episcopal office from first to last.”²

Dr. Hatch also notes that Ireneus, “in a formal letter to the head of the Roman church, in which, from the circumstances of the case, he would be least likely to omit any form of either right or courtesy, speaks of his predecessors by name as ‘presbyters’;” and that “so late as the third century, the extant epitaphs of Roman bishops do not give the title of *episcopus*”³

¹ *Apostolic Order and Unity* (Edinburgh, 1903), p. 117.

² *The Apostolic Fathers*, i, 254.

³ *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, p. 88 and note.

CHAPTER III

THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES

In the previous chapter I have shown that the unchallenged ecclesiastical writers of the period from the close of the age of the Apostles to the middle of the second century are harmonious in representing the churches of that time as governed by a plurality of presbyter-bishops. To this we have seven witnesses from various parts of the Church, from Syria to Rome, not excepting pro-consular Asia. And their direct testimony is corroborated by recorded occurrences in the churches of this period, in which the aggressions of heretical teachers were resisted by the presbyters of those churches. And I have shown that we have the authority of learned Anglicans for our Presbyterian interpretation of the facts in every case but one. This includes Drs. Lightfoot, Sanday, Salmon, Gore and Hatch, as also their German friends, Bunsen and Harnack.

If this accumulation of evidence is to be set aside by the word of a single writer, we surely have the right to demand that he shall be one of whose date and writings we are altogether sure, and to whose authority, as bringing light to this period, there shall attach not the shadow of a doubt. This certainly is very far from being true of the epistles ascribed to Ignatius of Antioch,¹ on whose author-

¹ Jean Daillé: *De Scriptis quæ sub Dionysii Areopagitæ et Ignatii Antiocheni Nominibus Circumferuntur* (Geneva, 1666). Bp. John Pearson: *Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii. Editio Nova Annotationibus et Præfatione ad hodiernum Controversiæ Statum Accommodata* [by Dr. Edward Churton]. II vols. (Oxford, 1852.) F. C. Baur: *Die Ignatianischen Briefe und ihr neuester Kritiker. Eine*

ity we are asked to believe that the plurality of presbyter-bishops had been superseded before A. D. 117 in the churches of Ephesus, Philadelphia, Tralles, Magnesia and Smyrna, by the rise of a monarchic episcopate, which was "so firmly rooted, so exalted above all other offices, and so completely beyond dispute" (Harnack) as to make another thing of those churches from what all other writers of the time lead us to expect.

Eusebius (A. D. 325) says that Ignatius was the second in succession to Peter in the church of Antioch, that he was sent to Rome to be thrown to the wild beasts, and that on his way through Asia he wrote seven epistles—three from Smyrna to the churches in Ephesus, Magnesia and Tralles, and from other points to the churches in Rome, in Smyrna, and in Philadelphia, and one to Polycarp. His message to the churches was that they should stand fast in the faith, keep themselves from heretical contagion, and cling to the apostolic traditions. In his *Chronicle* he says that this occurred in the reign of Trajan (A. D. 98–117).

In 1557 Valentin Pacæus published in Greek twelve epistles bearing the name of Ignatius of Antioch. Their genuineness was at once called in question by Calvin and other good scholars, but they were treated as an authority for primitive episcopacy by Drs. Whitgift, Hooker, Andrews, Hall and others who favored that form of government. Attempts were made to separate the genuine from the spurious in this collection. Archbishop Ussher discovered, and in 1644 published, a Latin version of a

Streitschrift gegen Herrn Bunsen (Tübingen, 1848). William Cureton: *Corpus Ignatianum; A Complete Collection of the Ignatian Epistles, Genuine, Interpolated, and Spurious; together with numerous Extracts from them, as Quoted by Ecclesiastical Writers down to the Tenth Century; in Syriac, Greek, and Latin: An English Translation of the Syriac Text, copious Notes, and Introduction* (London, 1849). Dr. J. B. Lightfoot: *The Apostolic Fathers*, second edition (London, 1889–1890). Canon Travers Smith: *Ignatius*, in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (London, 1882). Adolph Harnack: *Die Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius* (Leipzig, 1893–1897).

briefier recension of eleven epistles, and expressed the hope that the original Greek of this would be discovered. In 1646 Isaac Vossius printed from a manuscript owned by the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and dating back to the eleventh century, the shorter Greek text, for which Ussher was looking. This included six of the seven epistles ascribed to Ignatius by Eusebius, and two generally regarded as spurious. Thierry Ruinart in 1689 added the epistle to the Romans from a martyrology of Ignatius, and thus completed the seven.

By this, the shorter Greek recension, Ussher, Pearson and other Anglican and Roman Catholic authors have stood ever since the publication. But in 1845 William Cureton published a still shorter Syriac recension, including the epistles to the Romans, the Ephesians and Polycarp of Smyrna, with considerable omissions from two of the three, and an insertion of two chapters in the Romans, which are found in the Greek of the epistle to the Trallians. Mr. Cureton maintained that his discovery was the recovery of the real Ignatius, whose epistles had been inflated and interpolated not only in the longer recension published by Pacæus, but in the shorter brought to light by Vossius. A curious confirmation of this view is the fact that every quotation made from Ignatius by the fathers, from Ireneus to Chrysostom, including the latter's long panegyric on the martyr, is to be found in the narrow range of the Syriac. At first Mr. Cureton's discovery was hailed by many as being all that he claimed for it, and men of such different views of early Church history as Bunsen, Lipsius, Ritschl and Volkmar accepted this as the true Ignatius, while Baur rejected it equally with the rest. More recently it has lost ground, Lipsius returning to the Vossian Greek, and Volkmar resuming his position beside Baur. This has been due mainly to

Petermann's discovery of a complete Armenian version of the shorter Greek recension made from a Syriac original, from which in turn the Curetonian text is said to be an abridgment.

From their appearance to the present the genuineness of these epistles of the shorter recension has been impugned and defended with much erudition and acumen by Continental and British scholars. The problem they present is, as Dr. Lightfoot says, "one of the most perplexing which confronts the student of earlier Christian history." Half a century ago they found few defenders, but just at present they are come into credit again with Church historians, partly through the scholarly labors of Theodore Zahn¹ and Dr. J. B. Lightfoot, and partly through the swing of the pendulum away from the historical skepticism of the Tübingen school of F. C. Baur and his consorts. "In the criticism of the sources of Christianity," says Dr. Adolph Harnack, "we are, without doubt, embarked in a retrograde movement toward tradition." "The chronological framework, in which tradition has arranged the documents from the Pauline Epistles down to Ireneus, is in all main points right,² and compels the historian to disregard all hypotheses in reference to the historical sequence of things, which deny this framework."

The date of Ignatius is one of the uncertain elements of the problem. Origen, who died seventy-seven years

¹ *Ignatius von Antioch* (Leipzig, 1873).

² It is worth while to consider what this broad statement involves. Between Paul and Ireneus the following documents can plead orthodox tradition for their place in that "framework": The Gospel of the Hebrews, the Gospel of Peter, the Gospel of Thomas, the Protevangelium of James, the Acts of Pilate, the Epistle of Barnabas, seven uncanonical Pauline Epistles, the preaching of Peter, the Teaching of the Apostles, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Sibylline Books, the Second Epistle of Clement of Rome, his two Epistles to the Apostle James, his two Epistles on Virginity, his Apostolical Constitutions, seven spurious writings ascribed to Justin Martyr, and others. Church history constructed on the framework of early tradition will be a new thing.

after Trajan, says that Ignatius was the second bishop of Antioch after the Apostle Peter. Eusebius is the first who mentions Evodius as his predecessor, and the *Apostolical Constitutions* say that he was ordained by Peter, but Ignatius by Paul. Athanasius and Chrysostom speak as if Ignatius dated from the apostolic age, without any predecessor. As tradition had arranged a twenty-five years' episcopate for Peter in Rome, he had to be got thither in time to die with Paul in the Neronian persecution (A. D. 67). So his ordination of Evodius must be got over by the year 42, which is rather an early date for a monarchic Bishop of Antioch, and seventy-five years before the death of Trajan. Dr. Salmon says: "We have no data for fixing the time of his accession; but we may safely say that it was considerably later than the year 42." No less absurd is it to assign to Peter the arrangement of the affairs of the ecclesia of Antioch, in the face of all that we know of it from the Acts of the Apostles. His relations with it were always external, to say the least, and his intrusion there would have been a breach of the covenant which he and the other "pillar Apostles" made with Paul (Galatians ii: 9).

The Ignatian epistles themselves do not help us out of the chronological difficulty. They mention no emperor or any other civil ruler, and indeed no person otherwise known to history except Polycarp. As he died A. D. 166, according to Eusebius, this reference leaves the date of the martyrdom of Ignatius open for any year of the first half of the second century. All that is advanced against this is that Eusebius probably derived his information as to the date within the reign of Trajan from Julius Africanus, a Christian chronologer of the third century.

If we could rely upon the Ignatian martyrologies, the doubt would be at an end. There are nine of these, but

they resolve themselves into two—the Colbertian and the Vatican. The former makes his martyrdom incidental to a general persecution at Antioch, consequent upon the great earthquake of A. D. 115, which almost destroyed the city, and very nearly cost Trajan his life. It represents the emperor as directing the severe measures taken against the Christians, the presumable cause of the divine anger, and as sending Ignatius to Rome to be thrown to the wild beasts, after hearing him declare his faith in Christ.

A close study of the martyrologies shows that they both use the account given by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*, and that they create new difficulties. They represent Ignatius as taken by sea from Seleucia, the port of Antioch, to Smyrna. The epistles, indeed, make him speak of journeying “by land and sea,” but they imply that he came to Smyrna by the military road which passed through Philadelphia; and it may be that he proceeded from Seleucia to some port in Cilicia, before starting for the overland journey.

Their story is out of keeping with all we know of the character of the Emperor Trajan. His clemency is celebrated not only by pagan writers like Dio Cassius (Xiphilin), but by Tertullian, Melito and Lactantius among the fathers of the Church. His reply to the famous letter of Pliny shows him indisposed to use any rigor in enforcing the Flavian law, which made the name of Christian a capital offence; and he kept his reign free of bloodshed, except in war. “To the fathers who wrote during the second half of the second century,” says Dr. Lightfoot, “and to Christian writers of subsequent ages, Trajan appeared as anything rather than a relentless persecutor. . . . The usual authors who represent Trajan in an unfavorable light are chiefly martyrologists

and legend-mongers, to whom this dark shadow was necessary to give effect to the picture.”¹

But to dismiss the martyrologies, is not to get rid of this difficulty. The date given by Eusebius throws the death of Ignatius within Trajan's reign, and presents no difficulty in associating it with his stay at Antioch in A. D. 115, before starting on that Parthian war which was to cost him his life two years later. We are forced to ask if it was probable that the ruler who deprecated needless bloodshed, and who tried to impress on the capital his clemency, ordered this Christian bishop to be carried to Rome and thrown to the wild beasts. If this were done to Ignatius, must it not have been in the reign of the callous Hadrian, or one of the Antonine emperors?

This difficulty as to Trajan is reinforced by the greater difficulty of accepting the picture of the government of the churches of Asia given in the epistles. “Ignatius' conception of the position and significance of the bishop,” says Dr. Adolph Harnack in *The Expositor* for January, 1886, “has its earliest parallel in the conception of the author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*; and the epistles show the monarchic episcopate so firmly rooted, so highly elevated above all other offices, so completely beyond dispute, that on the ground of what we know from other sources of early Church history, no single investigator would assign the statements under consideration to the second, but at earliest to the third century.” At that time he thought A. D. 140 the earliest possible date. In his latest work he says the epistles “were composed in the last years of Trajan, or perhaps a few years later (A. D. 117-125)”; that is, in the reign of Hadrian. Dr. R. A. Lipsius fixes on A. D. 140, when Antoninus Pius

¹ *The Apostolic Fathers*, ii, p. 2.

was emperor, as the earliest possible date for their composition. That would be sixteen years before the death of Polycarp.

The later date would remove a difficulty presented by the Ignatian epistle to the Romans. In this Ignatius is made to plead with them not to intercede for his life, and thus prevent his martyrdom. This plea is unmeaning if it concerned a sentence pronounced by Trajan, for no official in the capital would have dared to set aside the order of so strict a disciplinarian; and as the emperor was in the east and never returned from it, it could not mean that Ignatius was dissuading them from an appeal to Trajan. It acquires meaning if we suppose it the language of a man summoned to Rome by Hadrian or one of the Antonine emperors, for trial and punishment under the Flavian law, and aware of the manner of its execution in the case of a provincial who possessed no Roman citizenship.

The existence of the spurious and inflated epistles casts some discredit upon those which are alleged to be genuine. I know of no other case in ancient or modern literature in which personal documents have been subjected to such elaborate interpolation and distortion, as must have been undertaken in this instance, if the epistles on the Eusebian list are genuine. It is different with the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which the alleged interpolator of Ignatius is supposed to have used. In that case the impostor starts from a number of impersonal codes, and works them into a consistent system of church law, giving free scope to his imagination and his rhetoric. He does not follow a series of epistles, text by text, with alterations often purposeless and uncalled for. Nor were the Ignatian epistles in such esteem and currency as to make this worth while. They were so little in circulation that

Jerome, with all his literary curiosity and his facilities for seeing almost everything, east and west, does not seem to have met with them. And if the interpolator felt enough respect for Ignatius to carry him through the job of transforming his epistles for a purpose, why had he not respect enough for him to let them alone? But if he knew that they were an invention of some other forger, a sort of rhetorical exercise in imagining what Ignatius might, could or would have written, such as was usual in the schools of rhetoric of that age, then he may have felt free to recast the performance, and to show how much better he could have done it.

The external evidence for the epistles is not first-rate. The quotations from Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians, given in the last chapter, show that Ignatius passed through that city on his way to Rome, and that he had written epistles of an edifying character. That these were the epistles of the Vossian recension might be taken for granted, were it not that Polycarp's own is so much out of harmony with their ecclesiastical theory, and that he represents the church in Philippi as taking so lively an interest in them. How could they as Presbyterians—Bunsen's word—find pleasure or edification in statements that obedience to a monarchic bishop is obedience to God, that the injunction "Do nothing without the bishop" was given by revelation, and that they who do not obey it have a bad conscience?

Drs. Zahn and Lightfoot seek to break the force of this objection by interpreting the injunctions of the Ignatian epistles as pressing the claims not of any particular form of Church authority to obedience, but those of that which was found in any church, whether episcopal or presbyterial, and by explaining that the threefold ministry is specified because that existed in the churches of Asia,

to which these epistles were addressed. In fact, as Dr. Zahn puts the case, Ignatius requires obedience to Church government for the sake of unity, very much as the Apostles enjoin submission to civil authority, without committing the Christian Church to an exclusive approval of any particular form of it. "There is no indication," says Dr. Lightfoot, "that he is upholding the episcopal against any other form of Church government, as, for instance, the presbyterial. The alternative which he contemplates is lawless isolation and self-will. No definite theory is propounded as to the principle on which the episcopate claims allegiance. It is as the recognized authority in the churches which the writer addresses that he maintains it. Almost simultaneously with Ignatius, Polycarp addresses the Philippian church, which appears not yet to have had a bishop, requiring its submission to its 'presbyters and deacons.' If Ignatius had been writing to this church, he would doubtless have done the same. As it is, he is dealing with communities where episcopacy has been already matured, and therefore he demands obedience to their bishops."

Canon Travers Smith, writing between Zahn's treatment of the subject and that of Dr. Lightfoot, finds this explanation hard to reconcile with the facts. He quotes the statement made to the church in Tralles, that without the bishop and presbyters there is nothing that is called a church (*choris touton ekklesia ou kaleitai*), and finds in it an evident purpose to sanction episcopacy as necessary to the being of a church. For himself he gets over the difficulty presented by Polycarp's epistle by appealing to Ignatius as a sufficient witness to the universality of episcopacy. He rests his case for this upon the language in the Ignatian epistle to the Ephesians (cap. iii), as to "the bishops established in the farthest parts of the

world" (*hoi episkopoi kata ta perata horisthentes*).¹ This is asking us to accept the vague and rhetorical statement of a disputed author, against the testimony of Clement, Hermas, the *Didache* and Polycarp to the contrary.

Dr. Lightfoot, like Dr. Zahn, admits the force of their testimony. "All the ancient notices," he says, "point to the mature development of episcopacy in Asia Minor at this time. On the other hand, all the notices of the church in Rome point in the other direction." After alleging Clement and Hermas, he proceeds: "The contrast admits of an easy and natural explanation. As Jerome saw long ago, the episcopal government was matured as a safeguard against heresy and schism. As such it appears in the Ignatian letters. But Asia Minor was the hotbed of false doctrine and heretical teachers. Hence the early and rapid adoption of episcopacy there. On the other hand, Rome was remarkably free from such troubles. . . . Hence the episcopate, though it doubtless existed in some form or other in Rome, had not yet (it would seem) assumed the sharp and well-defined monarchical character with which we are confronted in the eastern churches."

But this leaves the Philippian difficulty just where it was, and makes the epistle of Polycarp a witness not for but against the six Vossian epistles, by representing the genuine epistles of Ignatius as pleasing and interesting to the Presbyterians of Philippi. Ireneus, quoted by Eusebius, says that Polycarp wrote several hortatory epistles to the neighboring churches; yet all are lost but

¹ I give Dr. Lightfoot's translation of these words, and I feel great hesitation in suggesting that their sense is different. There is nothing in the context that calls for a statement of the extent of the episcopate. The words are not so understood in the old Latin version, which renders them, "*secundum terræ fines determinati*." "Within the bounds of their several districts" seems to me to express the writer's meaning.

one. Why may not the genuine epistles of Ignatius, sent by Polycarp to the Philippians, have perished likewise?

Two other ante-Nicene fathers refer to the Ignatian epistles, while Justin, Athenagoras, Clement and Dionysius of Alexandria, Tertullian and Hippolytus ignore them.

(1) Ireneus of Lyons, writing sixty or seventy years after Trajan's time, quotes a sentence from the epistle to the Romans, as spoken by "one of our people condemned to the wild beasts for his testimony for God." This probably was the only Ignatian epistle known to Ireneus, although Drs. Zahn and Lightfoot have tried to find in his writings coincidences with the other epistles, and to build a farther proof on the statement of Eusebius that Ireneus had "made use of the writings of Justin Martyr and Ignatius." The Ignatian epistle to the Romans must have circulated in the west separately from any others, until the literary diligence of Eusebius brought it into the collection. If Ireneus had known the other six, he surely would have used them in elaborating his argument against the gnostic novelties from the succession of orthodox bishops in the churches founded by the Apostles.

(2) Origen of Alexandria, writing nearly three generations after Trajan's reign, quotes the Ignatian epistles to the Romans and to the Ephesians, and calls Ignatius "the second Bishop of Antioch after the blessed Peter," describing him as a martyr, and "one of the saints." His quotations, like those of Ireneus, Chrysostom, Basil and Athanasius, are all within the limits of the Curetonian Syriac recension.

Dr. Lightfoot argues for the Eusebian date of the epistles from various internal peculiarities, such as the way in which they refer to the *agape* (love-feast), the re-

jection of a very early type of Docetism,¹ the absence of reference to well developed types of gnosticism, and the freedom from sacerdotal claims for the clergy. His arguments assume an acquaintance with the situation and movement of affairs in the Asian churches between A. D. 115 and A. D. 140, which is not supplied by the literature of the time. I can see nothing in the reference to the *agape* in the letter to the Smyrnæans (Chapter VIII) which indicates that that was still a part of the eucharist, or which would make it a different thing from what Tertullian describes. As to freedom from sacerdotal ideas, I shall speak of that after giving quotations from the epistles themselves.

On the other hand, the Ignatian epistles contain indications of a later date than Drs. Zahn and Lightfoot claim for them. Ignatius writes to the church in Rome that he comes to the capital "bound to ten leopards," meaning of course Roman soldiers. The animal we know under that name was well known to the Romans under the name of "pard" or "pardalis." That which they called the leopard, as supposing it a cross between the lion and the pard, was the cheetah or "hunting leopard" of Persia and India, which does not seem to have been known to the Romans at this time. It is mentioned in no other Greek or Roman writing before the Montanist acts of the martyrs Felicitas and Perpetua, who suffered at Carthage A. D. 203. Its appearance in the Ignatian epistles is suspicious.

Still more suspicious is the uniformity of the language used as to the offices of bishop and presbyter. Other

¹ Monsignor Duchesne, in his valuable *Early History of the Christian Church* (London and New York, 1909), quotes what the *Ignatian Epistle to the Trallians* says on this head, and adds: "These expressions do not apply only to the reality of the death and resurrection of the Saviour; they cover the whole of his earthly life. They are not aimed at the imperfect Docetism of Cerinthus, but at a real Docetism, like that of Saturnilus and of Marcion, according to which Jesus Christ had only the appearance of a body."

writers of the period of transition—Ireneus, Clement and Dionysius of Alexandria, Hippolytus of Rome, Rhodon, Tertullian, Firmilian of Cæsarea and even Cyprian—retain something of the earlier usage in calling bishops “presbyters.” But there is not a trace of this in the Ignatian epistles, in which it might have been expected with great confidence.

So is the use of the phrase “the Catholic church” in the letter to the church of Smyrna (Chapter VIII). That expression was struck out in the fervor of the controversy with the Gnostics, much later than the reign of Trajan. In justification of its appearance in the Ignatian epistles appeal is made to the epistle of the church in Smyrna to the church in Philomelium, narrating the martyrdom of Polycarp. But as Polycarp died in A. D. 166 according to Eusebius, the phrase would not be so much out of place there as it is in a document of the age of Trajan. But even there it seems to be an interpolation, as Harnack undertakes to show in *The Expositor* for December, 1885. While it occurs both in the independent MSS. of that epistle, and in the ample quotations made from it by Eusebius, it is not found in the Armenian translation of Eusebius, which may have followed a purer Greek text of the epistle than Eusebius possessed. It does not occur in any undoubted writer of the second century before Tertullian, who died A. D. 220.¹

Another point in which the Ignatian epistles differ from those we know to have come to us from early in the second century, is in not using the customary form of greeting to the churches. In a formula suggested by the New Testament (1 Peter i: 17; ii: 11; Hebrews xi: 9), though not employed by its writers, and conformably to the belief in the nearness of the second advent, they

¹ F. C. Conybeare's *Monuments of Early Christianity* (London, 1894), p. 4.

addressed the church of any city as "sojourning" there. Clement sends the greetings of "the church sojourning in Rome" to "the church sojourning in Corinth." Polycarp sends his to "the church sojourning in Philippi." "The church sojourning in Smyrna" sends greeting to "the church sojourning in Philomelium." Hence the use of the term *paroikia* (parish), meaning "sojourn," for the corporate body of a city church. But in the Ignatian epistles greeting is sent in every case to "the church which is in" that city, the only exception being in the "spurious" epistle to the Antiocheans.

But, as Canon Travers Smith says, "the chief difficulty in the way of accepting the epistles as genuine has always been found in the form of Church government which they record as existing, and which they support with great emphasis. In the cities of Asia Minor and in Syria they display to us the threefold ministry established, and the term *episkopos* and *presbuteros* are applied to perfectly distinct orders." This was the point made by Jean Daillé, their most vigorous critic at the time of the publication of the Vossian recension; and he is amply sustained by modern scholarship in pressing this as "the palmary argument" against them.

Dr. Lightfoot admits that "at one time he had entertained misgivings about the seven Vossian letters"; but he reached a very positive conclusion in their favor, when he edited them in his valuable edition of the Apostolic Fathers. So far from being staggered by the picture they present of the churches of Asia, he apparently would have been filled with doubts if they had presented any other. "If the writer of these letters," he says, "had represented the churches of Asia Minor as under presbyterial government, he would have contradicted all the evidence, which, without one dissentient voice, points to episcopacy

as the established form of government in those districts from the close of the first century." These are strong words; but what is there on which to rest such confidence? Not one scrap of contemporary evidence from any source in Asia Minor, during the first half of the century, at the opening of which he places these epistles. Against it the epistle of the Apostle John to Gaius, the *Didache*, and Polycarp. "Apart from the epistles of Ignatius," says Dr. Harnack, "we do not possess a single witness to the existence of the monarchical episcopate so early as the time of Trajan and Hadrian." Sir William Ramsay's researches into the monumental records of Phrygia bring to light no name of a bishop earlier than the third century.¹

Dr. Lightfoot appeals to four authorities, all of them from the close of the second century. Of Ireneus and Clement of Alexandria, I shall speak in the next chapter. Here I speak of the other two.

(a) The *Muratorian Fragment*, which Dr. Lightfoot and others date A. D. 170, and Dr. Salmon thinks cannot be later than A. D. 180, preserves for us a valuable catalogue of the books of the New Testament. It says that John wrote his Gospel, *cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis*, "at the persuasion of his fellow-disciples and bishops." The statement has value only if the Roman author of the fragment is using some earlier document. Its language fits more naturally into the state of things when John had at Ephesus a council of presbyter-bishops, than into that produced by the erection of a single bishop above the rest. This is Dr. Harnack's judgment.

(b) Polycrates became Bishop of Ephesus in the last decade of the second century. He stood up for the Asian usage in determining the proper day for the ob-

¹ *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, II vols. Oxford, 1895-1897.

servance of Easter, against the attempt of Victor, Bishop of Rome, to force western usage upon all the churches. He alleges the Apostles Philip and John, Polycarp and four other early lights of Asia, as supporting the Asian usage. "All these," he says, "observed the fourteenth day of the passover, according to the gospel, deviating in no respect, but following the rule of the faith. And I also, Polycrates, the least of you all, [do] according to the tradition of my kinsfolk, some of whom I have followed. For seven kinsfolk of mine were bishops, and I the eighth. And my kinsfolk always observed the day on which the [Jewish] people threw away the leaven. I then, brethren, who have sixty-five years in the Lord, and have met with the brethren from all the world, and have gone through all Holy Scripture, am not scared by terrifying [words]."

What does this language prove for the existence of the monarchic episcopate in Asia? Is it supposable that before the church in Ephesus had reached its century and a half, eight in one family connection had filled the place of monarchic bishop there? Or are we to commit the anachronism of distributing these eight through the churches of Asia, ignoring the usage that each church in that age found its ministers among its own members? The eight "bishops" were mostly contemporaneous presbyter-bishops of that eminent church, and more than one of them may have taken part in urging John to write the fourth Gospel.

Let me note here that Polycrates, the monarchic Bishop of Ephesus in A. D. 190, like every other writer of the second century, omits to mention the name of the bishop whom the Apostle John appointed to occupy that see. We have to go to spurious writings of unknown date, ascribed to Dorotheus and Hippolytus, for the information

that one of the Seventy Disciples (Luke x: 1, 17), named Caius,¹ or another of them named Phygellus, received that appointment. And then we find this contradicted by the equally trustworthy "tradition" of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which tell us that the first Bishop of Ephesus was another John than the Apostle. This is a matter of the first importance for Dr. Lightfoot, who, while admitting that the development of monarchic episcopacy "was not simultaneous and equal in all parts of Christendom," asserts that "it is more especially connected with the name of S. John; and in the early years of the second century the episcopate was widely spread and had firmly taken root in Syria and Asia Minor." Now Ephesus was the city in which, according to Ireneus, Clement of Alexandria and Polycrates, the last of the Apostles, spent his later years; yet authentic "tradition" is silent as to his appointment of any bishop of that church.

I shall now quote from the Ignatian epistles, in the Vossian and Curetonian recensions, what they have to say about the monarchic episcopate, both in itself and in relation to the other offices of the Church. And first as to the Curetonian (Syriac) recension:

The epistle to the church in Rome is entirely silent upon the subject. Ignatius himself is described as "Theophorus" in the greeting, but not as Bishop of Antioch. And no reference is made to any bishop of the church in

¹ The farther we get from the times of the Apostles, the more abundant the information as to what they did in appointing bishops for the churches they established. The poverty of the lists we get from Tertullian and Ireneus is more than compensated by later "tradition," which enumerates one hundred and sixteen cities, which received the monarchic episcopate at the hands of an Apostle, mostly those of Peter. Fifty-nine of these apostolic bishops are said to have been of the number of the Seventy Disciples, and thirty-five others are identified with persons mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament. To these are added eight other New Testament characters. In fact, any male person of fair repute who had the good fortune to be mentioned in the New Testament was sure of being provided with the oversight of some notable church of which he never heard, and in some country he never visited. For details see J. E. T. Wiltsch's *Handbook of the Geography and Statistics of the Church* (London, 1859). i: 26-33.

Rome. Renan thinks this the only genuine epistle in the series.

The epistle to the church in Ephesus, in the Curetonian recension, contains nothing but a reference to "Onesimus your bishop."

The epistle to Polycarp has exactly the same statement on the subject in the Syriac as in the Greek, but oddly enough, while the epistle is addressed to the bishop, it contains an exhortation as to episcopacy addressed to the church, although that also is instructed on the subject in another epistle in the Greek recension. He says:

If anyone be able to continue in chastity [*i. e.*, celibacy] in honor of our Lord's flesh, let him do so without glorying, else he is lost. If he is known, except to the bishop, he is corrupted. It befits those who marry, both men and women, to make their union with the knowledge of the bishop, that their marriage may be according to the Lord, and not according to lust. Let all things be done to the honor of God. Give heed to your bishop that God may give heed to you. My soul be ransom for those who are subject to the bishop and the presbyters and the deacons (Chapters V and VI).

In the shorter Greek recension of the epistle to the church in Ephesus, but not in the Syriac, occur the following passages:

For Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the purpose of the Father; as also the bishops each within his boundaries, are the purpose of Jesus Christ. Wherefore it befits you to concur with the opinion of the bishop, as also ye do. For your presbytery honorable, worthy of God, is fitted as the strings to the harp. Therefore it is that Jesus Christ is sung in charity, through your agreement and harmonious love.

If I, in a short time, have formed such intimacy with your bishop, as is not of man but of the Spirit, how much more do I judge you happy who are so joined to him as the Church to Jesus Christ, and as Jesus Christ to the Father, that all things may be harmonious in unity. Let no one mistake. If anyone be not within the altar, he comes short of the bread of God. For if the prayer of one and another have such power, how much greater that of the bishop and of the whole Church! Whoever comes not to the assembly, is already elated with pride, and has condemned himself. For it is written, "God resisteth the

proud." Let us give diligence therefore not to resist the bishop, that we may be subject to God.

And however long anyone sees the bishop keep silence, let him revere him the more. For everyone whom the master of the house sends to rule his house, it befits us to receive as we would him who sent him. The bishop, therefore, we evidently should look upon as the Lord himself. Onesimus himself, however, praises your good order in the Lord exceedingly, that you all live according to the Truth, and that no heresy dwells among you (Chapters III-VI).

The four epistles not found in the Syriac, but in the shorter Greek recension, and mentioned by Eusebius, are addressed to the churches in Magnesia, Tralles, Philadelphia and Smyrna. All of them contain exhortations to obedience to the bishop, couched in the same style as those already quoted:

Since, therefore, I was thought worthy to see you through Damas your godly bishop, and the worthy presbyters Bassus and Apollonius, and my fellow-servant the deacon Sotion, in whom let me have joy, because he is subject to the bishop as to the grace of God, and to the presbytery as to the law of Christ. But it becomes you also not to abuse the age of your bishop, but according to the power of God the Father, to bestow upon him all reverence, as I have known also the holy presbyters to do, not taking up what seems his more youthful condition, but as prudent men in God, giving place to him, and that not to him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ, the Bishop of all. To the honor, therefore, of him who hath chosen us, it is becoming for us to render obedience without hypocrisy, since he who errs in this, does so not as to the bishop whom we see, but undertakes to deceive the Invisible. Such a thing is to be regarded as concerning not the flesh, but God who knows secret things. It befits you, therefore, not only to be called Christians, but to be such, just as some call the bishop such, yet manage all things without him. Such persons seem to me not to have a good conscience, since they are not firmly assembled according to the commandment.

I exhort you to study to do all things in harmony of God, the bishop taking the first seat in place of God, and the presbyters in place of the council of the Apostles, and the deacons, most sweet to me, having intrusted to them the service of Jesus Christ, who before ages was with the Father, and who was manifested in the end. All then, accepting the common usage of God, reverence each other, and let no one look upon his neighbor according to the flesh, but love one another always in Jesus Christ. Let there be nothing among you which shall be

able to divide you, but be united to the bishop and those who preside for a symbol and teaching of immortality. For just as the Lord did nothing without the Father, although united with him, either by himself or by his Apostles, so do you perform nothing without the bishop and the presbyters.

Study to be established in the doctrines of the Lord and of the Apostles, that all that you do may turn out well for flesh and spirit, faith and love in Son, Father and Spirit, in the beginning and end, with your most estimable bishop and worthily spiritual crown of your presbyters, and the godly deacons. Submit yourselves to the bishop and to one another, as Jesus Christ submitted himself to the Father according to the flesh, and the Apostles to Christ and the Father and the Spirit, that your unity may be both fleshly and spiritual (Epistle to the church in Magnesia: Chapters II, III, IV, VI, VII, XIII).

When you are subject to the bishop as to Jesus Christ, you seem to me to live not according to men but to Jesus Christ, who died for us that ye may escape dying through believing in his death. It is necessary, therefore, that however you may act, you do nothing without the bishop; but subject yourselves also to the presbytery as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ, our hope, in whom we shall be found living. It is needful also to please the deacons, as of the mysteries of Jesus Christ, in every way in all things. For they are not ministers of meat and drink, but servants of the Church of God. It is necessary for them to guard themselves against accusations as fire. Let all alike reverence the deacons as the ordinance of Jesus Christ, and the bishop as Jesus Christ the Son of the Father, the presbyters as the council of God and the bond of the Apostles. Without these the Church is not called. I am persuaded that you take this position about these. For I have received the exemplar of your love, and have it with me in your bishop.

Keep yourselves from such [heretics]. This will be true of you if ye be not puffed up, nor separated from God, Jesus Christ and the bishop, and the ordinance of the Apostles. He who is within the altar is pure; that is, he who does anything without bishop and presbytery and deacon, is not clean in conscience.

I beseech you by my bonds, which I bear for Jesus Christ, seeking to attain to God, continue in one mind and in prayer with one another. For it befits each one of you, and especially the presbyters, to refresh the bishop, to the honor of the Father, Jesus Christ and the Apostles. I pray of you in charity to hear me, lest I be a witness against you in writing. Farewell in Jesus Christ, being subject to the bishop as to the ordinance, and to the presbytery likewise (Epistle to the church in Tralles: Chapters II, III, VII, XII, XIII).

Ignatius to the church of God which is in Philadelphia in Asia, . . . which is my eternal and steadfast joy, especially if they are in unity with their bishop, and with the presbyters who are with him, and with the deacons. . . . Which

bishop I know not from himself nor through men, to have obtained his ministry suited to the common interest, not of vainglory, but in the love of the Father and of the Lord Jesus Christ; with whose gentleness I have been much struck; who in silence can do more than those who talk foolish things.

As children of Light and Truth, flee division and bad doctrines. Where your pastor is, there as sheep follow him. . . . For as many as are of God and Jesus Christ, these are with the bishop; and as many as come by repentance into the unity of the Church, these also will be of God, that they may be living according to Jesus Christ. Do not err, my brethren. If anyone follow him who makes division, he does not inherit the kingdom of God; if anyone walk in strange opinions, he does not assent to the passion. Study, therefore, to use one eucharist, for the flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ is one, and the cup in the unity of his blood is one, one altar, as one bishop, along with the presbytery and deacons, my fellow-servants.

For even if some according to the flesh wished to deceive me, yet the Spirit is not deceived, being from God. For it knows whence it cometh and whither it goeth, and brings to light the hidden things. I cried aloud, when with you, I spoke with a great voice: "Give heed to the bishop, the presbytery and deacons." Some, indeed, suspected me of foreknowing the division of some when I spoke thus. He is my witness, for whom I am in bonds, that I knew it not from human flesh. But the Spirit proclaimed it, saying, "Do nothing without the bishop; keep your flesh as the temple of God; flee divisions; be ye followers of Jesus Christ, as he is of the Father." (Epistle to the church in Philadelphia: Chapters I, II, III, IV, VI.)

Let all follow the bishop, as Jesus Christ the Father, and the presbytery as the Apostles. And reverence the deacons as the ordinance of God. Let no one, without the bishop, do anything pertaining to the Church. Let that be regarded as a valid eucharist, which is by the bishop, or him to whom the bishop intrusts it. Wherever the bishop appears, there let the assembly be also, as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church. It is not permitted either to baptize or to hold a love-feast without the bishop; but whatever he approves, this is well pleasing to God also, in order that whatever is transacted may be unshaken and valid.

It is good to know God and the bishop. He who honors the bishop is honored of God; he who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, serves the Devil.

Greet your bishop worthy of God, and your presbytery most pleasing to God, and the deacons my fellow-servants (Epistle to the church in Smyrna: Chapters VIII, IX, XII).

Such is the Ignatian teaching as to the monarchic episcopate, in its entirety. It is notable in several respects.

Observe that the Ignatian epistles afford no direct support to Dr. Lightfoot's theory that monarchic episcopacy is of apostolic origin. It would have afforded an excellent reinforcement of their injunctions that the Church shall obey and depend upon the bishop if it could have been added that his position had its warrant from the Apostles. In the epistle to the church in Ephesus, how easy and natural it would have been to remind the Ephesians that they had received their first bishop at the hands of the beloved Apostle, and even to have named him for the information of posterity and the comfort of Dr. Lightfoot. But there is not a word of this in that epistle, or as to the activity of the Apostle in giving a bishop authority to bear rule over each of the churches of Asia, for the establishment of unity and for the prevention of heresy. In fact the Ignatian epistles never mention the Apostle John, although they mention Paul, Peter and Timothy; nor do they quote any of his writings. "It seems impossible," says Canon Bruce, "that Ignatius could have read the letters to the seven churches in Asia in the Apocalypse, and have made no allusion to them when writing to three of the same churches and to two other churches in the same province. The omission gives no color to the theory that St. John was the founder of the episcopacy in the churches of Asia, and through them in all churches."¹

The epistles, however, do represent the monarchic episcopate as having a divine right in the churches. But this is made to rest (*a*) on the fitness of things, and (*b*) on a special revelation made to Ignatius.

(*a*) The threefold ministry is treated as an ecclesiastical order which corresponded to the spiritual order of the Gospels. The bishop stands for our Lord and the pres-

¹ *Apostolic Order and Unity* (Edinburgh, 1903), p. 106.

byters for the Apostles; and this correspondence is so self-evident, so complete and so important, that anyone who rejects it shows a contempt for divine authority, has a bad conscience, and resists God. They who accept it are "living according to Jesus Christ."

(b) Of the revelation in behalf of monarchic episcopacy, we learn from the epistle to the church in Philadelphia. It must be remembered that until the rise of Montanism, in the last quarter of the second century, the Church generally believed in the continuance of prophetic inspiration. Ignatius is represented in that epistle as claiming—as did Hermas and others—to speak to the churches with the authority of the Holy Spirit. He writes to that church: "The Spirit proclaimed it, saying, 'Do nothing without the bishop.'" I do not observe that the champions of authenticity lay much stress on this statement. Even they hardly will find in their author that weight of sobriety and simplicity which befits a true prophet. They want a "historic episcopate;" but he lifts himself above history and precedent, by basing it upon a private revelation.

The Ignatian epistles also give no sanction to the notion that the monarchic bishop is a successor of the Apostles. "It is certainly somewhat startling," says Canon Travers Smith, "to those who are accustomed to regard bishops as the successors of the Apostles, that Ignatius everywhere speaks of the position of the Apostles as corresponding to that of the existing presbyters, while the prototype of the bishop is not the Apostles, but the Lord himself." No writer of the early Church before Cyprian speaks of the monarchic bishops as successors of the Apostles; and even he makes them rather the successors of Peter than of the Twelve. The generations which stood nearest to the Apostles knew that bishops, whether of the earlier or the later type, were not taking

up the work of the Apostles as world-wide witnesses of the resurrection of their Lord, and as missionaries, not to a single city, but to all nations. The Ignatian epistles aim only at exhibiting the threefold ministry as reproducing in each city-church what corresponded to the order of the gospel story, so that the presbyters naturally took the second place in the church, as did the Apostles in that.

Dr. Lightfoot bases an argument for the authenticity of the epistles on their freedom from those sacerdotal ideas of the ministry which afterwards pervaded the churches. Canon Travers Smith, however, says: "We find in the epistles the germ of the great ideas of worship afterwards developed in the Church. The altar-idea and the temple-idea as applied to the Church are there. The eucharist holds its commanding place, though the question what were its rites at this early period is hard to answer from the letters."

The essential thing in sacerdotalism is the limitation of access to God to the ministrations of a clerical class. On that road the Ignatian epistles, whatever their teaching about the eucharist, have gone far from the simplicity of the gospel. They require the Church to be subject to the bishop as to their Maker. Where he is, the Church is, without regard to the promise made to the "two or three" (Matthew xviii: 20). They who ignore him in anything have a defiled conscience, and serve the Devil. The Church is to follow him as the sheep follow their shepherd. That they have a divine "Shepherd and Bishop of their souls" (1 Peter ii: 25), whose voice they can hear for themselves (John x: 3), is never suggested. It is only a step farther to the teaching of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which say of the bishop: "He is your ruler and governor, your king and potentate; he is next after God

your earthly god, who has a right to be revered by you. . . . Let the bishop preside over you with the authority of God. . . . Let the presbyters be esteemed by you to represent the Apostles."

Whether authentic or not, the Ignatian epistles furnish neither warrant nor precedent for that diocesan episcopacy which in later days has been put forward as "the historic episcopate." The Ignatian bishop is the pastor of an urban church, whose members constitute a single congregation, meet in one house of worship, break one loaf in their communion. "That they are to do nothing without their bishop" is the injunction most frequently repeated to them. He is their bishop in John Ruskin's sense, knowing all about the troubles of Bill and Nancy in the back streets of Antioch, with the care of their souls upon him as his chief work in life. His is what Dr. Seabury called "the new-fangled scheme of parochial episcopacy," and nothing grander.

CHAPTER IV

FROM SENATE TO MONARCH

After the middle of the second century we find the monarchic episcopate generally established in the churches of both east and west; and we also meet with writers who claim for it apostolic origin and authority, generally in the supposed interests of Christian unity and orthodoxy. They appeal to the succession of orthodox bishops in the churches founded by the Apostles, as disproving the claim of the gnostic heretics to represent the Christianity of the Church's first days. In this connection I shall quote what is said by:

- I. Hegesippus (A. D. 156-189);
- II. Irenæus of Lyons (A. D. 177-189);
- III. Clement of Alexandria (A. D. 190-215);
- IV. Tertullian of Carthage (A. D. 197-220);
- V. Cyprian of Carthage (A. D. 248-258);
- VI. Dionysius of Alexandria (A. D. 232-265); and
- VII. *The Constitutions and Canons of the Holy Apostles.*

To this I shall add what (8) Isaac of Rome, (9) Jerome, and (10) Aërius of Sebasteia have to say against the view that the monarchic episcopate dates back to the times of the Apostles, and has a divine right to govern the Church.

I. Hegesippus was an oriental Christian, probably a Hebrew Christian from Palestine, who traveled westward to Corinth and Rome, and who compiled five books of *Memoirs*, which are known to us only through some quotations made by Eusebius (A. D. 325). These leave us in doubt as to both the purpose of the work and the

theological position of its author. Some regard it as a work on the history of the Church; others as an account of the Church as he found it in his travels. Had it been either, others think, Eusebius would have quoted it far more freely; so they believe it to have been a treatise in refutation of Gnosticism, containing a few incidental historical notices, which Eusebius found useful for his history.

More important is the question of his orthodoxy. Baur and his school regard Hegesippus as an Ebionite, and treat his statements as justifying the inference that Ebionism was the generally accepted doctrine of the Church of the west as late as the last quarter of the second century. The fact, however, may be true without warranting the inference. It may be that Hegesippus was an Ebionite; but it does not follow that his claims as to the prevalence of Ebionism in the early Church were true.

There is nothing that points in either direction in the passage which tells of the Roman authorities making inquiry in the reign of Domitian (A. D. 81-96) as to the surviving kinsmen of our Lord. But the account of James the Lord's brother¹ seems to have been taken from Ebionite sources, and to describe him as an Ebionite ascetic:

James the Lord's brother, surnamed the Just, . . . received the Church in his turn after the Apostles. This man was holy from his mother's womb. Wine and strong drink he never drank; nor did he eat flesh. A razor went not upon his head; with oil he never anointed himself; and the bath he did not use. To him alone it was permitted to enter the holy place [of the Temple], for he did not wear woollen, but linens. And alone he went into the Temple, and used to be found prostrate upon his knees, praying for the release of the people, so that his knees grew hard as those of a camel, because of his constant bending in supplication to God, to entreat release for the people. . . . Some of the seven sects among the people asked him what was the door to Jesus. And he told them that He was the Saviour.

¹ *Eusebii Historia Ecclesiastica*, Lib. II, Cap. 23.

Then follows the account of his martyrdom, copying in some of its details the story of our Lord's passion. It occurs at a passover time; the rulers fear that the people may be led to accept Jesus as the Messiah; James is stoned and clubbed to death, and his last words are, "I beseech thee, O Lord God Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!" Eusebius adds, "In this, but more fully, Hegesippus agrees with Clement." His reference is to Clement of Alexandria, who, in his *Outlines* (*Hypotyposesis*), gives an account of James not unlike that of Hegesippus, and drawn from the same Ebionite sources. Both Hegesippus and Clement were students of the pseudo-apostolic records which claim Clement of Rome as their author, although Clement of Alexandria was the farthest from its Ebionism. These books exalt James to the rank of "lord and bishop of the whole Church," "archbishop," "the lord and bishop of bishops," and make Peter his humble subordinate. It is true that no existing portion of that queer collection of apocryphal histories and teachings contains an account of James's asceticism and martyrdom. But we know that both the *Clementine Recognitions* and the *Clementine Homilies* are an abridgment of a still larger work now lost; and the harmony of this narrative with their general purport leads us to suppose that this is the source from which they have drawn. Albrecht Ritschl, in his *Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche* (1857), the work with which he bade farewell to Baur and his school, although he antagonizes the inference that Ebionism is primitive Christianity, and makes out the best case he can for the orthodoxy of Hegesippus, yet admits that this account of James has an Ebionite and Essenish stamp.

Nor is this the only indication of the Ebionism of Hegesippus. Eusebius mentions that he uses the Ebionite

“Gospel According to the Hebrews” (as does also Clement of Alexandria), and does not mention his using any other. Photius quotes Stephen Gobarus as saying that Hegesippus reprobated as vain words the statement, “Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for the just.” Now it is possible that the Gnostics made a wrong use of the Apostle’s words (1 Corinthians ii: 9); but an orthodox Christian, who accepted Paul as an Apostle, would almost certainly have discriminated between his meaning and the gnostic abuse of his language. And when we find Hegesippus describing the canon of Scripture as consisting of “the law, the prophets and the Lord,” *i. e.*, the gospel, with no mention of the apostolic writings, we seem to be on Ebionite ground. Ritschl, indeed, is alleged by Professor Milligan (in Smith and Wace’s *Dictionary of Christian Biography*) to have shown these terms “to be precisely those of the Catholic Church of the time, to which it made its appeal, and in which it instructed its catechumens.” But Ritschl does nothing of the sort. He tries to account for the omission by the supposition that the canonical rank of the apostolic writings “was not yet fully established.” Yet the Pauline Epistles were already quoted as having authority by Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Hermas, “Ignatius,” the epistle to Diognetus, Valentinus, Marcion, and Justin Martyr, as well as enumerated as part of the canon in the *Muratorian Fragment*. Ritschl quotes four passages from early Christian literature which bear on the question, namely, from the epistle to Diognetus (second century), Ireneus and Tertullian, which expressly mention the writings of the Apostles, while the *Apostolical Constitutions* (regarded by Rothe and Baur as of Ebionite origin) specify only the law, the prophets and the gospel.

Add to this that the work of Hegesippus, in spite of the interest of its subject, has perished along with the works of the heretics generally, except in a few quotations.

For our present purpose, the most important of the quotations Eusebius makes from Hegesippus is that which relates to his travels to the west:

And the church of the Corinthians continued in the right teaching, down to Primus, who was bishop in Corinth. And with them I had intercourse while journeying to Rome, and spent days enough with the Corinthians, during which we found rest in the right doctrine. And on arriving in Rome I made out the succession [of bishops] as far as Anicetus [A. D. 157-168], whose deacon Eleutherus was. And from Anicetus Soter received it, after whom Eleutherus [A. D. 177-192]. And in each succession and in each city it is so, as the law proclaims, and the prophets, and the Lord.¹

What concerns us here is that (as Dr. Salmon puts it) "a traveler to Rome, about A. D. 160, found that church ruled by a bishop, and that the Roman church [or some of its members] then believed that since the Apostles' times it had been governed by bishops, whose names were then preserved." If the traveler was an Ebionite, he seems to claim that Ebionism was the dominant teaching in the two churches he mentions. His language seems to me rather that of a sectarian, who is seeking confirmation for his sectarian sympathies, than of a Christian rejoicing in the diffusion of the gospel. But if so, his account is as little to be taken for a picture of the actual situation as are the reports of "party prospects" in a doubtful American election. Hegesippus may have gone upon the familiar maxim: "Claim everything!"

His is the oldest unquestioned testimony as to the existence of the monarchic episcopate in the churches. He is the fountain head of the traditions about the Bishops of Jerusalem and Rome. That he did not draw

¹ *Eusebii Historia Ecclesiastica*, Lib. IV, Cap. 22.

his information from the archives of the church in Rome is indicated by the absence of any recognized tradition as to the names and order in succession of the bishops of that church, and their relations to the Apostles Paul and Peter. Dr. Richard F. Littledale, in his work on *The Petrine Claims* (London, 1889), enumerates eleven divergent views of this from the second, third and fourth centuries. Some of these are:

Ireneus: Peter and Paul, Linus, Anacletus, Clement.

Tertullian: Peter, Clement.

Apostolical Constitutions: Linus (ordained by Paul), Clement (ordained by Peter).

Optatus: Peter, Linus, Clement, Anacletus.

Epiphanius: Peter and Paul, Linus, Cletus, Clement.

Rufinus: Linus, Cletus (both dying before Peter).

Victorinus: Linus, Cletus, Anacletus, Clement.

Liberian Catalogue: Peter, Linus, Clement, Cletus, Anacletus.

This last was drawn up in Rome A. D. 354, under Pope Liberius, possibly to settle by authority the points in dispute. "The utter discrepancy," says Dr. Littledale, "of these different accounts of the order and succession shows that no reliance whatever can be placed upon the trustworthiness of the early Roman historical records." "The alleged succession of the early Roman bishops," says Dean Stanley, "is involved in contradictions which can only be explained on the supposition that there was then no fixed episcopate."¹

This "amount of irreconcilable variation concentrated within the brief space of thirty-three years," as Dr. Littledale calls it, grows inevitably out of an attempt to read the story of a presbyterially governed church into harmony with a monarchic-episcopal theory of what had

¹ *Christian Institutions*, p. 214.

happened. Historical literature abounds in such mis-readings. So Bæda tells of Cædmon in the monastic terms of his own time, changing the Celtic church-sept at Whitby into a monastery, and its co-arb Hilda into an abbess. So Linus, Anacletus, Cletus and Clement—presbyter-bishops of the church in Rome and contemporary members of its presbytery—are transformed into successive monarchic bishops of that church, and made the first after Peter in the series of the popes. Their contemporary, Hermas, describes them rightly as “elders who were over the church.”

II. Ireneus, the estimable Bishop of Lyons, was a native of Asia, and heard Polycarp preach in his early youth, but made his home in the west. His birth is dated by one modern at A. D. 97, and by another at A. D. 147. We know that after the persecution of A. D. 177 he became the Bishop of Lyons, and was still active at the close of the century. All his writings, except the recently recovered *Exposition of Apostolic Teaching*, are polemic, and are occupied with the refutation of the gnostic heresies, which his countryman and acquaintance Florinus had brought from the east into the churches of Italy. The chief is his *Detection and Overthrow of Gnosis Falsely So Called*, which we possess in an early Latin translation, and in passages of the original Greek. It dates from about A. D. 182.

What brings Ireneus into the present discussion is the stress he lays upon the succession of orthodox bishops as part of his answer to the Gnostics. Yet he is by no means clear as to the distinction between bishop and presbyter. “Leimbach can have made but small acquaintance with the writings of Ireneus,” says Dr. R. A. Lipsius in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, “if he imagines that the term *presbuteros* constituted for him an antithesis to

episkopos. It is just a characteristic feature of his style that this antithesis was for him as yet unknown." This, however, is an overstatement. Ireneus stands, in fact, on the dividing line between the earlier and the later view of the relation of the two officers, and uses at one time the language of the earlier period, and at others that of the later. But so far from not recognizing such antithesis, he has a distinct interest in establishing it.

I give first the pertinent passages from his great treatise, and then extracts from two epistles written subsequently:

From the fortieth to the fiftieth year the man declines toward old age, arrived at which our Lord was teaching, as the gospel and all the presbyters testify, who in Asia had met with John the disciple of the Lord, that John had handed this down to them. For he remained with them until the times of Trajan. Some of them besides saw not only John, but other Apostles also, and bore witness of a like report (ii, 22, 5).

When we call upon them to consider that tradition, which is from the Apostles, which is preserved in the churches through the successions of presbyters, they are opposed to tradition, saying that they are wiser not only than the presbyters, but also than the Apostles, and have discovered the pure truth (iii, 2, 2).

The tradition of the Apostles, therefore, manifest in the whole world, it is possible for all who desire to see the truth, to perceive in every church; and we are able to count up those who were appointed by the Apostles bishops in the churches, and their successors down to our own times, who neither taught nor knew such stuff as these men's deliriums (iii, 3, 1).

Since it would be very long in such a volume as this to count up the successions of all the churches, we confound those who through self-pleasing, or vainglory, or blindness and evil opinion, meet for worship otherwise than they ought, by pointing out the tradition of the greatest and oldest and universally known church, founded and constituted at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, and the faith declared to men which comes down to us through the succession of its bishops. For to this church, because of its more powerful leadership, it befits every church,—that is, the faithful wherever they are,—to conform; for within it is preserved that tradition which is from the Apostles (iii, 3, 2).

The blessed Apostles, having founded and built up the church [in Rome] intrusted the ministry of the episcopate to Linus.

Of this Linus Paul makes mention in his Epistles to Timothy. Anencletus succeeded him. After him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement obtained the episcopate, who had both seen the blessed Apostles and conversed with them, so that he had their teaching in his ears, and their tradition before his eyes. Nor he alone, for many then were living, who had been taught by the Apostles. In the time of this Clement no small dissension having arisen among the brethren in Corinth, the church in Rome sent a most suitable letter to the Corinthians, reconciling them in peace, renewing their faith, and the tradition they had newly received from the Apostles. Euarestus succeeded this Clement, and Alexander Euarestus. Then likewise, sixth from the Apostles, Xystus is appointed. After him Telesphorus, who also endured martyrdom gloriously. Then Hyginus; then Pius; after him Anicetus; Soter having succeeded Anicetus, Eleutherus, in the twelfth place from the Apostles, now holds the ministry of the episcopate. In the same order, and the same succession, the tradition in the church and the preaching of the truth have come down to us from the Apostles (iii, 3, 2-3).

But Polycarp also was not only taught by the Apostles, and acquainted with many who had seen Christ, but also by the Apostles in Asia had been appointed bishop in the church in Smyrna, whom we also saw in our first youth, for he lived a long time, and when a very old man departed from life by a glorious and illustrious martyr's death. He taught always those things he had learned from the Apostles, which the Church also hands down, and which alone are true. All the churches throughout Asia bear witness to these things, and those who have succeeded Polycarp down to the present time. . . . He also was in Rome in the time of Anicetus, and turned many from the heretics to the Church of God, preaching that he had received from the Apostles that one and only truth, which has been handed down by the Church. And there are those who heard from him that John the disciple of the Lord, on going to the bath in Ephesus, and seeing Cerinthus within, ran out of the bathhouse without bathing, and saying, "Let us fly lest even the bathhouse fall, as Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is there." And Polycarp himself, when Marcion came into sight, and said, "Do you know us?" answered, "I know thee, the firstborn of Satan" (iii, 3, 4).

To those presbyters who are in the churches it behooves us to listen,—to those who have succession from the Apostles, who also with the succession of the episcopate have received an assured gift of the truth, according to the pleasure of the Father (iv, 26, 2).

It befits us to adhere to those who keep safely the teaching of the Apostles, and, with the order of the presbytery, hold forth sound speech and a blameless conversation, for the confirmation and correction of others (iv, 26, 4).

The Church raises presbyters such as the Prophet (Isaiah

ix: 17, Septuagint version) speaks of, "I will give thee thy rulers in peace and thy overseers [*episcopous*] in righteousness" (iv, 26, 5).

Where the gifts of the Lord are placed, there it befits us to learn the truth, from those who possess that succession of the Church, which is from the Apostles, and that which is sound and above reproach in behavior, and untainted and unspoiled in speech (iv, 25, 5).

True knowledge is the teaching of the Apostles, and the ancient standing of the Church throughout the world, and the character of the body of Christ, according to the successions of bishops, to whom they intrusted that church which is in each place (iv, 33, 8).

For all those [the heretics] are much later than the bishops, to whom the Apostles intrusted the churches (v, 20, 1).

These doctrines the presbyters who were before us, who were taught by the Apostles, never handed down to thee. For I saw thee (while I was yet a boy, being in lower Asia, with Polycarp) performing splendidly in the royal court, and trying to stand well with him. For I remember what then happened better than things nearer our time, . . . so that I can tell the very place where the blessed Polycarp sat and discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and the manner of his life, and the appearance of his body, and the discourses which he made to the multitude, and his familiarity with John as he told it, and with the others who had seen the Lord; and how he would recall their sayings, and what he had heard from them about the Lord and his miracles and his teaching, as from eyewitnesses of the Word of Life. Polycarp having received these things, told them all in agreement with the Scriptures (Epistle to Florinus, quoted by Eusebius, v, 20).

Those presbyters who, before Soter, were presidents of the church which you now guide,—I speak of Anicetus and Pius, Hyginus and Telesphorus,—neither themselves observed [Easter] nor allowed this to those who were with them; and none the less they kept peace, though not themselves observing it, with those who came to them from other parishes, in which it was observed, although to observe it was then more offensive to those who did not. And neither at that time were any cast off on account of the form, but the presbyters before you, themselves not observing, sent the eucharist to those from the parishes which did. And the blessed Polycarp sojourning in Rome in the time of Anicetus, although they had some small differences about other things besides, quickly came to an understanding, not striving much with each other on this head. For neither was Anicetus able to persuade Polycarp not to observe what he always had observed along with John the disciple of our Lord, and the other Apostles with whom he had consorted; nor did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it, as he said it behooved him to maintain the practice of the presbyters who were before him. And in this situation they

communed with each other; and in the church Anicetus yielded the eucharist to Polycarp, evidently out of respect; and they parted in peace, all the church, both of those who observed it and those who did not, being at peace (Epistle to Victor, Bishop of Rome; quoted by Eusebius, v, 24).

It will be observed that Ireneus never once mentions that threefold ministry, on which Ignatius, Cyprian and the *Apostolical Constitutions* lay such stress. His Church vocabulary seems to belong to an earlier stage of ecclesiastical development. In these quotations he applies the term presbyter ten times to those whom he as often calls bishops. "In his language," says Dr. Lightfoot, "a presbyter is never designated a bishop, while on the other hand he very frequently speaks of a bishop as a presbyter. In other words, though he views the episcopate as a distinct office from the presbytery, he does not regard it as a distinct order in the same sense in which the diaconate is a distinct order" (*Philippians*, p. 226). Even in his polite and conciliatory letter to Victor of Rome, who wanted to excommunicate those who did not agree with him about Easter observance, he calls the previous rulers of that church presbyters and nothing else. His references to those who in Asia had known the Apostles, describe them also as presbyters. The only place in which he seems to discriminate between the two offices is his absurd and misleading comment on the account of Paul's solemn meeting with the elders of the Ephesian church (Acts xx), where he says that Paul sent for "the bishops and presbyters from Ephesus and the other neighboring cities." That and the long quotation from the Third Book, as to Rome and Polycarp, are the only two passages which disclose his interest in upholding episcopacy.

Yet he comes from that Asia to whose churches are addressed five of the Ignatian epistles, describing incidentally a state of things in which the distinction between

bishop and presbyter amounted almost to an article of faith, and the two terms are never treated as in the least degree interchangeable.

On the testimony of Ireneus, more than that of any other father, must rest the case for Dr. Lightfoot's contention that monarchic episcopacy in the Asian churches dates from the Apostle John and has his sanction. The Ignatian epistles, as we have seen, do not say a word of such an origin of the Church order they are describing, and even commending as indispensable to the churches. Polycarp, we have found, is rather a witness against it than for it. Ireneus, as himself a native of Asia and a younger contemporary of Polycarp, should be a first-rate witness on that side. But the value of a witness must depend upon his accuracy, his carefulness in dealing with the facts and his fullness.

Ireneus obliges us to doubt his accuracy, when he testifies to the establishment of monarchic episcopacy in the church of Rome by the Apostles. This Dr. Lightfoot himself discredits, and Dr. Salmon regards doubtfully. "Linus, Cletus, Clement," the latter says, "are commonly supposed to have been, after the Apostles, the first Bishops of Rome (see Ireneus, iii, 3), and, by the confession of everyone, were leading men in that church in the latter part of the first century." "We need not suppose that the name bishop was then distinctively used to denote the head of the church, nor are we bound to think that the line of separation between him and other presbyters was as marked as it became in later times."¹ So much the Dublin scholar concedes to the evidence of Clement and Hermas that the church in Rome was governed by its presbyters.

As to carefulness in dealing with facts, we have already

¹ *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 411.

seen an instance in his comment upon Acts xx: 17, where he says that Paul sent for "the bishops and presbyters from Ephesus and the other neighboring cities." We have yet another in his advocacy of his pet idea that our Lord's earthly ministry did not terminate in his thirty-third or thirty-fourth year, but extended nearly to his fiftieth. It is of this that he says that "all the presbyters testify, who throughout Asia had met with John the disciple of the Lord, that John had taught this" (Book II, 22, 5). No doubt he believed this; but who else does so? Nobody else among the Fathers did. Yet he is as positive about it as he is as to "the Apostles" having made Polycarp "Bishop of Smyrna," and far more explicit as to the grounds for his assertion.

It is still worse with him as to the fullness of his testimony at the really critical points. Even as to Polycarp, all he has to tell us is that that good man had been made bishop in the church in Smyrna by the Apostles. He undoubtedly was a bishop—not the bishop—of the church in Smyrna, but whether made such by the Apostles may be doubted, as his martyrdom falls well past the middle of the century. If Eusebius is right in assigning A. D. 166 as the date, and the tradition which makes him die in his eighty-sixth year be trustworthy, then he would be in his eighteenth year at the latest date that can be assigned for the death of John, and hardly would have entered upon the presbyterate at that age. If, with Dr. Salmon, we put his death eleven years earlier, it still looks doubtful. But Ireneus does not say "by the Apostle John"; he says "by the Apostles," which makes his statement more difficult still.

Of another church in Asia he says: "Then again the church in Ephesus, founded by Paul, and having John abiding among them until the reign of Trajan, is a true

witness of the tradition of the Apostles." If Ephesus is to take its place beside Rome and Smyrna in his argument, it must be because John appointed a bishop of that church, as "Peter and Paul" did for Rome, and "the Apostles" did for Smyrna. Why not name him? Was he Phygellus? Was he another John? Or was he "Gaius the beloved," whom John made the Bishop of Ephesus, by way of indicating that he had changed his mind since he wrote that Third Epistle, and by way of "casting out of the episcopate" (Clement's phrase) those "elders of the church in Ephesus" of whom Paul said that the Holy Ghost had "made them bishops" there? Why drive us to spurious documents, like those ascribed to Dorotheus and Hippolytus, or *The Constitutions and Canons of the Holy Apostles*, when so little effort of memory would have set the matter at rest, to the satisfaction of ourselves and Dr. Lightfoot? To me it seems that Ireneus knew the name of no monarchic bishop set up in Ephesus by John, and he was too honest to pretend that he did.

"It must be carefully noticed," says Mr. H. T. Purchas, an Anglican writer, "that Ireneus promises lists of names and rests his argument upon his ability to produce such lists. What then is our surprise to find that he has only one such list to produce, viz., that of the church of Rome. 'It would be very tedious,' he says, 'to reckon up the successions of all the churches,' and therefore he will put all heretics to confusion by giving the succession in 'the very great, very ancient, and universally known church, founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul.' He thus determines to rest his case on one church, viz., that of Rome, 'with which every church should agree.' Ireneus, however, was enough of a logician to perceive that one episcopal list was a production very far short of what he had promised.

He therefore tries to strengthen his case by adducing the church of Smyrna. 'Polycarp also was not only instructed by the Apostles, and conversed with many who had seen Christ, but was also, by Apostles in Asia, appointed bishop of the church in Smyrna, whom I also saw in my early youth.' This is an exceedingly interesting piece of information, but why is it so vague? When so much depended upon definite names, why does Ireneus mention only 'Apostles'? Who were these Apostles? Bishop Lightfoot pleads that the plural need not be pressed, and that St. John only is meant. But if Ireneus had meant St. John, he would assuredly have said so. . . . The very least that can be said is that Ireneus did not feel sure enough about St. John's connection with Polycarp to enable him to assign the latter's appointment to that Apostle. . . .

"At the end of the same chapter Ireneus comes to the church of Ephesus. Here he is still more vague. He gives no succession of bishops at all. He merely says: 'Then again the church in Ephesus, founded by Paul, and having John remaining among them permanently until the times of Trajan, is a true witness of the tradition of the Apostles.' It is thus evident that Ireneus—the authority so confidently quoted in favor of a Johannine sanction of the episcopate, is, in fact, against it. If the facts, as he knew them, had been more favorable, he would assuredly have spoken in plainer and more decided language."¹

We leave Ireneus of Lyons with sincere respect for the evident sincerity with which he abstains from overstatement, but with recognition of the controversial purpose

¹ *Johannine Problems and Modern Needs* (London, 1901, pp. 9–11). Mr. Purchas is an Episcopalian, holding that that is the providential government of the Church. But he declines to accept the kind of evidence which is offered for the existence of that form of government in the primitive Church.

with which he handles his facts. And we find in his account of the state of affairs in Asia nothing but the poorest foundation for Dr. Lightfoot's theory of its early acceptance of monarchic episcopacy from apostolic hands.

III. Clement of Alexandria, Christian poet, philosopher and teacher, was a contemporary of Ireneus, but probably about ten years younger. He was a presbyter of that great church and the head of its catechetical school in his later life. Like that of Ireneus, his language sometimes recalls the earlier usage of the Church, when bishop and presbyter were names of the same office, and when that and the office of deacon made up the church's list. "He speaks," says Dr. Lightfoot, "sometimes of two orders of the ministry, the presbyters and deacons; sometimes of three, the bishops, presbyters and deacons. Thus it would appear that even as late as the close of the second century the Bishop of Alexandria was regarded as distinct and yet not distinct from the presbytery."¹ Thus in his principal work he says that "the presbyters preserve the better likeness of the Church; the deacons the serving."

What especially concerns us here is the beautiful story he tells of the Apostle John and his labors in Asia. It is found in the forty-second chapter of his book: *What Rich Man Is Saved?*

When, after the death of the tyrant [Domitian], he returned to Ephesus from the Isle of Patmos, he went, on being invited, to the neighboring places and peoples, in some places to appoint bishops, in others to constitute entire churches, in others yet to admit to the clergy anyone who was pointed out by the Spirit. And coming to a city not far [from Ephesus], whose name also some mention, after refreshing the brethren in other

¹ (*Philippians*, p. 224.) Harnack (*Dogmengeschichte*, I, 332 n.) says that "Clement in his works mentions ecclesiastical officials very rarely, and bishops most rarely, as they do not generally belong to his conception of the Church, or merely as antitypes of the angelic orders. . . . Clement would not have expressed himself thus if the bishop's office had been at that time as much valued in Alexandria as in Rome and other churches of the west."

respects, and looking upon the bishop who had been placed over them all, seeing a young man superb in body and of a graceful face and earnest mind, he said, "This man I intrust to you with all seriousness, the church and Christ being witnesses." He received him and promised all that was asked; and John repeated what he had said, and took witnesses, and returned to Ephesus.

And the presbyter taking into his house the young man, who had been intrusted to him, raised him, restrained him, encouraged him, and finally baptized him. And afterwards he relapsed from the more abundant care and guardianship, as having bestowed upon him the perfect safeguard, the seal of the Lord. But he who had received relaxation of restraint before he was ready for it, fell under the corrupting influence of idle fellows of his own age, practised in evil. And first of all they led him on by many costly banquets; then somewhere and by night they bring him to share in robberies; and then they exhort him to participate in still graver crimes. And by little things grown used to such things, and through the greatness of his disposition, bolting like a hard-mouthed and powerful horse from the right road, and taking the bridle between his teeth, he was carried more quickly to destruction. And at last, despairing of salvation from God, he no longer set his mind on small things, but having committed some great crime, since he had destroyed himself once for all, he expected to suffer equally with the others. Having taken up the same fellows, and formed a robber-band of them, he was their fit captain, the most violent, bloody and savage of them all.

In the meantime, some necessity having arisen, they send for John. And when he had disposed of the other matters, for which he came, he said, "Come now, O bishop, give me back the deposit which I and the Saviour intrusted with you in presence of the church you are over." But the bishop at first was distressed, thinking himself charged with money he never had received, and could neither believe about what he had not got, nor disbelieve John. But when John said, "I ask of you the young man, and the soul of thy brother," the presbyter, sighing deeply and shedding tears, said "That man is dead!" "What! and by what death?" "He is dead to God," he said; "he turned out wicked and abandoned, and at last a robber; and now instead of the church he occupies the mountain, with a band like himself." Then the Apostle rent his clothes, and after much lamentation, smiting his head [exclaimed]: "I left a fine keeper of his brother's soul. But bring me a horse, and get me a guide for the road."

He went off as he was from the very church. Arriving at the place, he was taken prisoner by the outpost of the robbers, neither attempting to escape nor begging anything from them, but calling out: "I have come for him! Take me to your chief!" And he, armed as he was, awaited him. But when he recognized John approaching him, he took to flight for shame. And

he [John] pursued him with all his might, forgetting his own age, and calling out: "Why do you fly me your own father, my son, though I am unarmed and an old man? Pity me, my child; do not fear me. You still have hope of eternal life. I, if it be necessary, will answer for you to Christ. If need be, I will gladly undergo thy death, as the Lord bore death for us. I will give my soul for you. Stop! Believe Christ hath sent me." And he hearing this, stopped with downcast looks; then he threw away his arms and began to weep bitterly, and embraced the old man, excusing his crimes with lamentation as best he was able, being baptized a second time with tears, and hiding only his right hand. And he, pledging himself and assuring him that he has found pardon for him with Christ, imploring him on his knees, and kissing his right hand as cleansed by his repentance, brought him back to the church. And entreating God with plentiful prayers, and agonizing along with him in continuous fastings, and instructing his mind by the varied charms of his discourses, he rested not, it is said, until he had restored him to the church.¹

Thus to Clement of Alexandria also there clings the usage of the speech of an earlier age. His bishop is still a presbyter, and the little touch, "who had been placed over them all," is needed to adapt the story to his own times. Most noticeable is the use of the term "bishop" in closest relation to the presbyter's pastoral work and its responsibilities. It is to him as bishop that John intrusts the young man. It is from him as bishop that the Apostle requires "the soul of thy brother." The title of bishop designates what was most Christian in the work of the Christian presbyter, and the farthest removed from the varied but mostly unspiritual activities of the diocesan prelate of later times. Would the Apostle John have selected for this trust anyone who now bears the name of bishop, or who has done so for centuries past?

Origen of Alexandria, the more famous pupil of Clement, belonged to a time when even in Alexandria the regard for the bishop and the deference to his office had increased notably. This is seen by the action of the patriarch

¹ *Clementis Alexandrini Liber, Quis dives salutem consequi possit? perpetuo commentario Illustratus a Carolo Segario* (Utrecht, 1816), pp. 106-115.

Demetrius refusing to allow him to return to the city after his irregular ordination by a synod of bishops and presbyters in Palestine, and his undertaking to depose him in a synod of bishops alone (A. D. 231). Origen insists on the value of orthodox tradition much in the fashion of Irenaeus: "The preaching handed over by the Apostles to the Church is preserved by the order of succession, and remains in the churches to the present: that alone is to be accepted as truth which is in no respect out of harmony with ecclesiastical and apostolic tradition." I have mentioned him as the oldest witness to the existence of the Ignatian epistles, or at least to the Curetonian recension of them.

IV. Tertullian of Carthage was almost exactly the contemporary of Clement of Alexandria, but his very opposite in spirit and method. He is the first Latin father, writing at a time when Greek was still the language of the churches of Rome and Lyons, no less than of Corinth and Alexandria. After having been a presbyter of the church in Carthage, he went over to the Montanists, and died in their communion some time after A. D. 220. While Clement tried to displace the heretical gnosis by a Christian gnosis, Tertullian showed a violent antipathy to the very name. It was this which carried him over to the Montanists, with their dependence upon authoritative revelations, and their moral rigorism. Of the works preserved, most were written during his Catholic period, while his great work on "Ecstasy," in defence of Montanism, has perished. In his *Apologetic for the Christians*, written about A. D. 197, he describes Christian discipline and worship:

We are one body through agreement in religion, and unity of discipline, and the bond of hope. We come together into a meeting and assembly, that we may, as it were, form a troop

and beset God with our prayers. This violence is well pleasing to God. We pray also for the emperors, for their ministers and men in power, for the welfare of the world, for the peace of the empire, for the delay of the end. We are brought together for the reading of the divine Scriptures, if anything in the character of the times compels us to give warning or thanks. At any rate we nourish our faith with holy words, elevate our hopes, confirm our confidence, and none the less strengthen our discipline by impressing the precepts; there also are exhortations, reproofs and divine censure. For judgment is pronounced with much gravity, as by those who are sure they are in the sight of God; and it is a very serious anticipation of judgment to come, if anyone has so offended as to be excluded from fellowship in prayer and in meeting, and from all holy intercourse. There preside certain approved elders, who have obtained this honor not by payment, but by repute. Also if there is any kind of chest, it is collected not in fees, as though it were a gathering for worship by contract. Each contributes a moderate sum once a month, or when he chooses, and only if he chooses and is able; for nobody is under constraint, but gives of his own will. These are, as it were, the deposits of charity, for they are not spent on eating and drinking, and thankless eating houses, but on feeding and burying the poor, on boys and girls destitute of both property and parents, on old folk kept at home, and also on shipwrecked people; and whoever are in the mines, the islands, the prisons, if it be for the cause of God, are supported for the sake of their confession of him.

They [the Apostles] founded in the several cities churches, from which the rest have borrowed the root and seeds of doctrine, and do daily borrow these, that they may become churches. And through this they themselves will be accounted apostolic, as the offspring of the apostolic churches. Every sort of thing must be judged according to its origin. Therefore, whatever the number and size of the churches, there is but that one first Church from the Apostles, and all are from it. Thus all are primitive, and all are apostolic, since all hold with the unity. The communion of peace, the name of brotherhood, the exchange of hospitality, are rights which no other principle controls than the common tradition of the same mystery. Thence we enter our demurrer, that if the Lord Jesus sent Apostles to preach, other preachers than Christ has appointed are not to be received (*De Præscriptione*, Cap. 30).

The Apostles, having obtained the power of the Holy Spirit promised for virtues and eloquence, after they had instituted churches throughout Judæa, through the faith in Jesus Christ which they testified, then setting out into the world, promulgated the same teaching of this faith to the Gentiles.

Let the heretics publish the origin of their churches, unroll the list of their bishops, so descending by successions from the beginning that that first bishop had as his source and predecessor some one of the Apostles, or of the apostolic men who

adhered to the Apostles. For in this way the apostolic churches present their list, as the church of the Smyrnæans reports Polycarp appointed by John, as that of the Romans reports Clement ordained by Peter. Furthermore the others also bring forward those whom they have to show as appointed to the episcopate by the Apostles, shoots of the apostolic seed (*De Præscriptione*, Cap. 32).

Run over the apostolic churches, in which the very thrones of the Apostles still rule in their places; among which their authentic epistles are read, echoing the voice and representing the face of each one of them. Nearest to thee is Achæa; you have Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, hast Thessalonica. If thou canst pass to Asia, thou hast Ephesus. But if thou art close to Italy, thou hast Rome, whence authority comes to us also. How blessed that great church, where Apostles poured forth the whole doctrine with their blood, where Peter equaled his Lord in suffering, where Paul is crowned with the death of John, where the Apostle John, after escaping harm in being plunged into boiling oil, is banished to an island. See what it learned, what it taught, what hospitality it has shown to the African churches also (*De Præscriptione*, Cap. 36).

The right of conferring it [baptism], indeed, the chief priest, that is the bishop, possesses; then the presbyter and the deacon, yet not without the authority of the bishop, for the honor of the church being preserved, peace is preserved. Otherwise laymen also have the right (for that which is equally received may be equally given), unless the term "disciples" (John iv: 2) denote at once bishops, priests or deacons. The saying of the Lord must not be hidden from any. Wherefore baptism, which is equally derived from God, may be administered by all. But how much more incumbent on laymen the duty of reverence and modesty! Since those things befit persons of higher rank, let them not take upon them the duty assigned to the bishops (*De Baptismate*, Cap. 17).

It will be observed that Tertullian has nothing new, nothing of his own, to tell us about the episcopal succession in Rome and Smyrna. He leans on Ireneus, as Ireneus probably leaned on Hegesippus, and is only more explicit in saying it was John who appointed Polycarp the Bishop of Smyrna. Of that fact Ireneus does not profess to know; and Tertullian had fewer opportunities for knowing it. Like Ireneus, he sets out with a great announcement of what the orthodox churches have to show in the matter of the successions of bishops. Like

Ireneus, he stops with Rome and Smyrna; and can tell us no name of a Bishop of Ephesus appointed by the Apostle John. Yet, like Ireneus, he is quite ready to maintain the Johannine origin of the episcopate. Writing against Marcion, he says: "We have churches also nourished by John. For although Marcion rejects his Revelation, yet the order of bishops, if traced to its origin, will be found to rest on the authority of John." What then of the establishment of the episcopate in Rome by Peter and Paul, long before John's activity in Asia Minor?

In Tertullian the sacerdotal theory of the Christian ministry finds expression. The bishop is a priest (*sacerdos*), even high priest (*summus sacerdos*) and supreme pontiff (*pontifex maximus*). The presbyters are a priestly order (*sacerdotalis ordo*). Yet at other times he recalls the fact that Christians as such are priests through the vocation of Christ (*Certe sacerdotes sumus a Christo vocati*).

V. Cyprian of Carthage (A. D. c. 200–258) was a man of such heroic mold, and of such Christian devoutness, as must inspire respect. But he did so much to corrupt the simplicity of the gospel, and to secure acceptance for those legalistic conceptions of the Church and of Christianity which at last drove the Teutonic churches into revolt against Latin leadership, that we must regard him as having achieved more of harm than of benefit to the cause of the Master.

He was a Carthaginian lawyer and a pagan until middle life. The generous use he made of his wealth after his conversion and his imposing qualities as a leader brought the people of the church in Carthage to raise him to the rank of bishop within two years after his conversion. This was a violation of the rule laid down by the Apostle Paul (1 Timothy iii: 6), and it was opposed by five of the nine presbyters of the church. Their resistance seems to

have produced in him an antagonism to their order, and of their order to him, which lasted while he lived, and colored his measures as well as his opinions. He took from the presbyters all share in the control of the church's revenues, maintained the rights of the people to elect their bishop without consulting them, and generally used the popular element to uphold the bishop at the expense of this intermediate class. This monarchic policy is familiar to the students of civil history.

The ten years of his episcopate were years of storm and stress. He had no heresies of importance to contend with. The Montanists of Carthage, with whom Tertullian had fraternized, seem to have been a feeble and dwindling remnant, who could be left to themselves and to time. The Manichæans did not enter Africa until a generation after his death. Where he talks of heresy, he most commonly means schism, for to him separation from the Church on any ground was a renunciation of essential Christian principle.

Two disciplinary controversies agitated the African churches of his time, and on both he managed to get on the wrong side, and to commit his friends to it. Those "confessors," who either had escaped death during a persecution, or were still in prison expecting death, had been recognized as having the right to absolve those who had lapsed, and to restore them to the bosom of the Church. This was doubly offensive to Cyprian, as an invasion of the field of authority by a sentiment, and because his old opponents, the five recalcitrant presbyters, made common cause with the confessors in asserting the right. In opposing this irregular form of restoring the lapsed, however, he overshot the mark, and not merely reserved to the bishop the power to absolve and restore, but declared that even he could not do this until the offender had undergone

years of penitence, and only then in the hour of death. He afterwards backed down from this rigorism to some extent; but by maintaining it he gave currency to the conceptions of Church discipline, which afterwards, in the Donatist schism, rent the orthodox churches of Africa for two centuries.

The other controversy was as to the validity of baptism administered by heretics, where the form employed was open to no objection. In Cyprian's view, the orthodox episcopally governed Church was the sole possessor of the gifts and activity of the Holy Spirit, and no valid baptism could be administered except by its ministers. So he had no choice but to reject heretical (including schismatic) baptism. Through his influence the African churches were formally committed to his view by the unanimous vote of eighty-seven bishops in a synod held at Carthage, A. D. 256. The contrary view, maintained by Stephen, Bishop of Rome, was declared that of the church in the great Synod of Arles (A. D. 314),¹ and is accepted by implication in the nineteenth canon of the Council of Nice, which enjoins that the Paulianists—who did not baptize in the name of the Father, Son and Spirit—should not be admitted to the Church without rebaptism. So the zealot for the unity of the Church laid the foundations of the worst of schisms; and the cynosure of second century orthodoxy is repudiated by the great synods.

His position in the Church was a commanding one. To him, and not to those bishops of Rome who were his contemporaries, came the ecclesiastical problems of Spain and even Italy, as well as of Africa, for his decision. He

¹ De Afris, quod propria lege utuntur, ut rebaptizent, placuit ut si ad ecclesiam aliquis de hæresi venerit, interrogent eum symbolum; et si perviderint cum in Patre, et Filio et Spiritu Sancto esse baptizatum, manus ei tantum imponatur ut accipiat Spiritum Sanctum. Quod si interrogatus, non responderit hanc Trinitatem, baptizetur (Synod of Arles: Canon 13).

established one Bishop of Rome in possession of his see, against an able and dangerous rival. He opposed another unreservedly on the question of heretical baptism. He upheld in theory the equality of all bishops, but made himself the metropolitan of the whole African region, from Tripoli to the Atlantic Ocean. Synod after synod met at Carthage to record his judgments as their own. Yet as Laud's seven years in the English primacy ruined the national Church, drove Puritanism into armed revolt, and laid the lasting foundations of Nonconformity, so Cyprian's ten years prepared for Africa an age of church strife over secondary questions more bitter, more unchristian and more destructive than any other part of the empire endured from the agitation of the really great questions of Christian doctrine. Heylin was right in calling Laud "Cyprianus Anglicus." And the two resemble each other in other ways. They both look back upon their public careers with an evident satisfaction, and regard their opponents with an outspoken scorn which is more Roman than Christian. They both belong to the type of churchman who is personally humble and officially insolent, and is sure that some sort of wickedness underlies resistance to his plans and ideas.

Cyprian's theory of the Church is elaborated in his treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*. He sees in it a visible corporation, taking its origin from the episcopal office. It is "constituted of bishop, clergy and all who have standing within it." It is "founded upon the bishops, and its every action is controlled by these appointed rulers, by a divine law." Only those "remain without who ought to be cast out if they were within it." As the Apostles did not withdraw from Christ along with the multitude, so the Church is made of "the people united to their priest, the flock adhering to their shepherd. Whence

you should learn that the bishop is in the Church, and the Church is in the bishop; and if anyone be not with the bishop, he is not in the Church." They who have not the Church as their mother, have not God as their father. Those who separate from the Church share in the sin and guilt of Judas. Even if they are put to death for the Name, they are not martyrs. They are worse than those who apostatize under persecution, as these may be restored to the Church's communion through repentance.

The beginning of the Church was in our Lord's declaration to Peter, through whom even the rest of the Apostles, and consequently all the bishops, derive their authority. But the Bishop of Rome is not more the successor of Peter than is the bishop of every other church founded by him, or even by any other Apostle. As for the other offices, they are the creation of the Apostles after the Ascension. The episcopate alone goes back to our Lord's acts and words.

Besides the conception of the Church as a visible corporation, within which alone, and through whose bishops alone, the Holy Spirit confers grace upon men, we owe to Cyprian the conception of the succession of those bishops to the authority and functions of the Apostles. Clement of Rome discusses the activity of the Apostles in establishing the Christian ministry in terms which exclude this notion. The Ignatian Epistles make the presbyters, and not the bishops, the successors of the Apostles. Tertullian, Ireneus and Origen lay stress on the succession of bishops (or presbyters) in the churches founded by the Apostles, as a guarantee of the truth of the Christian gospel against the half-pagan doctrines of the Gnostics. It is not the "grace of orders," but the "grace of truth" (*charisma veritatis*) on which they insist as connected with this succession. But Cyprian shifts the stress from truth

to power, claiming that the bishops have succeeded to the authority and work of the Apostles. "It is the manifest judgment," he says, "of Jesus Christ in sending out his Apostles, and intrusting the power given him by his Father to them alone, to whom we have succeeded in governing the Church of our Lord with the same authority, and baptizing believers." "Christ says to the Apostles, and by this to all the prelates who succeeded the Apostles by vicarious ordination, 'He who heareth you, heareth me.'"

Manifesta est sententia Jesu Christi Apostolos suos mittentis et ipsis solis potestatem a Patre sibi datam permittentis, quibus nos successimus, eadem potestate ecclesiam Domini gubernantes et credentium fidem baptizantes.

Christus dicit ad Apostolos, ac per hoc ad omnes præpositos, qui Apostolis vicaria ordinatione succedunt, "Qui audit vos, audit me."

This was as much a novelty as was the heresy of Marcion. It made its way, however, in the western Church, where the Latin atmosphere naturally inclined theologians to legalistic conceptions of Christian doctrine. The eastern theologians of this age, not excepting the *Apostolical Constitutions*, know nothing of it, and the Eastern Church has adapted its teaching very slowly to it.

Cyprian is no "papist." But he helped to prepare for the imperial rule of the popes, by his exaltation of the monarchic principle in the churches, by his insistence on a visible, human center of unity, and by establishing an authority over Roman Africa more masterful than any Bishop of Rome had exercised in Italy. As Dr. Möhler says, "the pope was only awaiting the summons to appear," when Cyprian and his like had completed their work. His bishop is a local pope, invested with such an unlimited power (*licentia*) as our Lord employed in working his miracles, or as the Roman emperor exercised in the

army and in the state. He is responsible to nobody so long as his orthodoxy is above suspicion, and then only to his brethren in the episcopate. He is the sole possessor of the priesthood (*sacerdotium*), with power to offer the sacrifice of the eucharist, to exercise discipline with the assent of the people, to ordain presbyters and deacons with—and sometimes without—the same assent, to remove the unworthy from office, to control the finances either directly or through the agents he selects. So far as he associates other clerics with him in any of these things, it is of his own choice; and they act as his deputies, and not by any right of office. Toward other bishops he holds the place of a member of a great association, whose unity and agreement make the Church one in all the earth. No bishop should be admitted into this association without the approval of the rest, or at least of those of his own province. It is on this assent, rather than any laying on of hands that he insists as regards a bishop's induction into office. While he mentions that ceremony in his account of the consecration of Sabinus as Bishop of Merida in Spain,¹ he is silent about it in detailing the claims which his friend Cornelius had to recognition as Bishop of Rome.² From other sources we have reason to doubt if it was used in Rome.

VI. Dionysius of Alexandria (ob. 265), like Clement and his own teacher, Origen, stood at the head of the catechetical school, which gave the Christians of that learned city standing among its scholars. Unfortunately his

¹ Manus ei in locum Basilidis imponeretur (*Epistl.* LXVII, Cap. V).

² Factus est Cornelius episcopus de Dei et Chrsti ejus judicio, de clericorum paene omnium testimonio, de plebis quæ tunc adfuit suffragio, et de sacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum virorum collegio, cum nemo ante se factus est, cum Fabiani locus, id est cum locus Petri et gradus cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret; quo occupato de Dei voluntate atque omnium nostrum consensione firmato, quisquis jam episcopus fieri voluerit, foris fiat necesse est, nec habeat ecclesiasticam ordinationem qui qui ecclesiæ non tenet unitatem (*Epistl.* LV, Cap. VII).

writings were only such as were called out by some temporary need, and they have perished with the exception of some quotations. These show us a keen intelligence, a statesmanlike grasp of Church problems, and an independence of judgment, which make us regret that we have not more from his pen. He pleaded for moderation and conciliation in both the controversies, in which Cyprian dispensed with both. His argument from the style of the Apocalypse, that it could not have been the work of the Apostle John, is admirable, though mistaken. He interests us here through a passage in a short work, *On the Gospels*, written in refutation of the Millenarianism of Nepos, "a bishop in Egypt," as Eusebius calls him. Dionysius says:

When I was at Arsinoë, where, as you know, this dogma has been current for a long time, so that even schisms and apostasies of entire churches took place, I called together the presbyters and teachers of the brethren in the villages (*komais*), such brethren as wished being present also, and we exhorted them to make a test of the doctrine in public. And when they brought to me the book as invincible armor and fortress, I sat with them for three days, from morning till evening, and I attempted to refute what was written in it. Then also I was delighted with the steadfastness, the love of truth, and the docility and intelligence of the brethren. . . . At length the originator and leader of this teaching, named Coracio, in the hearing of all the brethren who were present, confessed and declared to us that he would no longer adhere to it, or discuss it, or mention it, or teach it, as he was sufficiently taken with what had been said against it. And of the rest of the brethren, some rejoiced in the conference, and in the conciliation and unanimity toward all.¹

To make this quotation intelligible, I must anticipate part of what I shall say in a later chapter of the social structure of Egyptian society. It was not a country of cities in the Greek and Roman sense, but of districts, called *nomes*, each with a considerable center of government, trade and population, but populated elsewhere by

¹ *Eusebii Historia Ecclesiastica*, Lib. VII, Cap. 24.

the residents of villages, such as were rare in Asia, Greece or Italy. Dionysius finds these villages possessed of churches, which are in charge of presbyters, and has nothing to tell us of any higher Church authority over them. He mentions no "Bishop of Arsinoë," although some modern writers make Nepos himself to have filled that office, possibly by way of explaining the neglect by Dionysius of the bishop of the nome. It is not Nepos, however, but Coracio, who represents the Millenarian doctrine in the Arsinoitic nome. "At the close of the second century," says Dr. Lightfoot, "when every considerable church in Europe and Asia appears to have had its bishop, the only representative of the episcopal order in Egypt was the Bishop of Alexandria. It was Demetrius first (190-233), as Euty chius informs us, who appointed three other bishops, to which number his successor Heraclas added twenty more" (*Philippians*, p. 230).

A Bishop of Alexandria in the third century was less likely to stumble at finding churches ruled simply by presbyters than if he were a bishop in Asia or Italy. Jerome, writing in the next century, says of that see:

In Alexandria, from the time of the Evangelist Mark to those of Bishops Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters always called one bishop chosen from among themselves, and placed in a higher rank. Just as if an army should make a general, or the deacons were to choose from among themselves whom they know to be diligent, and call him archdeacon.¹

Many and ingenious attempts have been made to break the force of this statement. Some would have Jerome to be merely emphasizing the freedom of choice exercised by the presbyters of Alexandria in selecting a bishop from among themselves, as though that were pertinent to the matter in hand, and were not the known usage of the

¹ Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, xxii, 1194.

churches generally; or as though there had been some change in that respect about the year A. D. 232. What Jerome meant is shown by the chronicle of the see of Alexandria, written by its archbishop Eutychius in the tenth century. He writes in Arabic, and his work was published in 1658 by John Selden and Edward Pococke, with a Latin translation by the latter. I shall follow, however, the translation made by Abraham Ecchellensis in his *Eutychius Vindicatus* (1661):

Mark the Evangelist along with the Patriarch Hananias appointed twelve presbyters to be with the patriarch, so that when he died they might choose one of the twelve, and the other eleven presbyters should lay their hands on his head and bless him, and constitute him patriarch. Then they chose some man of eminent virtues, and made him presbyter along with themselves, in place of him who had been raised to the patriarchate, so that there always might be twelve. Nor did this custom of the presbyters of Alexandria constituting the patriarch from those twelve presbyters cease until the time of the patriarch Alexander, who was of the number of the three hundred and eighteen [bishops at the Council of Nice]. For he forbade the presbyters to constitute the patriarch, and gave orders that on the decease of a patriarch, the bishops should come together and constitute a patriarch. He gave orders also that on the death of a patriarch they should choose any man preëminent in virtues from any region, or some one of the twelve presbyters, or any one else whose character satisfied them, and him they constituted patriarch. And the old custom of presbyters constituting the patriarch by presbyters ceased, and the power of constituting a patriarch was vested in the bishops.¹

Some object that Eutychius was very ill informed as to the history of the early Church, and even of his own see,

¹ Constituit enim Marcus Evangelista cum Hanania patriarcha XII presbyteros, qui adessent patriarchæ, ut, decedente patriarcha, eligerent unum ex xii presbyteris, et imponerent reliqui manus suas capiti ejus, et benedicerent eum, et constituerent eum patriarcham. Dein eligerent virum aliquem virtutibus præstantem, illumque sufficerent presbyterum secum, loco ejus, qui patriarcha suffectus est, ut essent perpetui xii. Neque desit mos ille presbyterorum Alexandriæ constituendi patriarchum ex iis xii presbyteris usque ad tempus Alexandri patriarchæ, qui erat ex numero CCCXVIII; is enim vetuit, ne presbyteri constituerent patriarcham. Præcepit quoque, ut mortuo patriarcha convenirent episcopi et patriarcham constituerent. Præcepit etiam, ut defuncto patriarcha, eligerent ex quacunque regione virum aliquem virtutibus præcellentem, sive aliquem ex illis xii presbyteris, sive alius cujus placeat conditio, et illum constituerent patriarcham; cessavitque antiquus mos constituendi patriarcham a presbyteris, facta est potestas penes episcopos constituendi patriarcham. (Migne's *Patrologie Grecque-Latine*, Tome cxi, 903.)

so that he has made some surprising blunders in his chronicle. He had, however, access to the archives of his own church; and the points on which he is most likely to be correct are those on which early usage differed from that with which he was familiar, and was of a kind which he must have thought not very creditable to the see he occupied. And he is confirmed by Jerome, writing six centuries earlier. "The authority," says Dr. Lightfoot, "of a writer so inaccurate as Euty chius, if it had been unsupported, would have had no great weight; but, as we have seen, this is not the case" (*Philippians*, p. 231, note). "The priests of Alexandria," says Monsignor Duchesne, "in replacing their dead bishop not only elected, but also consecrated his successor. This custom no doubt dated from a time when Egypt had no church but that of Alexandria. It would not be surprising to find that the same circumstances led to the same results in Antioch, Rome and Lyons, and in fact in every place where the local churches had a very wide jurisdiction."

On one point Euty chius and Jerome differ. Jerome puts the change from the earlier usage at the patriarchate of Heraclas and Dionysius. Heraclas was patriarch A. D. 233-249; Dionysius A. D. 249-265. I take it that he did not know exactly when the presbyters ceased to constitute the patriarch, but gave the date between A. D. 233 and A. D. 265 as a safe one. Euty chius, writing with the records before him, puts it fifty years later. Dr. Lightfoot thinks that "the extension of episcopacy to the provincial towns of Egypt" in the first half of the third century "paved the way for a change in the mode of appointing and ordaining the Patriarch of Alexandria. But before this time it was a matter of convenience, and, almost of necessity, that the Alexandrian presbyters should themselves ordain their chief."

VII. The collection of ecclesiastical forms and enactments called *The Constitutions and Canons of the Holy Apostles* cannot be dated earlier than the middle of the third century, although it works over earlier materials, such as the *Didache*, into conformity with the usages of its own date, and so as to present a different and far more complex system of Church order. The longer recension of the Ignatian epistles borrows freely from this work, and, like that, lies under the suspicion of Arianizing.¹

The Ignatian and Cyprianic theory of the monarchic episcopate is here elaborated into a system of law, which exercised a notable influence upon the subsequent development of the Church, especially through the eighty-five canons appended to the last book. The Council of Trullus (Constantinople), which rejected the *Constitutions* as heretical, A. D. 692, accepted these canons as apostolic. By this decision the Greek Church stands to this day. For centuries these directions as to the duties of bishops, presbyters, deacons, readers and singers were regarded as emanating from the Apostles, as truly as any part of the New Testament, and proposals were made to admit them into the canon. From the fourth century downward they played the same part as did the False Decretals from the ninth. As these built up the authority of the papacy by tracing it back to the early Bishops of Rome, beginning with Peter, so those threw the glamour of a false antiquity around an episcopal system which had been evolved in the third and fourth centuries.

Roman Catholic scholars—Bellarmin, Baronius, Peta-

¹ The text first appeared in J. B. Cotelier's *Sanctorum Patrum qui Temporibus Apostolorum floruerunt Opera* (Paris, 1672). Whiston's translation for his *Primitive Christianity Revived* (London, 1711-1712) is reprinted with revision in *The Work Claiming to Be "The Constitutions of the Holy Apostles," Including "The Canons"; with a Prize Essay Upon Their Origin and Contents [by Otto Karsten Krabbe]. Translated from the German by Irah Chase, D.D.* (New York and Philadelphia, 1848).

vius and Tillemont—agreed with Protestants generally in pronouncing them apocryphal. Their only friends in western Christendom have been Anglican champions of monarchic episcopacy, who have shown them no small kindness. Bishop Montagu (1625) maintained that they were the work of Clement of Rome. Bishop Pearson (1672) held that the *Constitutions* were collected out of the teachings of the Apostles and the Apostolic Fathers, and that they exhibited the character of the apostolic age. Bishop Beveridge (1673) ascribed them to Clement of Alexandria. Dr. Isaac Barrow (ob. 1677) quoted the *Constitutions* as “a very ancient book, and setting forth the most ancient traditions of the Church.” Dr. John Grabe (1700) believed the whole work was collected out of the traditions the churches had received from the Apostles, and that it was compiled before A. D. 120. William Whiston (1711), not in the interests of episcopacy, but in those of Arianism, undertook to prove that the *Constitutions* “are the most sacred of the canonical books of the New Testament,” and “are no other than the original laws and doctrines of the gospel.” R. Wedgewood (1851) reiterated this absurd claim. Benjamin Shaw in Drs. Smith and Cheetham’s *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* (1876), says all he can for Bishop Beveridge’s view of the antiquity of the canons,¹ while admitting that Roman Catholic scholars—Bishop Hefele and Professors Von Drey and Bickell—reject them as a representative of apostolic tradition.

As the canons generally are regarded as the oldest part of the work, it is worth while to notice how they emphasize the threefold ministry, and at the same time we are to remember that thousands of Christians in the later

¹*Codex Canonum Ecclesie Primitivæ Vindicatus ac Illustratus. Auctore Guilielmo Beveregio* (London, 1678). New edition in two volumes, Oxford, 1848.

patristic age believed that they were injunctions laid upon the Church by the Apostles. Twenty-seven of the eighty-five canons mention bishop, presbyters and deacons; nine others the bishop and the presbyters; sixteen others the bishop alone. I shall quote six:

I. Let a Bishop be ordained by two or three Bishops.

II. Let a Presbyter be ordained by one Bishop; as also a Deacon and the rest of the Clergy.

XXXV. The Bishops of each Province ought to know who is the chief among them, and to esteem him as their head, and not to do any great thing without his consent; but everyone to manage only the affairs of his own parish, and the places subject to it. . . .

XL. Let not the Presbyters and Deacons do anything without the consent of the Bishop; for it is he who is intrusted with the people of God, and will be required to give an account of their souls. . . .

XLI. We command that the Bishop have power over the goods of the church; for if he be intrusted with the precious souls of men, much more ought he to give direction about goods, that, under his authority, they all be distributed by the Presbyters and Deacons to those who are in want, and be administered in the fear of God with all pious caution. . . .

L. If any Bishop or Presbyter do not perform three immersions of one initiation, but one immersion into the death of Christ, let him be deposed; for the Lord did not say, "Baptize into my death"; but, "Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

These are enough to show how far the Church had gone in the development of a government unknown to the Apostles, and in what direction she was going. The last is a stumbling-block to both Roman Catholics and Anglicans, all whose bishops have incurred deposition from office under this "Canon of the Holy Apostles," for not practising trine immersion in baptism, as is done by the bishops and presbyters of the Greek Church.¹

¹ Another spurious authority for the monarchic episcopate is found in the writings ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, Paul's principal Athenian convert, and "the first Bishop of Athens" in the traditional account. These were first produced at a council held in Constantinople A. D. 532, and their authenticity was at once challenged by Hypatius, Bishop of Ephesus. But from this time they are constantly cited as the work of the Athenian magistrate and "bishop."

The name of Clement of Rome is attached to this compilation, as to many other spurious documents of the third century. The others are all of Ebionite origin, and represent an attempt to graft the Christian gospel upon a mass of Jewish beliefs and observances. It is suggested by Richard Rothe, and in this he is supported by his antagonists of the Tübingen school, that the *Constitutions and Canons of the Apostles* were originally an Ebionite document, but altered and adapted by some "Catholic" Christian. He finds evidence of this origin in the stress laid on the monarchic episcopacy in this work, as in the other works of clearly Ebionite character, to which the name of Clement has been affixed. And this again he traces back to the Jewish Essenes, whom he believes to have influenced greatly the Ebionite churches, and who, according to Josephus, laid great stress on the principle of autocracy in religious discipline.

Yet the opening words of the book, "The Apostles and presbyters to all those who from among the Gentiles have believed in the Lord Jesus Christ," seem rather to point to the working over of earlier Catholic documents, like the *Didache*. It seems if our monarchist so far forgot himself as to let the Apostles speak of themselves and the presbyters, and leave the bishops out.

VIII. Attached to many editions of the works of Ambrose, the great Bishop of Milan, is a commentary on the Epistles of Paul, which manifestly is by another hand. To distinguish the author from Ambrose, somebody gave him the name Ambrosiaster. Modern scholarship has

The treatise *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* develops to their logical conclusions all the sacerdotal ideas of the Christian ministry to be found in previous writers from the Ignatian epistles to Chrysostom, and makes the threefold ministry an indispensable complement to the order of heaven. First Erasmus and other humanists, then theologians—Sirmond, Launoy, Morin, etc.—called the writings in question, while Bellarmin and Halloix tried to defend them. Their spuriousness was demonstrated by Jean Dailé (1666) in his treatise, *De Scriptis quæ sub Dionysii Areopagitæ et Ignatii Antiocheni Nominibus Circumferuntur Libri Duo*.

conjectured his identity with several writers of that age, but I think the best supposition is that he was Isaac, a convert from Judaism and a presbyter of the church in Rome, and that he also was the author of a series of *Questions on the Old and New Testament*, frequently printed in the works of Augustine. Both these works are valuable for the penetration and sound judgment of their author, and his knowledge of the Church's history. He tells us he was writing during the occupancy of the see of Rome by Damasus (A. D. 366-384).

One of his "Questions" relates to the peculiar situation of the church of Rome with regard to its deacons. Accepting as a precedent the appointment of seven deacons by the church in Jerusalem (Acts vi: 3), the number in Rome was limited to seven, while that of the presbyters increased with the growth of the church. This seems to have made the diaconate in Rome a distinction which was highly valued; and it came to be the usage to choose the bishops of that church from this seven, to the exclusion of the presbyters. It was one of the complaints of Novatian against Fabianus, Bishop of Rome, that he had ordained him presbyter, so as to shut him out from being bishop. Isaac, as a member of the Roman presbytery, seems to have resented the insolence of the Roman deacons, and in this "Question" he discusses the "braggartry of the Roman Levites":

A person named Falcidius, led on by folly and boastfulness of Roman citizenship, has not delayed to put Levites on a level with priests, and deacons with presbyters. I will not say to put them first, as that is too foolish, and would certainly seem beyond belief, and we would have not reformers but calumniators. . . . But he so maintains the cause of the deacons against the presbyters, as if presbyters were ordained to be deacons, and not deacons to be presbyters. But forasmuch as they are ministers of the church in Rome, they therefore count themselves more eminent than those of the other churches, because of the magnificence of Rome, which seems the head of

all cities. If it be so, they ought to make this good for their priests also. . . . That presbyter means bishop, Paul the Apostle shows when he instructs Timothy, whom he had ordained a presbyter, what sort of man he should make a bishop (I Timothy iii: 1-7). For what is a bishop but the foremost presbyter, that is, the high priest? He therefore gives them no other name than his fellow-presbyters and sharers in the priesthood. Why does not the bishop call the ministers his fellow-deacons? He does not because they are far below him. For in Alexandria, and throughout Egypt, if a bishop is not to be had, a presbyter consecrates (*consecrat*).¹

He is still more explicit in his commentaries on the epistles of Paul. I shall give his comment on Ephesians iv: 11, and that on 1 Timothy iii: 8-10:

For he calls Timothy, made a presbyter by himself, a bishop, because the first presbyters are called bishops; that as he retired, he might succeed him. Furthermore in Egypt the presbyters consecrate (*consignant*) if no bishop be present. But because presbyters began to be found unworthy of holding the chief place the method was changed by far-seeing design, so that not order but merit should go to the making of a bishop, appointed over many priests, lest an unworthy man should rashly seize the place and scandal should arise to many.

Right after the bishop, however, he treats of ordination to the diaconate. Why is this, except because there is one ordination of bishop and presbyter? Each is a priest, but the bishop comes first; as every bishop is a presbyter, but not every presbyter a bishop. For he is the bishop who is first among the presbyters. Furthermore he indicates that Timothy had been ordained a presbyter; but because there is no one who is his superior, he was a bishop. Wherefore also he shows him in what way to ordain a bishop; but it neither was right nor will be allowed that one of lower rank should ordain one of higher. For no one gives what he has not received.

At the first all taught and all baptized, at what days and hours it might suit. . . . That the people might increase and be multiplied, at first it was allowed to all to preach the gospel, and baptize, and expound the Scriptures in church. But when the Church extended to all places, meetings were appointed, and rulers and other officers were established in the churches, to the end that no one who was not ordained to it, should dare to take upon himself any duty which he knew had not been intrusted or conceded to him. And the Church began to be governed on a different plan and with a different prudence; because if everybody could do the same things, it would be unreasonable, and would appear a vulgar and very cheap

¹ Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, xxxv, 2301-03.

affair. Hence it is that deacons do not preach to the people, nor is baptism by either laymen or clerics indifferently, nor are converts baptized on any day whatever, unless they are sick.¹

IX. Jerome, as we are accustomed to call Eusebius Hieronymus (A. D. 346–420), was another contemporary of Bishop Damasus, and his personal friend. It was, indeed, Damasus who set him upon the work of revising the old Latin translation of the Bible, and thus led to his making the great Latin version we call the Vulgate. He was not a thinker of the same order with his other friend, Augustine of Hippo; but he surpassed all the Christian writers of the patristic period in scholarly acuteness and breadth of knowledge. His only rivals in scholarship are Origen and Eusebius.

Like Origen, he was a presbyter, and never a bishop. Like Isaac, he was offended by the “braggartry of the Levites” of Rome; but he never distinctly refers to Isaac’s writings, even when he is enumerating those who had written on Paul’s Epistles. In a letter to a presbyter named Evangelus, Jerome says:

I hear that somebody has burst forth into such folly as to put deacons before presbyters, that is, before bishops. For since the Apostle clearly teaches that presbyters are the same with bishops, what permits a servant of tables and of widows to uplift his swollen self above them, at whose prayer the body and blood of Christ are made (*conficitur*)? Listen to the proof (Philippians i: 1; Acts xx: 18). And that no one may quarrel with there being several bishops in one church, hear yet another proof, by which it is proved most clearly that bishop and presbyter are the same (Titus i: 5). And to Timothy (1 Timothy iv: 14). But Peter also in his first Epistle (1 Peter v). And this said more meaningly in Greek *episcopountes*, that is, superintending, and from this the word bishop is derived. Do the testimonies of men so great seem to you a small thing? The evangelical trumpet sounds, the “Son of thunder” whom Jesus loved the most, who got his doctrine as it flowed from the breast of the Saviour (2 John i). But that afterwards one was chosen to be placed over the rest, this was done in prevention of schism, lest anyone by attracting adherents to himself, should break

¹ Migne’s *Patrologia Latina*, xvii, 388.

up the church. For at Alexandria, from the time of Mark the Evangelist to those of Bishops Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters used to appoint as bishop always one chosen from among themselves and placed in the higher degree, as though an army should make some one their commander, or the deacons should choose from among themselves one whose industry they knew, and call him archdeacon. For what does a bishop do, which a presbyter does not, except ordination?¹

In his commentaries on the Scriptures, Jerome is as diffuse as he is emphatic on this point. The classic passage is that on Titus i:

A presbyter, therefore, is the same as a bishop, and before party zeal sprang up in religion, at the instigation of the Devil, and it was said among the peoples, "I am of Paul," "I of Apollos," "But I of Cephas," the churches were governed by the common council of the presbyters. But after each one came to regard as his own, and not Christ's, those he had baptized, it was decreed through the world that one of the presbyters should be chosen and placed over the rest, and that the care of the whole Church should belong to him, that the seeds of schism might be taken away. Does anyone suppose that this is not Scripture, but our opinion, that bishop and presbyter are one and the same? Let him read again the words of the Apostle to the Philippians: "To all the saints which are in Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Philippi is a single city of Macedonia, and certainly in one city there could not be several bishops, as they now are styled. But because at that time they called the same persons bishops as they called presbyters, therefore he spoke indifferently of bishops as of presbyters. This still may seem doubtful to somebody, unless it is proved by farther testimony. It is written in the Acts of the Apostles that when the Apostle came to Miletus, he sent to Ephesus and called the presbyters of that church, to whom afterwards he said, among other things, "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you bishops." And here note diligently how calling the elders of the single city of Ephesus, he afterwards speaks of the same men as bishops. If anyone is willing to accept [as Scripture] that Epistle to the Hebrews, which bears the name of Paul, there also the care of the church is divided among several, if he writes to the people: "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves to them, for these are they who watch for your souls as giving an account." And Peter says in his [first] Epistle, "The presbyters among you I beseech, who am their fellow-presbyter, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of the Lord, which is

¹ Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, xxii, 1192-1194.

among you, not by constraint but willingly." This then we say to show that of old [*apud veteres*] the same persons were presbyters who also were bishops, but, little by little, that the seedplots of dissensions might be rooted up, all responsibility was conferred upon one. Therefore, as presbyters know that they are subject to him who is placed over them by the usage of the Church, so let the bishops know that they are greater than the presbyters rather by custom than by the verity of a divine appointment; and that they should rule the Church in common, imitating Moses, who, when he had the power to rule alone over the people of Israel, chose the seventy, with whom to judge the people.¹

This statement of the case met with no challenge from Jerome's contemporaries, and was repeated, as we shall see, from one writer to another, down to the close of the sixteenth century. It became a commonplace of the scholastics, and of the Canonists, from Gratian (A. D. 1151) to Lancelotti (A. D. 1570). It was accepted by both parties to the great dispute of the Reformation. And while it was abandoned by Roman Catholic theologians from Bellarmin onwards, it continued to find acceptance with the more moderate and scholarly Anglicans, until interest in the subject died out in the eighteenth century. It was the accepted tradition of both Latin and Teutonic Christendom.

Observe how completely Jerome rejects the Ignatian and Cyprianic theory of the monarchic episcopate. That theory involves a regard for it as the ecclesiastical equivalent of the spiritual order of God's heavenly kingdom. Jerome says that it was at best a concession to human frailty, and implies that if the original presbyterial constitution of the churches could have been maintained, it would have been so. Cyprian sets out with the declaration that the episcopate began with our Lord's grant of the keys to Peter. Jerome shows from the New Testament that no such elevation of the bishop above the presbyters was known in that age, and that the change it

¹ Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, xxvi, 562f.

involved has left not a trace of itself in the inspired Gospels and epistles.

Noteworthy is his view as to the way and the time of the change. When he says that "it was decreed throughout the world" (*in toto orbe decretum est*), we would like to know by whom it was decreed. Richard Rothe naturally thinks of his council of the surviving Apostles after the fall of Jerusalem; Bishop Lightfoot of his last survivor of the Apostles, John at work in Asia. Jerome, who certainly knew as much of the facts of the history as either of them, gives no sanction to either hypothesis. That the change was not effected by apostolic authority is evidently his opinion, for he bids the monarchic bishop remember that he holds his place of superiority to the presbyters "rather by custom than by the verity of a divine appointment" (*magis consuetudine quam dispositionis Dominicæ veritate*). Nor is this inconsistent with his using the watchwords of the contending parties in the church of Corinth in Paul's time, as illustrating the party zeal which he believes to have made the episcopate a necessity. He takes these as typical of such carnal disputes; but he must not be taken too literally, or we shall have him putting two Apostles into the list of those who regarded their converts as belonging not to Christ but to themselves.¹

X. Half a century earlier, however, that great heresy-hunter, Epiphanius of Salamis (Cyprus), enumerated among the heresies of Acrius of Sebasteia (Pontus) that he denied the rightfulness of the distinction between bishop and presbyter:

Acrius says: "What is a bishop more than a presbyter? In no respect does the one excel the other, for they are one order,"

¹ For a very able discussion of Jerome's statement, and of the attempts to belittle it, see Dr. Stillingfleet's "Irenicum" (London, 1659; Philadelphia, 1842); pp. 301-308.

he says, "and one honor, and one office. The bishop," he says, "ordains, but so does the presbyter. The bishop confers baptism (*loutron*), and likewise the presbyter. The bishop celebrates the Lord's supper, and the presbyter does just the same. The bishop is seated on his throne, and the presbyters also."¹

This has given Dr. Richard Bancroft, Dr. Peter Heylin and some other High Anglicans an excuse for calling Presbyterians "Aerians," and talking of "the Aerial heresy." Unfortunately we know nothing of Aerius and his adherents except through the most narrow-minded and inaccurate of the Church fathers,² who explains the rise of this party much as some trace the Reformation to a quarrel between the Augustinians and the Dominicans about the profits of trading in indulgences. By his own account the Aerians were treated as the Scotch Covenanters were in the seventeenth century. "They were denied not only access to the churches," says Canon Venables, "but even access to the towns and villages; and they were compelled, even in the depth of winter, when the country was covered with snow, to sojourn in the open fields, or in caves and ravines, and hold their religious assemblies in the open air exposed to the severity of the horrible Armenian winter. Little mercy would be inculcated by the ecclesiastical authorities toward the followers of one who ventured to bring Scriptural weapons to the attack of the fast-growing sacerdotalism of the age; who dared to call in question the prerogatives of the epis-

¹ Migne's *Patrologie Grecque-Latine*, Tome xlii, 506. Harnack (*Dogmengeschichte* II, 69 n.) says that "Aerius not only asserted the original identity of bishops and presbyters—Jerome and the Theologians of Antioch had done that, appealing to The New Testament—but made the question an *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*," and refers to Epiphanius as showing this. I find nothing of the sort in that author.

² "We have often reason to remark that the literary work of the Fathers falls short of the modern standard of accuracy; but there is none who is more apt than Epiphanius to make blunders through carelessness, want of critical discrimination, and, through a habit, not unknown at the present day, of stating what he guessed might be true, as if he had ascertained it to be true." (Dr. Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 155n.)

copate; and who was struggling to deliver the Church from the yoke of ceremonies which were threatening to become as deadening and more burdensome than the rites of Judaism.”¹

¹Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. i, pp. 50, 51.

CHAPTER V

GRADATIM

Some of those who maintain the apostolic origin of the monarchic episcopate challenge as unreasonable the statement that it made its way into the Church without apostolic authority, and yet (they say) without protest in the period of its introduction. They claim that its general recognition in the second half of the second century proves either that it was substantially the Church order which had existed in the churches of the apostolic period, or that whatever alterations had taken place must have been made by an authority to which the churches could not but defer.

As to the introduction of monarchic episcopacy without contemporary protest, it must be remembered that the records of the first half of the second century are not better than scanty; but even these afford us evidence that the innovation was met with outspoken disapproval in some quarters. Mr. Purchas points out the Apostle John's epistle to Gaius as "a quiet protest" against the change; and Dr. Salmon's interpretation of that epistle supports this view in a general way. And in the *Shepherd* of the prophet Hermas we have a similar protest against the same tendency among the Roman presbyters in the time of Clement, who himself speaks of "strife over the name of the episcopate" as predicted by our Lord to his Apostles. Besides this, the excessive emphasis laid upon episcopacy and its value in the Ignatian epistles and the

Apostolical Constitutions hardly would have been employed if there had been no resistance to it in the churches meant to be reached and influenced. Montanism, which was in good part an effort to maintain the liberty of prophesying, as in apostolic times, shows an antagonism to the monarchic episcopate as aiming to set aside all other utterance in the churches than the voice of the bishop.

There were some notable elements in the situation of the early churches which facilitated the change from presbyterial to episcopal government in their administration, and which deserve consideration.

I. The chief of these was the decay of faith in the living and abiding presence of our Lord in his Church. The apostolic Church rested its faith upon his promise of his real and personal presence with his people, to the end of time, which he makes again and again in the Gospels. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," are the great words by which he assures them of the availing power of their united prayers (Matthew xviii: 19, 20). They come immediately after that solitary mention of the Church, in which he invests it with the right of discipline and the power to bind and loose. "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," are the closing words of the first Gospel, uttered after the commission to baptize all nations, and just before his ascension. He constantly puts himself forward as the source of spiritual life, both to the Church at large and to its individual members. And he warns his people against the practical atheism into which their countrymen had fallen, through the notion that God had gone away to a distance, and was to be conciliated by men's "binding the yoke of the law" upon themselves to induce him to return to them.

After Pentecost the Spirit wrought in them to make the Son of God a more living reality to them than he could have been in the years of his visible ministry. Now at last they are enabled to own his lordship in the fullest measure (1 Corinthians xii: 3), and to know the things which are freely given them of God in giving him (1 Corinthians ii: 12). For the Spirit did not in any sense displace the Son, but revealed and glorified him as the living and present Saviour and Lord of men, taking always of what was Christ's and showing it to his people (John xvi: 14, 15). So in the actual history of the Church, believers found their Lord going on to do and to teach what he "began both to do and to teach" in the Gospel story (Acts i: 1), and that in a more vital and effective way than in his visible ministry. The conversion of Paul was an especially impressive proof, if proof had been needed, that the Saviour was still with his Church, and possessed the power to touch men's lives to still finer issues than when he dwelt in mortal flesh. No Gospel records so great a miracle as this, excepting always that miracle of miracles, the rising again from the dead. And the Apocalypse depicts him as walking among his churches in unspeakable glory, rebuking their sins and weaknesses, and commending their loyalty and patience.

But even before the close of the apostolic age a change began to pass over the churches, and the love of many waxed cold, as our Lord himself had predicted (Matthew xxiv: 12). In John's great epistle and in that of James we have a sense of this. The Church, which had mounted up on eagle's wings at Pentecost, and had run without being weary in the great missionary age which came after the conversion of Paul, could claim no more than that she did walk, and not faint (Isaiah xl: 31), in the days when John lived on and encouraged his brethren to assurance

in faith. Let us not undervalue that, however, for it was this steady tramp at marching pace which carried the gospel to city after city, and spread it through every province of the Roman world, until at last the empire itself confessed the Name, which Vespasian had made a capital offence. There was a grandly heroic side to this period between Trajan and Constantine; but there were painful weaknesses, which every outburst of persecution brought into light. In that under the Emperor Decius (A. D. 249-251), Cyprian of Carthage lamented that the greater part of his flock had given way, and had sought safety in compliance or fraud.

The men who are the spokesmen of the post-apostolic church, from Clement of Rome onward, often impress us with their Christian excellence, and yet their difference from the teachers of the apostolic age. Albrecht Ritschl owed his conversion from the Tübingen theory to his observation that the best of them were unable to enter into the teaching of Paul as to the spiritual meaning of the gospel and its relations to the law; and he inferred the impossibility that any of the New Testament writings could be the products of the second century, as Baur and his consorts asserted of all of them except four Pauline Epistles and the Apocalypse.

Especially we find in the patristic Church a distinct decay of that faith in Jesus Christ as the real, personal and present Head of the Church which characterized the first age. Hence the stress on Church officials as his representatives, his substitutes, and on acts of worship, which were interpreted as recovering for an instant his presence and bestowing a grace not otherwise enjoyed by them. Hence the deepening distinction between laity and clergy, as the apostolic faith in the universal priesthood of believers was displaced by the recognition of a

class of priests. Hence the organized fussiness about departures from a traditional creed, when men ceased to look to their Master as the living teacher of his Church. This new attitude finds a frank expression in the brief speech made by Venantius, the Bishop of Timisa, in the council held at Carthage, A. D. 256, under the presidency of Cyprian. He said:

If a husband were obliged to set out on a journey, and had intrusted his wife to a friend for safekeeping, with what carefulness he would see that her chastity and sanctity should not be smirched by anyone! Christ, our Lord and God, setting out on his journey to the Father, has intrusted his Spouse to us. Shall we keep her incorrupt and inviolate, or surrender her to fornicators and pimps?¹

The church practically widowed, through her Spouse having gone away to a distant heaven, and left her dependent for her purity and integrity upon human officials—this is the picture which this African bishop draws of her condition, without either exciting criticism or calling forth a reply.

The council of the Apostles was a body in which none of the Twelve aspired to the Master's place, simply because that place was not vacant, and never could be. They were not a lordless and headless body, for he was with them as truly as when he visibly walked before them on their journeys through Galilee and Judæa. So the council of the presbyters in the local church required no visible superior, because their Lord and Master was the head of every church, as of every man in its fellowship. In both cases the seemingly empty place was symbolic of the unseen but real presence of their divine Lord, just

¹ Si maritus peregre proficiscens amico suo commendasset uxorem suam custodiendam, commendatam sibi ille quanta posset diligentia conservaret, ne ab aliquo castitas ejus et sanctitas adulteraretur. Christus Dominus et Deus noster ad Patrem proficiscens Sponsam suam nobis commendavit. Utrumne eam incorruptam et inviolatam custodiemus, an integritatem ejus et castitatem moechis et corruptoribus prodemus? Cypriani Opera, Curante E. G. Gersdorf (Leipzig, 1838-9), I, 275.

as the Christian house of worship, unfurnished with either image or picture, announced to the faith of every true worshiper the abiding presence of the Saviour with his own. When that faith decayed, a visible head came to fill the vacuum this left. He came as the monarchic bishop of the local church, the high priest of a new worship. He came as the archbishop of the provinces, as the patriarch of the great divisions of the empire, and finally as the pope of Christendom. And with this change came also the images and statues into the churches, although the early apologists had laid stress upon their absence as a witness to the spirituality of Christian worship.

II. That the political environment of the churches had a great share in developing the monarchic episcopate is pointed out by several of its friends. Dr. Salmon suggests that "in the natural order of things, the method of government by a single man, which in political matters was the rule of the Roman Empire, proved to be also the most congenial to the people in ecclesiastical matters." Dr. Hatch points out the existence of "a general drift in contemporary organizations" "toward the institution of a president" over both public and private bodies, and gives eighteen instances of the existence of such officers from the existing inscriptions, most of them in Greece.¹

It is not true, however, that the monarchic form of rule was natural with either the Greek and Roman peoples, or that of the Jews. From the time of the overthrow or subordination of primitive kingship in the cities of Greece and Italy, in the fifth century before Christ, civic rule was in the hands of the elders of the city, called collectively the senate in Rome, and the *Gerousia* (senate) or *Boule* (council) in Greece. Monarchic authority, even in that early period, when their political instincts were still un-

¹ *The Organization of The Early Christian Churches*, pp. 34-6.

developed, was alien to the genius of both peoples. It came in again with the overthrow of civic liberty by the Macedonians, and the erection of a military empire by the Romans. But even the usurpers, who subverted the Roman republic, dared not assume the hated name of king. They called themselves merely "generals" (*imperatores*, emperors), and quite appropriately, for it was the militarism of Rome which had made their rule possible and even inevitable. Their civic title was "first member of the senate" (*princeps senatus*). And while military officers exercised a monarchic rule, the civic rule, even to the end of the Roman Empire, was in the hands of the senates of the cities.

In the glimpses of city government we get in the Acts of the Apostles there emerges no monarchic official corresponding to the mayor or burgomaster of mediæval and modern times. In Ephesus, during the tumult raised by Demetrius, the only official of the town we hear of is the "townclerk" (*grammateus*, scribe), who kept the city's archives, drafted the decisions of its senate, and read these to the people.

It was into a world of senate-governed cities that the Church was born, and from that order it took such impress as its political environment could impart to it. It was through imitation of that military system, which, as Hegel says, was "breaking the world's heart," and was reducing the whole population to the level of serfdom to supply the costs of its own maintenance, that the Church took on a monarchic character. Nor did that imitation cease until the Bishop of Rome acquired an imperial position in the Latin Church of the west, with the support of an episcopal hierarchy, which, in many respects, was a copy of the military staff of the emperors.

Sir William M. Ramsay, in his *Impressions of Turkey*

(1897), suggests one of the ways in which the pressure of the Roman military rule tended to foster monarchic episcopacy in the churches, and its equivalent in voluntary associations. He says of the founder of an independent Protestant church in Armenia, that he "organized his little church in accordance with the Turkish law, . . . that a religious community can be recognized only through its head; the government requires that the church shall have a head, through whom all communications between the government and the church take place." He contrasts with this the disadvantage of the position of the congregations established among the Armenians by our American Congregationalists, and adds: "In one respect there is an interesting analogy between them and the position of the earliest Christians of the Roman Empire. In both cases the state law demanded that the organization, if officially recognized, should have a distinct head, both as a whole and in each separate part, through whom it might communicate with the government. In both cases it was difficult to comply with such a requirement, for there was not a distinct and single head of the organization. The analogy cannot here be pursued in detail, as qualifications and chronological variations come in; but it is an interesting repetition of history."

III. But the elements of the situation which tended to develop monarchic rule in the churches were not all of an illegitimate nature. (a) One was the necessity for the direction of public worship by one, or at most a very few, of the presbyters, as was done by the archisynagogus of the Jewish synagogue. To this Paul refers when he speaks of "the elders that preside well," in writing to Timothy. But it is noteworthy that while the synagogue had a distinct name for the man or men who managed this,

the Church had none. It was a service not rewarded by an eminence of place or name, but by the consciousness of having deserved well of the congregation, and of being held in especial honor for the work. It was a part of that divine order of the kingdom proclaimed by our Lord, when he declared that they ranked the highest in it, who served most widely and most humbly, without even the reward of a title (Matthew xx: 25-28; Luke xxii: 25-27). Yet this innocent and useful prominence, when enjoyed by a Diotrephes, might become a stepping-stone to such a "preëminence" as John rebuked him for seeking.

(b) Marked excellence of character in one of the presbyters of the church must secure to him a weight of authority in spiritual things such as Polycarp enjoyed in Smyrna. This would bring him to the front in such a sort as to accustom the weaker members, and those less disposed to "make a conscience of their liberty," to regard the centralization of church activities around a single person as the best way. Thus a less noble and less useful man, on stepping into the place which had just been filled by a Polycarp, might acquire the credit and the influence rightly given to the saint, without possessing the great qualities which had made him a distinct power for good. This, of course, would be easier in the case of a hereditary position. It is in this way that kingships and aristocracies have been built upon gratitude toward the dead, for the benefit of those who inherited none of their virtues and their abilities. But even where there is no question of inheritance, it sometimes happens that the halo of a dead man may grow to a crown around the brows of the living man who sits in his seat.

IV. Dr. Lightfoot, following Jerome, ascribes the rise of the historic episcopate to a consideration of its advan-

tages as a safeguard against schism and heresy;¹ and he calls attention to the prevalence of schismatic and heretical tendencies in the churches of Asia, which he regards as its first home. It is quite possible, and even probable, that some such consideration may have had weight with the Asian churches, at whatever date they subjected the presbytery to the rule of a single official, and thus gave to that presbyter, whom they held most able to deal with existing difficulties, the power to resist and to control erratic elements in the church. But it is fair to ask whether the results, even as regards the suppression of schism and heresy, were such as justified the change.

There appears to be no evidence that the presbyteries of the churches were unable to cope with existing difficulties. We have seen the elders of the churches of Smyrna, Rome and Ancyra protect their flocks against the inroads of Noetian, Marcionite and Montanist heresies in the second century. This notion of the superior efficiency of episcopacy in such matters is somewhat like the old assumption that a republic, through its lack of a hereditary executive, must prove less able than a monarchy to maintain the authority of law and to protect the national existence.

Furthermore, what security did a man's elevation to the monarchic episcopate give for his orthodoxy? The Ebionites abounded in bishops, and were great sticklers for episcopacy. There is good reason to believe that Marcion was a bishop, and we know that his sectarian churches were organized with bishops and presbyters. Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch (A. D. 260-270), was one of

¹ Adolph Harnack (*Dogmengeschichte* I, 214 n.) lays stress on the episcopal organization of the churches (*Gemeinden*) as an element of strength in the struggle with Gnosticism. But he admits that the Gnostics showed an inability to organize and discipline congregations of any kind, being rather schools of philosophy than churches. Ritschl notices something of the same sort in the Socinians of later days.

the first who denied our Lord's preëxistence and equal deity. Arius, indeed, was a presbyter; but the bishops who adopted his creed, either in its entirety or in some modification, were numbered by hundreds. Athanasius and the Nicene Creed were condemned and rejected by episcopal majorities in the Councils of Tyre, Jerusalem, Antioch, Arles, Milan, and Sirmium; and for a time it seemed to be "Athanasius against the world" (*Athanasius contra mundum*). Even Liberius, Bishop of Rome, "assented to heretical pravity," as the old Roman breviary testifies, by signing a semi-Arian formula adopted at Sirmium, and disowning communion with Athanasius. Zosimus, Bishop of Rome, and the eastern bishops meeting in council, could detect no heresy in Pelagius, until Augustine and the church in Africa brought them to a better mind. And in the great Christological controversies settled by the general councils, every heresy had its episcopal champions in abundance.

As to schism the episcopate has no better record. The Marcionites, Novatianists, Donatists, Aetians or Eunomians, Arians (after A. D. 381), Nestorians, Monophysites, Monothelites, Priscillianists and Paulicians were all episcopal sects, with hierarchies of their own, and generally an unimpeachable "apostolical succession." The rending of the Copts, Syrians and Armenians from communion with the Orthodox Church of the east, whatever its excuse in the political reasons alleged by Dr. Edward A. Freeman, was a disaster to the Christian cause, and was the work of bishops (as well as emperors) on both sides the lines of division. The great schism between the Greek and the Latin churches in the eleventh century, on grounds too trifling for serious consideration, was effected by the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople, with the assent and consent of their suffragans, both

eastern and western. The separation of the Protestant communions from "the Roman obedience" was begun by Leo X, Bishop of Rome, who, in A. D. 1520, excommunicated Dr. Martin Luther by bull, with entire disregard of the canonical requirements of the case. That of the Anglican Church was consummated by Paul V, Bishop of Rome, who issued a bull of excommunication, in 1570, against the Queen of England and all who held by her. Throughout that period of division, while presbyters like Melanchthon, George Witzel and George Cassander, and the lay cardinal Gasparo Contarini, labored for peace and reconciliation, I am unable to recall the name of a single bishop who used his office and influence to those ends. The expulsion of the Jansenists of Holland and of the Old Catholics of Germany and Switzerland from the Latin church was also effected by the bishops, at the command of an "ecumenical" bishop.

V. The rise of the monarchic episcopate to the position it held in the fourth century can be traced only imperfectly, so gradual was the change. No new name was brought into Church use. For a time the term "presbyter" continued to be applied even to the monarchic bishop of the local church. We have seen Ireneus of Lyons and Clement of Alexandria speak of presbyters, when they certainly meant what they also called bishops. Cyprian calls his presbyters "co-presbyters," and Firmilian, Bishop of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, writes to him that "all power and grace are established in the Church, where the elders (*majores natu*) possess both the power of baptizing, and of laying on of hands, and of ordaining." Dionysius of Alexandria speaks of his "co-presbyters" in that church. But the term "bishop," which had been common to all the members of the presbytery, was withdrawn from them, and, with a certain

propriety, assigned to the man who came to monopolize that pastoral function which it especially described.

The change in the relation of the bishop to the other presbyters was at first slight. He was rather *primus inter pares*, than a lord over God's heritage. But, as early American politicians used to say, "power always accrues to a standing executive," and honor along with power. The control of the offertory, and consequently of the relief of the needy and the stranger, in the existing condition of general poverty, and with the necessity of feeding the Christians in prison and in the mines, created for him a special constituency and support, which must destroy the balance of functions and of authority within the congregation. Hence the rapid rise of the bishop to the place held by Cyprian, and described in the *Apostolical Constitutions* as "sustaining the character of God among men in ruling over all men, over priests, kings, rulers, fathers, children, masters, and in general over all who are subject to" him; as "the minister of the word, the keeper of knowledge, the mediator between God and men. . . . Next after God he is your father, who hath begotten you again to the adoption of sons by water and the Spirit. He is your ruler and governor, he is your king and potentate; he is, next after God, your earthly god." It is fair to suppose, however, that this code rather expressed what its author wished to be thought and done, than what was true in any part of the Church.

VI. At first the monarchic bishop would be inaugurated as such without any special form of consecration or ordination. He was recognized by his fellow-presbyters as taking up such duties and assuming such authority as belonged to his place. Least of all would there be any such practice as the assembly of the bishops of the other churches to set him apart to a new office. We have seen

that the presbyters of Alexandria, down to the beginning of the fourth century, felt no need of convoking outside bishops when a change in the occupancy of that "patriarchate" occurred. They chose from their own number the new patriarch, and installed him themselves. This probably was the general practice in all parts of the Church until well into the third century. The Roman ordinal, in the two earliest forms preserved to modern times, contains no form for the ordination of a bishop, but has those for ordaining presbyters and deacons.¹ Isaac, a Roman presbyter of the fourth century, says that "the ordination of bishop and presbyter is the same" (*Episcopi et Presbyteri una ordinatio est*). The first mention of the presence of bishops at the constitution of bishops is found in Cyprian (Epistle LV, vii.), but he assigns to them no other duty than that of assent to the choice made by the people. In detailing the grounds on which he and the church of Africa recognized Cornelius as rightful Bishop of Rome, against the claims of Novatian, he specifies popular choice and the assent of the bishops present; but says nothing of any act of "consecration" by them. But the Epistle of the Council of Carthage, three years later, for a similar recognition of Sabinus as rightful Bishop of Merida in Spain, does speak of "the hand laid upon him" (*manus ei imponeretur*).

It is in the canons of the Council of Nice that we find the first authentic requirement of the ordination or consecration of a new bishop by other bishops. And the fact that the Nicene fathers then enacted it suggests that it was not a practice fully established and universally recognized in the churches. Alexander of Alexandria was one of those fathers; but, according to his successor Eutychius, he had

¹ *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* (Hartford edition), vol. ii, p. 1498. Sub voce "Ordinal."

not been instituted patriarch in that way. Presbyters had made him a patriarch. It is not improbable that his title was just as good as that of the majority of the CCCXVIII, who united with him in enacting that other bishops must be called in to transmit episcopal succession by laying on of hands.

VII. "What does a bishop do, which a presbyter does not, except ordination?" asks Jerome. This also was secured to the bishops as their prerogative only by degrees. Cyprian complains of the presbyter Novatus because he ordained (*constituit*) Felicissimus a deacon, without his knowledge and permission (*nec permittente me nec sciente*), which plainly implies that if leave had been given, there would have been no reason to challenge the validity of the act. The Council of Ancyra (A. D. 314) forbade presbyters to ordain without the consent of their bishop, so that they cannot have been regarded as disqualified for ordination by any defect of their office (Mansi II, 513-39). Colluthus, a presbyter of Alexandria, ordained presbyters, apparently by way of perpetuating an extreme opposition to the Arian heresy. An Alexandrian synod declared his ordinations invalid, but in terms which implied that no earlier decision existed to which it might have appealed. Isaac of Rome, as we have seen, says that in Egypt presbyters consecrated when no bishop was present. John Cassian (A. D. 426) tells us that Paphnutius, the famous Egyptian abbot, although only a presbyter, ordained the monk Daniel deacon and presbyter.¹ Bishop Stillingfleet, in his *Irenicum* (1659), says that "where churches were planted by presbyters, as the churches in France by Andochius and Benignus, they did from among

¹ A beato Paphnutio presbytero ad diaconii est prælatum officium. In tantum enim beatus Paphnutius ipsius virtutibus adgaudebat, ut quem vitæ meritis et gratia parem noverat, cœquare sibi etiam sacerdotii ordinare festinavit. (Collatio IV, Cap. I.)

themselves choose one to be the bishop over them; for we nowhere read that they sent to other churches to derive their episcopal ordination from them." Willihad and Altfried, while laboring as missionaries among the Germans, ordained presbyters, although themselves presbyters, without incurring any censure. Boniface, the great Archbishop of Maintz, in the eighth century, found in the churches of Bavaria, some of which dated back to A. D. 540, only one bishop, and he a recent arrival, so that Pope Zachary had to give orders to have the presbyters in charge of these churches ordained by their bishop.¹

"In the year 452," says Stillingfleet, "it appears by Leo, in his epistle to Rusticus Narbonensis, that some presbyters took upon them to ordain as bishops; about which he was consulted by Rusticus, what was to be done in that case with those so ordained. Leo's resolution of that case is observable: 'Those clergymen who were ordained by such as took upon them the office of bishops, in churches belonging to proper bishops, if the ordination were performed by the consent of the bishops, it may be looked upon as valid, and those presbyters remain in their office in the church.' So that by the consent *ex post facto* of the true bishops, those presbyters thus ordained, were looked upon as lawful presbyters, which could not be unless their ordainers had an intrinsical power of ordination, which was only restrained by the laws of the Church; for if they have no power of ordination, it is impossible that they should confer anything by their ordination."

VIII. Our Lord, in formally constituting the Eleven his Apostles, used the symbolical act of breathing upon them; and no act is mentioned in the reception of Matthias

¹ Presbyteri vero quos ibidem reperisti, si incogniti fuerint viri illi a quibus sunt ordinati, et dubium est eos episcopos fuisse, an non, qui eos ordinauerunt, ab Episcopo suo benedictiones Presbyteratus suscipiunt.

among them. But in the case of the seven deacons the apostles prayed and laid hands upon them. The prophets of the church in Antioch "fasted and prayed and laid their hands on" Barnabas and Saul, when the Holy Spirit had given direction to "separate" them for missionary labor. Paul mentions in the case of Timothy "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" of Lystra. He also speaks of a "gift" (*charisma*), which had been bestowed "by prophecy" at the same time, and elsewhere he seems to intimate that this came through himself (1 Timothy iv: 14; 2 Timothy i: 6).

We also read of the imposition of hands upon persons who had just been baptized, and who were not ordained thereby to any office. Peter and John came to Samaria, after Philip had baptized many, and "prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit. Then laid they hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit" (Acts viii: 15, 17). Certain disciples of John the Baptist were baptized after instruction by Paul, and "when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied" (Acts xix: 6). In the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi: 2) "baptisms and laying on of hands" are specified among the elementary facts and experiences of the Christian life, from which we are to "go on to perfection." This would seem to indicate that the imposition was not an exceptional act in the two cases mentioned in the Acts, but a usual practice at the reception of baptized persons, as it was also at the restoration of penitents to the communion of the Church (1 Timothy v: 22).

That which is common to the two classes of acts is their association with prayer, not for the whole ecclesia and its needs, but for the persons specially in mind as recipients of a special grace. The subjects of this prayer are sym-

bologically "separated" by the laying on of hands, while God is asked to confer upon them either office or gift. "What is the imposition of hands," asks Augustine, "but prayer over the man?" Jerome speaks of it being used to prevent anyone being ordained without his knowledge and consent, as might be done if a mere form of words sufficed.¹

It is remarkable how infrequent are the references in early Christian literature to the imposition of hands in conferring office. Mention of its use in admitting catechumens into communion, and restoring penitents, is common enough; but there is hardly any reference to it as employed in ordination. The *Constitutions and Canons of the Holy Apostles* give the prayers for the installation of a bishop or a presbyter, but are silent as to the imposition of hands. The old Roman ordinal, even in its second form, which includes an office for the induction of a bishop, has nothing about bishops laying their hands on the head of the new bishop. A treatise *On the Divine Offices (Liber de Divinis Officiis)*, dating from the eleventh century, and wrongly ascribed to Alcuin, declares there is no authority for this usage, and especially none in Roman tradition, old or new (*non reperitur in auctoritate veteri neque nova, sed neque in Romana traditione*).²

The actual form of the installation of a bishop seems to have been to escort him after his election to his seat (*sedes*, throne), where he at once proceeded to the highest acts of his new office. He preached the word and celebrated the eucharist. The bishops present at the office performed their part by expressing their assent to his election and induction. It is recorded, indeed, that Novatian, a pretender to the Roman see, assembled a number

¹ *Augustinus de Baptismate contra Donatistas*, 3, 16.

² Migne's *Patrologie Latine*, Tome ci.

of bishops and had them lay their hands on his head in recognition of his claim to be Bishop of Rome. Cornelius, the lawful bishop, and Cyprian of Carthage both ignore this as having any real importance; and Cyprian enumerates the claims of Cornelius to that bishopric without saying anything of the imposition of hands by other bishops.¹

Even in later times there has been no such uniformity in the manner and method of ordination and consecration as has been generally supposed. "In the Alexandrian and Abyssinian Churches," says Dean Stanley, "it was, and still is, by breathing; in the eastern Church generally by lifting up the hands in the ancient oriental attitude of benediction; in the Armenian Church, as also at times in the Alexandrian Church, by the dead hand of the predecessor; in the early Celtic Church, by the transmission of relics or pastoral staff; in the Latin Church by the form of touching the head, which has been adopted from it by all the Protestant churches. No one mode was universal; no written formula of ordination exists. That by which the presbyters of the western Church are ordained is not later than the twelfth century, and even that varies widely in the place assigned to it in the Roman and the English churches."²

In the first *Book of Discipline* of the Scottish Kirk (1560) the "vocation" of ministers is said to be by "election, examination and admission. Other ceremonies than the public approbation of the people, and declaration of the chief minister that the person there presented is appointed to serve the church, we cannot approve; for albeit the Apostles used imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremony we judge not neces-

¹ *Cypriani Epistolae*, x, liii, lv, 7 (4). *Eusebii Historia Ecclesiastica*, Lib. VI, Cap. 43.

² *Christian Institutions*, pp. 191-192.

sary." This was John Knox's view; but the second *Book of Discipline*, composed under the influence of Andrew Melville (1578), says that "the ceremonies of ordination are fasting, earnest prayer and imposition of hands of the eldership," *i. e.*, the presbytery. It is a matter of controversy whether the imposition of hands was omitted even in the interval between the two books, and it certainly has been the usage in all Presbyterian churches from the second date.

CHAPTER VI

FROM PASTOR TO PRELATE

Thus far I have been comparing the monarchic episcopate of the congregational type, as depicted in the Ignatian Epistles, in the works of Cyprian, and in the *Constitutions and Canons of the Holy Apostles*, with the primitive type of presbyterial episcopacy, described or implied in the apostolic writings, in the *Didache*, Hermas, Clement of Rome and Polycarp; and I have sought to ascertain the manner and means of the transition from the one to the other, which is observable about the middle of the second century. As I said in the discussion of the Ignatian Epistles, there is no denominational interest at stake in this. The type of Church government which came into use at that date differs in kind from that which at present claims the name of "the historic episcopate." It is a type which nowhere exists in the Oriental, Greek, Latin, or Anglican communions. It was a pastoral episcopate, in which the bishop was at the head of a single urban church, assisted in his labors by the presbyters and deacons, but with the direct responsibility for the spiritual welfare of the congregation and of each of its members. "Do nothing without your bishop!" is the Ignatian exhortation not only to the presbyters and deacons, but to the whole congregation.

"Another caution that should be borne in mind," says Dr. Sanday, "is that in approaching the subject, it is well to divest ourselves, as far as possible, of associations derived from the modern episcopate. The bishop of primi-

tive times was not by any means the potentate we are apt to think him. There were, at first, very few Christians in the country, and these few could come into town to worship. Every town of any size had its bishop; and if there were several churches, they were served by the clergy whom the bishop kept about him; they were in fact like our present 'chapels of ease,' and the whole position of the bishop was very similar to that of the incumbent of the parish church in one of our smaller towns. The tendency at first, as Ignatius shows, was toward complete centralization; the whole serving of the parish was directly in the hands of the bishop. The parish system, in the later sense, with an extended diocese, and a number of more or less dependent clergy, took shape mainly in France, and under the Merovingian and Carolingian kings. In some respects the Nonconformist communities of our own time furnish a closer parallel to the primitive state of things than an Established Church can possibly do."¹

"The bishop, according to the early ideal," says Dr. Gore, "was by no means the great prelate. He was the pastor of a flock, like the vicar of a modern town, in intimate relations with his people."² In the third and the following centuries, in most parts of the Greco-Roman world, this congregational episcopacy passed, with more or less rapidity, into a diocesan prelacy, in which the bishop becomes the ecclesiastical administrator of a district much too large for the pastoral responsibility of any one person. The bishop is obliged to delegate the oversight of the people to subordinates. This was not a change from a smaller to a larger responsibility of the

¹ *The Conception of Priesthood in the Early Church and in the Church of England* (London, 1899).

² *The Church and The Ministry* (London, 1907). See p. 102.

same kind. It was what the logicians call a *metabasis es allo genos*—a change in kind and not in degree. It was, as David Calderwood said, a transition “from pastor to prelate.”¹

I. The Greco-Roman world, in which the Christian Church made its beginnings, was a world of cities. Its social order had originated at a time when the people of each district must organize and fortify themselves for self-defence against even their neighbors. So they built and lived in fenced cities, behind the ring-wall, and organized as military bodies. They tilled so much of the land as lay within reach of the city; but the open country, stretching from the neighborhood of one city to that of another, was not filled up with farms and villas, hamlets and villages, as in later times, but lay idle. Men could not venture to live in unprotected places, as they now do.

This state of things has left its record in many of our familiar words. Because the city was the ancient form of the state, we have polity, politics, polish and police, derived from the Greek word *polis*, meaning a city; and civic, citizen, civilized, from the corresponding Latin word. Nor can the Bible be understood without reference to the fact that the world it speaks of was a world of cities. Cities made up the homes of the ancient Israelites, and on the return of the Jews from the Captivity they went “every one unto his city.” In the New Testament the term city is treated as the type of human society. The divine order of society is “the city which hath the foundations,” which Abraham sought, and “the holy city” of John’s prophetic vision. And Augustine, exhibiting the nature of the divine government of the human race, calls his treatise *Concerning the City of God*.

¹ *Pastor and Prelate; or, A Treatise on Reformation and Conformitie*. Edinburgh, 1628; Philadelphia, 1844.

The erection of the Roman Empire, by establishing the Roman peace (*pax Romana*) between the cities it brought under its sway, effected something of a change in this order of things. It made it safe for people, in times when the empire was at peace within itself, to live out in the open country, or in villages or cantons (*pagi*) away from the hot and stagnant atmosphere of the walled city. In the Gospels we read of our Lord teaching in cities and villages (Matthew ix: 35; Mark vi: 56), and sending the Apostles to do the same; but the word village is sometimes used loosely by the evangelists, as meaning a small city, *e. g.*, Bethlehem (John vii: 42), which was counted "little among the cities of Judah." But the city tradition was too strongly established for any general departure from it, and the Roman peace was so frequently insecure as to discourage life in the open. The city continued to be the home of the vast majority of the human race, and its ways were the accepted order of human life, down to the time of the establishment of Teutonic kingdoms on the ruin of the empire, in the fifth century.

While western Asia was a land of cities, partly through old tradition, and partly through the Hellenization of its people after Alexander's conquests, Egypt was a marked exception to the rule. It never had been a land of cities, nor had Macedonia, the country which furnished its Greek conquerors and rulers. It was divided into thirty-six districts, called *nomes*, each with a religious and governmental center amounting to a town or city in size, but not in character. The Macedonians, indeed, erected Alexandria and Ptolemais after the external form of Greek cities; but they would not have been recognized as properly cities in Greece or Italy. They had no elective archons, no civic council, no approach to local self-government. Like all the rest of Egypt, they were governed

by officials appointed by the Ptolemies, as Memphis and Thebes had been by those of the Pharaohs.

In Roman Africa, at the other end of the Mediterranean, the city system was as flourishing as in Italy or Greece, though with a difference. The Punic settlers had brought with them from Syria a civic government of a less popular form than the Greek. Two magistrates, called *suffetes*, took the place of the civic council; and the cities established by the Romans after the conquest took much the same form. But no part of the empire was more abundantly furnished with cities than this large district.

It was different in the western European provinces, which had not evolved a city system of their own before the Roman peace made that dispensable. Spain, Gaul, Britain, Roman Germany, Pannonia, Illyria, Dacia and Thrace never became the homes of an urban system to the same extent. In each of them the local unit recognized by the Roman rulers is the *canton*, generally occupied by a tribal kinship, and originally ruled by hereditary chiefs. Rome achieved more in the way of urbanizing these cantons in Spain than anywhere else. In southern Gaul the influence, first of Greece and then of Rome, tended to develop a city system; but the whole country was divided into administrative districts called "*civitates*," with a town of some size at the center of each. Throughout the west, Rome fostered the erection of cities as a matter of policy, and established some as a means of defence. But the motive which produced the cities of Greece and Italy was wanting, and this later growth was feeble and exceptional.¹

It was within the region controlled by the city system, and in Egypt, that the Jewish Dispersion had found a

¹ *The Ancient City*, by Fustel de Coulanges (Fr. London, 1871). *The Provinces of the Roman Empire, from Cæsar to Diocletian*, by Theodore Mommsen (Trans. New York, 1887).

home. It was through this region that the Christian Church was extended by the labors of the Apostles. In cities of Asia, Greece and Italy we see Paul gathering churches; and to six of these city churches he addresses eight of his Epistles; and that to the Galatians was sent to the cities of Iconium, Lystra and Derbe. In each city of his field we see a church formed as the church of that city, with the municipal limits accepted as those of the church's responsibility. Barnabas invites him to "return and visit the brethren in every city wherein we proclaimed the word"; and he enjoins upon Titus to "appoint elders in every city" of Crete. Peter, in writing to the "sojourners of the Dispersion," implies that they were residents of cities. To the churches of the seven cities of Asia are addressed the epistles of the Apocalypse.

Nor is there any difference in this respect between apostolic and sub-apostolic literature. Clement writes in the name of the church of Rome to the church of Corinth; Polycarp addresses the church in Philippi; Hermas addresses the church of Rome, and asks that his book be sent "to the cities abroad." Every city that has been reached by the gospel has its church; and every church has its city. Nowhere, except in the case of the Apostles, and the evangelists specially commissioned to act for them, have we knowledge of any church official who claims to exercise authority over any larger area than a city.

This was indicated also by the name given to the region occupied by each church in the sub-apostolic period. It is called the *paroikia* or parish. The *paroikos* in a Greek city was an alien resident, who was sojourning in the city, but held his citizenship elsewhere. As the primitive Church regarded itself as having no permanent citizenship in this world, it adopted this term as indicating

that it was sojourning in the city, rather than abiding there.

II. The cities of the Greco-Roman world were places of very various size and importance. The commercial or the agricultural advantages of a city's neighborhood, or its importance as a military post, or its position on the frontier as a customs station, or its possession of great pagan sanctuaries attracting pilgrims, might secure it a large population. But in most cases it corresponded to the Preacher's "little city, and few men within it" (Ecclesiastes ix: 14), which yet had its bulwarks and must be taken by siege. Whether large or small, the city was the unit of Church organization throughout the lands around the Mediterranean, over which Rome had established her rule as a city mistress of the cities. Many or few, the Christians of each city made up one congregation, met at one communion table, broke the one loaf, and brought to the one place that weekly offertory, from which were relieved the poor, the stranger, the imprisoned for the gospel's sake and the widows and orphans. And they submitted to the rule of one presbytery, and filled vacancies in its membership by free election from their own number.

Even the largest of the cities was at first no exception. Rome is estimated to have held a population of four millions within its walls. The church of Rome was the largest and the most wealthy of all. In the time of Bishop Callistus (A. D. 218-223) we read of its forty-six presbyters, seven deacons and as many sub-deacons, forty-two acolytes or attendants, fifty-two exorcists, readers and door-keepers, and fifteen hundred widows and others on the list of persons aided from the funds of the church.¹ Yet not until the middle of the third century

¹ *Eusebii Historia Ecclesiastica*, Lib. VI, Cap. 43.

do we hear of any subdivision of the church. Bishop Fabianus or Flavianus (A. D. 236-250), we are told by the *Liber Pontificalis* (sixth century), divided the fourteen civil "regions" of the city "among the seven deacons, and caused to be erected many buildings in the cemeteries." This arrangement seems to have been made with reference to the rights of sepulcher and the orderly burial of Roman Christians; and the buildings were what now would be called mortuary chapels. Bishop Dionysius (A. D. 259-269), the same authority says, "divided the churches and cemeteries among the presbyters, and constituted parishes and dioceses." But the date given for this momentous change seems to be too early, as the same record says of Bishop Marcellus (A. D. 307-309) that he "instituted in the Roman city twenty-five titles as parishes (*titulos quasi dioceses*) for the baptism and penitence of the many who were converted from the pagans, and for the burial of the martyrs." In the time of Bishop Damasus (A. D. 366-384), Ambrose of Milan tells us, it was the custom at Rome that there should be "seven deacons, and so many presbyters that there should be two for each church." In the days of his successor, Bishop Siricius, we are told by Optatus of Milevis, there were forty or more basilicas in Rome; but antiquarians believe that nearly half of these were the mortuary chapels outside the walls in the cemeteries, one for almost every parish, and in charge of the junior presbyter of the parish.¹

So slowly did even the largest urban church in Christendom move toward a separation into several congregations, and away from the earlier method of a single meeting by which they "were all with one accord in one place." In the other great cities they clung to that formal unity.

¹ *Monuments of the Early Church*, by Walter Lowrie (New York, 1901), pp. 37-40.

Milan in the fourth century was the second city of Italy, and one of the new imperial capitals. Yet in A. D. 385–386, when its great bishop Ambrose was struggling against the intrusion of Arian worship by the Empress Justina, there was but one church within the walls and one—probably a mortuary chapel—outside them; and the empress was defeated in her purpose by the people keeping possession of the great basilica in relays, by night and day (*Dictionary of Christian Biography*, i, 95). In the many small cities, of course, there was no need for more than one place of assembly; but even in great places, where the number of the Christian believers was large, but one existed. As late as the Middle Ages, the populous city of Antwerp had but one priest in the twelfth century; Montpelier had but one church in A. D. 1213; and Ypres in A. D. 1247 had but four parish churches for two hundred thousand people.¹ This does not suit our modern ideas of “church accommodation,” but we must recognize the fact that converts from a system like the paganism of Rome did not easily come to accept the idea that all the people of a city should be in church at the same time. In fact, paganism knew of no religious assemblies but those of their priests; and the Christian way of worshiping in crowds had been thought a very suspicious feature of this new religion.

III. In the east the number of bishops and sees was a surprise to Walafrid Strabo (ninth century), who was accustomed to the magnitude and paucity of the dioceses of Germany and France. “It is reported,” he says, “that in certain parts of the east the government of bishops is over single cities and single districts.” After a great reduction through heretic secessions and Saracen conquests,

¹ *A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*, by Henry Charles Lea (Philadelphia, 1896), i, 205.

the Patriarch of Constantinople had four hundred and thirty-two bishops within his jurisdiction; the Patriarch of Antioch, two hundred and forty; the Patriarch of Alexandria, two hundred and six. Greece and Illyria had one hundred and sixty bishops; Cyprus, fifteen. This gives a total of nine hundred and fifty-five Catholic and orthodox bishops in the eastern half of the Church, besides the bishops of the oriental sects in Egypt, Syria, Armenia and Persia.¹ Some of the sees were small enough. Gibbon speaks with contempt of the customs house station at the crossroads, called Sasima, over which Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea and Metropolitan of Cappadocia, ordained his friend Gregory Nazianzen bishop in A. D. 372, with a maximum of six resident Christians to be cared for.

In Italy and the adjacent islands, in the fourth century, there were two hundred and ninety-three bishops; in Spain, seventy-six; in Gaul and Roman Germany, one hundred and twenty-two; and Mr. Palmer conjectures that in Britain and Ireland there were "perhaps nearly seventy." As to Roman Britain, we know of exactly three sees—London, Lincoln and York—whose bishops signed the proceedings of the council held at Arles in A. D. 314. Ireland came under a peculiar Church order, based on the sept system of its Celtic inhabitants, and had bishops galore. Sometimes there would be several resident in one small town, living under the jurisdiction of a co-arb, *i. e.*, the head of a church-sept, who might be a woman, as Hilda was at Whitby in the seventh century. Nennius, a British Celt of the seventh century, tells us that there were three hundred and sixty-six bishops in Ireland. A later authority says seven hundred.²

¹ *A Treatise of the Church of Christ*, by William Palmer (London, 1838), i, 204.

² Wiltch's *Geography and Statistics of the Church* (London, 1859); Dr. Todd's *Life of St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland* (Dublin, 1864); *Ireland and the Celtic Church*, by Dr. George T. Stokes (London, 1886); *The Making of England*, by John Richard Green, pp. 276-80.

In Roman Africa the urban type of the monarchic episcopate flourished, possibly because it corresponded to the civic government of a country which abounded in small Punic cities, each of them ruled by executive suffetes rather than civic councils, and in colonies of Roman veterans accustomed to military rule. Cyprian of Carthage held a council in A. D. 256, to condemn the recognition of heretical baptism, which was attended by eighty-seven bishops from the country now known as Algeria and Tunis. This is somewhat larger than England and Wales, but smaller than the State of Missouri; and it was not half Christianized. Thirty-two of these bishops represented places entirely unknown to history, being mentioned by no ancient author, and not identified by any inscription, although French scholarship has been searching that country for this kind of record with almost microscopic thoroughness.¹

In the course of a century the number of bishops attending African councils was greatly enlarged, through the inclusion of Numidia and Mauretania, and the general Christianization of the population. The Donatist heresy obliged the holding of many councils, and the records of the bishops present at several are preserved. Augustine speaks of four hundred and sixty-six bishops in his time, all of the Catholic party. The signatures of the Acts of Councils furnish a total of five hundred and eighteen orthodox African sees, scattered over what came to be called the Barbary States. Yet through most of the country the "Catholics" were in the minority, and the Donatists in control, until their churches were scattered and their clergy arrested by the imperial authorities at the instance of the rival Church. At the great conference

¹ Wiltsch's *Geography and Statistics of the Church*, i; Mansi's *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*, i, 921-32; ii, 463-512; iii, 159; iv, 7-286. *Roman Africa*, by Alexander Graham (London, 1902).

of A. D. 411, there were present two hundred and eighty-six "Catholic" and two hundred and ninety-six "Donatist" bishops; and it is noted that twenty-nine of the latter were absent. If we take Augustine's figures, we have a total of seven hundred and ninety-one bishops of both parties; if we follow the council lists, eight hundred and forty-three bishops, all holding the Nicene Creed, but quarreling over what was but a point of discipline. It is true that many of the Donatist bishops were disputing the possession of a see with a "Catholic" rival; but this was by no means the case generally. Many cities were entirely Donatist; and that party was censured for setting up bishops where no bishop should be, as on the great estates of their wealthy friends, where there would be a scattered rural population, but nothing that could be called a city. At the worst, however, they would have as many to care for as had Gregory Nazianzen in his Catholic diocese of Sasima.

A strong contrast to all this was seen in the north of Europe, where bishops were introduced later than in Italy or Africa, and cities were rare. Great Britain was the worst of all. The three sees of Roman Britain were wiped out, with almost all the rest of the fruits of Roman rule, by the Anglo-Saxon conquest, A. D. 449-588, and Christianity survived only in unconquered Wales and Strathclyde.

IV. Ecclesiastical historians have remarked the diminution of the number of episcopal sees, especially in the west, from that which existed in early times. Some have tried to account for it by the ravages of the barbarians in the fifth and the following centuries; but it began earlier than the coming of the Teutons upon the cities of the western empire, and it did not cease with the general restoration of order through their conversion to Chris-

tianity. It was one of the results of that desire for pre-eminence which was working in the Church even in the days of the last Apostle.

First came the claim of the bishop of the capital city of the province to take precedence as their metropolitan over the local bishops, and to require that their important acts be done with his consent, as is prescribed in the *Canons of the Holy Apostles*. He demanded a rank in the Church corresponding to that held in the civil government by the proconsul who governed the province in the name of the emperor; and through the attraction exercised by the state upon the Church, he obtained this. He acquired great powers of interference through the Nicene rule that a new bishop must receive ordination at the hands of the bishops of the province. "By a natural process," says Dr. Hatch, "just as the vote of a bishop had become necessary to the validity of the election of a presbyter, so the vote and sanction of a metropolitan became necessary to the validity of the election of a bishop."

The country bishops, whose sees were cities of trifling importance, or mere villages, were the victims of the new methods of aggression. Under the Roman peace there had been a considerable overflow of the population of the empire into villages, and cities not much above villages in extent. Thither the Church followed them. Peter and John "preached the gospel to many villages of the Samaritans" (Acts viii: 25). Clement of Rome speaks of the Apostles "preaching through districts (*choras*) and cities." Pliny writes to Trajan that in Bythia "not only the cities, but villages and farms (*agros*) have been reached by the contagion of the superstition." Justin Martyr says that on Sunday "there is a concourse of all who dwell in the cities and on the farms (*agrous*)" to the house of worship. Tertullian describes the pagans as

loud in their complaints "that the city is taken possession of, and that in the farms, the fortresses and the islands Christians are found." Origen boasts to Celsus that the Christians "neglect not to sow the seed of the word everywhere in the world, and that some make it their business to go around not only the cities but the villages and farms, that they may make still others pious toward God."

These statements need not mislead us into supposing that a very large share of the people of the Roman world around the Mediterranean lived outside the cities. That was true only of Egypt and the northern countries. But there was room and need for many country churches, and they either were formed by missionary work on the part of the clergy of the nearest city, or grew up independently, and came to have their body of presbyters, or, in later times, their monarchic bishops. We hear as early as A. D. 269 of bishops of country churches, and somewhat later the term *chorepiscopus* comes into use to mark them as a separate and inferior class of bishops, whose absorption into the city dioceses was a question of time.¹ The Council of Ancyra forbade them to ordain presbyters and deacons, thus reducing them to the level of city presbyters. Nothing more natural than to put such a presbyter into their place when a vacancy occurred, so that the class of *chorepiscopi* disappeared from the Church.

Similar aggressions on weaker urban sees have left their traces in the acts of the councils of the fourth century, in canons forbidding the invasion by a bishop of neighboring sees, and the reception to communion, and even to office, of clerics who had been excommunicated by their own bishops. The smaller sees were evidently losing ground; and the Cypriatic theory of the equality of all bishops, and their responsibility to God only, was replaced

¹Rothe's *Kirchengeschichte* (Heidelberg, 1875), i, 336-350.

by one which corresponded to the ideas of unity and authority on which Cyprian had acted. Consolidation and subordination were "in the air," and everybody seemed to be impressed with their advantages.

V. This process was greatly accelerated by the change of relations of the empire to the Church.

In every age the attraction of the organization of civil society has exercised an assimilating influence upon the polity of the Church. So Patrick shaped his wonderful missionary Church of Ireland upon the tribal constitution of the Irish people, and gave it rootless bishops, *sine titulo*, who went freely on mission work, wherever a field of labor was open to them. Every great political transformation has tended to carry the Church with it in imitation of whatever change is generally welcomed as a reform. So Hildebrand found that the shift of the feudal system from life-tenure of benefices to hereditary tenure was bringing the western Church under the yoke of a hereditary clergy; and he established the rule of clerical celibacy to avert the calamity.

In the first centuries of Christian history the Roman Empire was passing through a series of changes by which "the principate founded by Augustus was finally transformed into an undisguised absolutism," involving displacement of civil by military authority, and the reduction of local self-government almost to an empty form. This reached what seemed its goal in the imperial system elaborated by the Emperor Diocletian, A. D. 286-292, on the eve of the religious revolution wrought by Constantine. Diocletian divided the Roman world into four great dioceses, ruled by two principal and two subordinate emperors, and subdivided into provinces. At the same time all the simplicity of forms which the early empire had inherited from the republic disappeared, and

oriental formality took its place. To the earlier purple, the emperors added a diadem; and access to their presence was barred by a courtly etiquette and officials.

The empire under its new forms retained and even increased that prestige which had clung to it from the time of Augustus. The Roman peace, which had made commerce safe all round the Mediterranean; the extension of the great and just code of the civil law over peoples of a far lower jural development; the diffusion of Greco-Roman art, architecture and literature through a thousand cities; the stability of actual government even when rival emperors were fighting for the purple—these were its solid claims to being regarded as the most beneficent rule that had ever been set over mankind. Even the Christians, who had felt the weight of its hand in bloody persecutions, did not cease to regard it as a providential creation of the greatest value. For, after all, it had established and maintained the conditions which made possible the preaching of the gospel to so large a part of the human race. Along its great military roads, apostles, evangelists and humbler missionaries of the cross had passed from land to land. Under its protection they, like other travelers, were secure of life, and able to make their way to any field of labor. Its general religious indifference furnished them a safeguard, except in times when a fresh alarm was raised by their success, and persecution again became the order of the day.

When at last it became a Christian empire, it grew tenfold more admirable, especially to the clergy of the Church. It authorized and encouraged the churches to build basilicas, and allowed them to accept, inherit and hold property of any kind, in perpetual tenure, as the priesthoods of the pagan temples had done. It called great councils to protect the Church against false doctrines, furnished

the bishops and their company free transportation to the place of meeting, and enforced their decisions by inflicting civil penalties upon heretics. It even took up the old quarrels, which began before the empire became Christian. It seized the churches of the Donatist majority in Africa and of the Montanist majority in Phrygia, forbade their assemblies, burnt their books, confiscated any private house in which they met, declared them incapable of inheriting property and of testifying in courts of law, set free their slaves, authorized their nearest Catholic relatives to take possession of their estates, and drove them from the cities in which they had lived. It dug up and burnt the bones of the Montanist prophets. Both these sects had suffered for their confession of the Name; both held fast by the faith formulated at Nicæa. But both suffered at the hands of the Christian emperors, and at the instigation of Catholic bishops, more than they had endured under Decius and Diocletian. The Donatists were threatened with death; but, thanks to Augustine, it was not inflicted except in some cases by their own hands, as despair drove them to suicide. That penalty was first inflicted by the usurper Maximus upon the Priscillianists of Gaul, at the instance of two Catholic bishops, in A. D. 385.¹

It is not surprising that clerics who had been taught to set an excessive value on the external unity and the orthodox uniformity of the Church, and who could have said with Augustine to the Donatist, "You can find salvation only in the Catholic Church," saw in these things the fulfillment of the prophecy, "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers" (Isaiah xlix: 23); and that they invested the em-

¹ Articles on "Donatism" (by J. M. Fuller) and on "Montanus" (by George Salmon) in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

perors with more than the prerogative of the Jewish kings in the regulation of religion. The official imperial view seems to have been that Christianity had taken the place of the pagan religion as a department of the civil service. The position of the orthodox Church in Russia still perpetuates the status of the Church generally under the early Christian emperors, and reminds us of what Christendom owes to those mediæval popes who fought for the emancipation of the Church from imperial rule.

It was in this situation, and under the influence of this passionate admiration for the greatness and even the sanctity of the empire, that the episcopate took the shape in which it still exists in both eastern and western Christendom. The Church ceased to be urban, and became imperial, forming itself as a great visible corporation on the lines of the Roman Empire, as Dr. Hatch says, and constituting a graded hierarchy within exactly the same limits, and on the same footing, as the hierarchy of imperial officials. The bishop ceased to be the pastor, and forgot his Lord's warning against likeness to civil rulers. He copied their pomp, their insolence, and their luxury. When Pope Damasus urged the Roman senator, Prætextatus, to become a Christian, he was met with the answer, "Make me Bishop of Rome, and I will be a Christian to-morrow!"

While the episcopate was thus approximating to the state and glory of "the rulers of the Gentiles" (Matthew xx: 25), the bishops were letting slip from them those pastoral duties which the title *episkopos* was meant to emphasize, and were delegating these to subordinates in the Church. The cure of souls, which the Ignatian epistles, the writings of Cyprian and the apostolical canons—to say nothing of the Apostles Paul (Acts xx: 28) and Peter (1 Peter ii: 25; v: 2)—exhibit as the especial

work of the bishop, was passing of necessity to the presbyters. To them the real episcopate now returned, while the name and the shepherd's crook (crozier) remained with those who had abandoned that work for one which had a show of spiritual usefulness without the substance.

If we were asked to point out an English ecclesiastic whose labors corresponded to those of an Ignatian or Cyprianic bishop, it would not be a prelate who, though as zealous and active within his possibilities as the present Bishop of London, could be known personally to but a fraction of the people of his "flock." It would be to Richard Baxter in his pastorate in Kidderminster; or to a parish rector of the type described by Mr. Mozley in the twenty-ninth chapter of his *Reminiscences of the Oxford Movement*; or to Dr. Hook, the Vicar of Leeds, laboring among those headstrong Yorkshiremen, whose rough ways and speech had dismayed even John Wesley. These were bishops indeed, who knew their people and had a greeting for every one of their flock. They labored not only for and in the pulpit, as did the Evangelical clergy, but in the homes and on the streets of their parishes. They were consulted at every crisis of life by the families of their flock; they gave advice in perplexity, comforted in sorrow, sympathized with joy, applauded what was right and discouraged what was wrong.

It was exactly this class of English clergymen who also were most like the parish ministers of the Scottish Kirk. Even Boswell, with all his leaning to the Church of England, insisted to Dr. Johnson upon "the assiduity of the Scottish clergy in visiting and privately instructing their parishioners, and observed how much in this they excelled the English clergy," and would not allow that Anglican Tory to put him off with the assertion that the English clergy excelled in learning. But they had one great

advantage over men like Dr. Hook, in having associated with them the elders of the parish, whose weight of experience and of influence added greatly to the authority with which the Church approached the people to whom she was ministering. The office stands so high in the esteem of the Scottish people that the greatest in the land do not refuse it. Sir Walter Scott was an elder of Duddingston parish; the late Duke of Argyle and the present Earl of Aberdeen and Lord Balfour of Burleigh are of the many who combined it with the peerage. Dr. Hook's church wardens were his associates only in the care of church property; and his curates were younger men of his own selection, who were more likely to echo his opinions than to form judgments of their own.

"Let us not forget," says Canon Bruce, "that the three orders of the ministry in Asia in the beginning [?] of the second century were not a bishop over a diocese and a single presbyter with no deacon in each congregation; but an *episcopus*, a council of presbyters, and a number of deacons in each congregation. Many non-Episcopal churches retain, we believe, these three orders, while the Episcopal churches have given them up. Is it not our neglect, as Episcopalians, of these apostolic orders of ministry that paralyzes our work, and deprives us of the coöperation of the laity?"¹

¹ *Apostolic Order and Unity*, p. 122.

CHAPTER VII

THE EPISCOPATE OF THE MIDDLE AGES

The phrase "the historic episcopate" implies an appeal to the record made by the monarchic episcopate in all the phases of its history. Those who use it as recommending that to the modern Church, accept a certain responsibility for the whole course of its development, and its entire influence upon the religious life of Christendom.

Even its eulogists will hardly claim that its mediæval aspect suggests that separateness from the world, that humility of self-estimate, and that brotherly and long-suffering kindness, which our Lord and his Apostles speak of as characteristic of the Church and its ministers. We have, indeed, got past that indiscriminate abuse of the Middle Ages, which was made the fashion by the Illuminati of the eighteenth century. We have come to talk with more fairness of a time which, both in its achievements and its monuments, takes rank with the great ages of human history. We have ceased to look to some small and hardly known sect for the continuity of the Church through the centuries between Augustine and Luther. In the great central current of European history we see God working through many confusions, and in despite of much human willfulness, to grand and lasting results of good. But each of the elements of that time—the papacy, the hierarchy, the monastic orders, the empire, the feudal kingship, the university, the Crusades, the Inquisition—must stand on its own merits at the bar of history, and

answer for the use it made of its opportunities for the service of mankind.

The episcopate set out with as great advantages for good work as any other of these. It possessed the confidence of kings, kinship in most cases with the feudal nobility, an extensive and intensive authority over great dioceses, the monopoly of the councils of the Church, and the profound respect of the common people. It was able constantly to absorb men of ability and piety into its ranks. At the date of the coronation of Charles the Great, which established the new empire of the west (A. D. 800), it had the spiritual direction of Europe in its hands. At the appearance of Martin Luther, as the reformer of Teutonic Christendom, it had fallen in point of influence almost as low as had the empire. The papacy, the monastic orders, the new kingship and the university had outstripped it.

This change of estimate grew out of the inability of the bishops of the Middle Ages to make themselves felt by the people as in any way a beneficial order of men. The great dioceses of northern Europe were far beyond the reach of their prelates for pastoral work of any kind; and what they might have done, they generally neglected. "The office of preacher," says Mr. Lea, "was especially an episcopal function; he was the only man in the diocese authorized to exercise it; it formed no part of the duty or training of the parish priest, who could not presume to deliver a sermon without a special license from his superior. . . . The turbulent and martial prelates of the day were too wholly engrossed in worldly cares to bestow a thought upon the matter, for which their unfitness was complete." Hence, after four centuries of episcopal neglect, the rise of the mendicant orders to fill the void. Down to the Reformation, hardly one of the eminent

preachers is a bishop, Anselm of Canterbury and Hildebert of Tours being the exceptions I have observed.

This resulted not only in the profound ignorance and indifference of the common people, and the permanence of superstitions derived from their previous paganism, but also the spread of wild heresies through Italy, southern France and northern Spain. It was the duty of the bishops to deal with these by persuasion and—as that age judged—by measures of repression. In their diocesan courts the equitable provisions of the Roman law for the protection of accused persons were in force. But the negligence of the bishops, their sloth and indifference, and their absorption in worldly cares and quarrels were regarded as sufficient reason for transferring the duty to the Inquisition conducted by members of the mendicant orders, in which all such legal safeguards were ignored and torture was employed to extort confessions.

We can learn something of the esteem in which the office was held from the attitude of some of the best men of the time toward it. Thomas Aquinas, Peter of Blois, and Peter Cantor refused the office. Albert the Great was overpersuaded into accepting it, but got rid of it after three years. A prior of Clairvaux, in Bernard's time, was chosen to a bishopric, but declared he would rather be a tramp! One of his friends reported that the prior appeared to him after death, and declared that if he had accepted he would have been lost eternally. A Paris churchman expressed his doubt of the salvation of any German bishop, in view of the way in which ecclesiastical and civil power were combined in the office.¹

The names which make the Middle Ages illustrious are seldom those of bishops. (1) Of the workers for the reform of the Church they have Claudius of Turin, Rath-

¹ Henry C. Lea's *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, i, 13.

erius of Verona, Hildebert of Tours, Agobard of Lyons, Richard Fitzralph of Armagh, Robert Grosstete of Lincoln, and Pierre d'Ailly of Cambrai. But alongside these stand Ratramnus of Corbey, Berengar of Tours, Bernard of Clairvaux, Arnold of Brescia, Peter Damiani, Peter Waldo, Francis of Assisi, William of Saint Amour, Peter of Blois, John Wyclif, John Huss, Jerome of Prague, Gerard Groot and his order, John Gerson, John Wessel, and Nicholas of Clamanges.

(2) Among the episcopal theologians and philosophers we have Anselm of Canterbury, Peter Lombard (Bishop of Paris for the last five years of his life), John of Salisbury, Albert the Great, John Bonaventura, Thomas Bradwardine, and Nicholas of Kuss. But among what English writers used to call "the inferior clergy," we have John Scotus Erigena, Gottschalk, Paschasius Radbertus, Ratramnus of Corbey, Berengar of Turin, Peter Abaillard, Bernard of Clairvaux, Robert Pulleyn, Hugo, Richard and Walter of Saint Victor, Rupert of Deutz, Roger Bacon, Raymond Lull, Thomas Aquinas, John Duns Scotus, William Ockham, Master Eckart, Jan Ruisbroek and John Gerson.

(3) Among the notable mystics, Bishops Anselm of Canterbury, John Bonaventura, Albert the Great and Nicholas of Kuss hold rather a secondary place. But Erigena, Bernard, Joachim of Flores, Francis of Assisi, the Victorines, Rupert of Deutz, Eckart, John Tauler, Henry Suso, Nicholas of Strasburg, Ruisbroek, Otto of Passau, Gerard Groot, Thomas à Kempis, Walter Hilton, Richard Rolle of Hampoole, Vincent Ferrier and John Gerson hold the foremost place.

(4) Among the great Latin hymnodists are Bishops Theodulph of Orleans, Hildebert of Tours, and Bonaventura. But far greater eminence belongs to Walafried

Strabo, Notker of Saint Gall, Bernard of Clairvaux, Odo, Odilo, Peter and Bernard of Clugny, Peter Damiani, Herrmann of Reichenau, Adam of Saint Victor, Thomas of Celano, Thomas Aquinas, Jacoponi da Todi, John Huss and Thomas à Kempis.

(5) Among the outstanding historical scholars we have, among the bishops, John of Salisbury, Otto of Freysingen, Æneas Sylvius, and Antonino of Florence. But outside their order, and yet churchmen, are Widukind of Corbey, Luitprand, Peter of Clugny, Lambert of Aschaffenberg, Adam of Bremen, Matthew Paris, Conrad of Lichtenau, Saxo Grammaticus, Gottfried of Viterbo, Vincent of Beauvais, Geraldus Cambrensis, Salimbene of Parma, Nicholas of Clamanges, Platina of Rome and John of Tritenheim.

The type of man their position could not but develop was the hierarch, who fought for the privileges and immunities of the Church—meaning mostly its clergy—against encroaching statesmen or erratic heretics. Such were Hincmar of Rheims, Agobard of Lyons, Rabanus Maurus of Mainz, Gregory VII of Rome, Dunstan, Ælfric, Lanfranc, Anselm and Becket of Canterbury, Ratherius of Verona, Innocent III and Boniface VIII of Rome and Nicholas of Kuss. A few of them, such as Hildebert, Langton and Grosstete, stood against the encroachments of Rome, in defence of the rights of the national churches.

The great schism of the fifteenth century gave the episcopate its opportunity to vindicate the view that their collective body, in council assembled, was superior to the pope, and could undertake “a reformation of the Church in its head and its members.” With that object they met in council at Constance (1414–1418) and Basel (1431–1443); but their movement failed signally. The papacy,

united after the schism of nearly forty years, proved stronger in the affection of the Christian people. Far-seeing men, like Nicholas of Kuss, deserted the Council of Basel. Genuine reformers were disgusted by its judicial murder of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, who had appealed to its justice. The collapse was but a part of the general failure of the bishops of western Christendom to command the respect and affection of the Christian people.¹ Their love of worldly splendor and wealth, their dissolute lives, their frequent quarrels with each other and with the civil power, their palpable uselessness for any spiritual service, and the oppression exercised by their episcopal courts and officials, forfeited the confidence of the people, and led all who aspired to a better life for the Church to look elsewhere for a dawn of the day of the Lord.

A modern wit has said that the bishops went into the Council of the Vatican in 1870 shepherds, and came out sheep. It was just because they were not shepherds in any right sense, nor indeed could be with such dioceses on their hands, that the bishops of northern Europe underwent that decline of spiritual power and social influence which at last put them into a helpless subordination to the papacy, or, in Protestant countries, to the civil power.

While Germany was the worst in this respect, England was not far behind her in the erection of the episcopate into a provincial jurisdiction, the absorption of its functions into a semi-political administration and the consequent neglect of really pastoral duties. At first there was but one bishop for each of the kingdoms into which the island was divided, even after the conversion of the English by Irish and Italian missionaries. He was called the bishop of the people among whom he resided, and was the

¹ *The Christian Ministry*, by Dr. William Lefroy, Dean of Norwich (London and New York, 1891), pp. 353-354 n.

chaplain of their king. Those of the northern kingdoms were bishops after the fashion of the Irish church, which gave the bishop a place corresponding to the *brehon* of the Irish sept; and when Wilfrid was chosen bishop of the see of York, he would not accept ordination at their hands. Passing by the bishops of south England equally, he went over to Gaul and was consecrated at Compiègne.

In 673 Theodore of Tarsus, the seventh Archbishop of Canterbury, held a national synod, by which the church in England was organized into a diocesan system like that of France and Germany. Seven bishops were exercising jurisdiction over all the island from the British Channel to the Firth of Forth: Canterbury, Rochester, London, East Anglia (Dunwich), Lichfield, Winchester and York. These were now located each at some episcopal city, where this had not been already done, and others were established by division of the older sees. It was resolved to make "more bishops as the number of the faithful increased"; and in the lifetime of Theodore nine were added, mostly by his efforts. Before the Norman Conquest were set up the sees of Elmham (by division from Dunwich), Selsey (Chichester), Crediton (Exeter), Worcester, Dorchester (Lincoln), Sherborne, Ramsbury, Hereford, Hexham, Lindisfarne, Lindsey (Ripon) and Leicester. Dunham and Elmham were afterwards united into Norwich; Hexham and Lindisfarne into Durham; Sherborne and Ramsbury into Salisbury. After the conquest were established Wells (Bath and Wells), Ely and Carlisle.¹ To these eighteen sees not another was added until the Reformation, when Henry

¹ *Chapters of Early English Church History*, by Dr. Wm. Bright (Oxford, 1878). J. R. Green's *The Making of England*. I have not taken into account the four Welsh sees of Llandaff, Saint David's, Bangor and Saint Asaph, as their connection with the church in England is late and superficial, beginning with the conquest of Wales (1277-1284). Man was added in the fifteenth century.

VIII used a part of the spoils of the monasteries to endow six more. In the meantime the population had increased from less than two millions to more than five.

The dioceses of early England corresponded in a general way first to the old kingdoms, and then to the shires into which the country was divided for purposes of civil rule. In the shire-mote, which administered justice, the earl and the bishop presided jointly, until William introduced the Norman way of distinguishing sharply between civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The older arrangement distracted the bishops from their proper work and identified them with political affairs. As on the continent, there was a tendency toward a hereditary clergy, through bishop and priest securing the succession to his benefice for his son, at a time when secular benefices were undergoing the change from life tenure to that by inheritance. It was to stop this that Hildebrand set about enforcing the rule of celibacy on the clergy of the west; and we find Dunstan of Canterbury laboring rather ineffectually to establish this rule in England.

Up to the Norman Conquest the story of the church in England is one of almost constant relapse into the vices of paganism, and of the helplessness of an ignorant clergy and a worldly episcopate to stem the tide, with here and there a king like Ælfred or Eadward, or a bishop like Dunstan or Wilfrith, laboring to establish order. It was Eadward's conviction that nothing could save English Christianity short of the introduction of the spiritual energy possessed by Norman churchmen, which led him to take the steps which resulted in William's becoming king of the English.

This change did bring into English sees men of stalwart mould in Lanfranc, Anselm, Theodulph and Becket—bishops known and respected throughout Christendom.

But for a time the gain was small, through the new prelates being alien in speech and thought to the people they came to rule.

“The Norman bishop,” says Mr. Freeman, “ignorant of the English tongue, stood in a very different position from his English predecessor. There was, in the nature of things, a gap between him and the mass of his flock and of his clergy. . . . And everything tended to make the gap grow wider and wider. The first set of bishops of William’s appointment were, for the most part, men well fitted, except in their foreign birth, for the office in which they were placed. But when, in the later days of the Conqueror, and in the reign of Henry I—to say nothing of the mere corruption and simony of Rufus—bishoprics were systematically given away to the king’s clerks as the reward of their temporal services, when the king’s chancellor succeeded to a bishopric as a matter of course, the change in the position of the bishops grew more and more marked. The bishop so appointed had commonly the habits of a courtier and a man of business, rather than those of a churchman. And all the recent changes tended to strengthen the temporal side of his office at the expense of its spiritual side. He, indeed, no longer sat, directly in his character as bishop, as joint president with the ealderman in the assembly of the shire. But he not uncommonly appeared there in the more distinctly temporal character of a royal *missus*; and the devices of Roger Flambard had given him a new character, alike in the kingdom at large and in his own diocese and his own house. As an English freeman, he had always been a member of the national assembly. As a father of the Church, he had often been the special counsellor of the king. But now he had become a baron, holding his lands by military tenure, a character which in the larger

and wealthier dioceses clothed its owner with a good deal of the character of a wealthy prince. The bishop had his manors, and on his manors, as on those of other lords, castles often arose. He had his military retinue; even the mild Wulfstan was surrounded in Norman fashion by a following of knights. All this tended to strengthen the character of the lord at the expense of the overseer of the flock. In accordance with the spirit of the time, even purely ecclesiastical relations became feudalized. The bishop seemed to have become a feudal lord, with the lesser clergy to his vassals. We now hear less of the duty of the chief pastor to overlook both shepherds and flocks within the range of his authority, and we hear more of the rights of visitation which the episcopal or abbatial church holds over the lesser churches. These were rights which bishops and abbots, no less than kings, valued as a source of profit as well as of dignity and power. Money, so powerful with those who exercised jurisdiction in the king's name, was not without its weight with those who exercised it in the bishop's name. The archdeacons of the twelfth century had won for themselves a reputation as bad as that of the sheriffs. In everything the tendency was to put the benefice before the office, possession and right before duty. Everything helped to stiffen the fatherly care of the shepherd and bishop of souls into a formal jurisdiction exercised according to a rigid and technical law. The bishop, like the king, had made himself lord over God's heritage, in a sense which was as strange to the democracy of the primitive Church as it was to the democracy of the old Teutonic community. Good bishops, like good kings, might rise above the temptations among which they were placed; but the tendency to secularity which beset all the Teutonic churches from the beginning, both grew in strength and put on a worse

form through the changes which followed on the Norman Conquest."¹

The secular position thus created with a spiritual title was a natural object of ambition to the great families, who sought especially the wealthier sees for their younger sons, without any regard to spiritual fitness. These in turn threw themselves into the political and military struggles of their time for the support of their kinsmen. They stand out in all the distractions of the period as implacable foes and merciless conquerors. In the anarchy, for instance, which fills the greater part of the reign of Stephen, the bishops showed themselves as violent, tyrannical and unprincipled as the worst of the nobles; and not one of them comes forward as a peacemaker to bring to an end the miseries inflicted by the wars upon the common people.

It would have been hard, indeed, to devise a system of Church rule more in contrast with that of the first days of the Church than was the prelatial episcopacy of the church in England, France and Germany during this period. Worldly pride and pomp, a keen resentment of everything which intruded upon "the rights of the Church," a complete indifference to the duties and responsibilities of the Christian ministry and to the rights of the Christian people, were the common features of the class. The fleece and not the flock was the object of these shepherds' concern. Here and there a Grosstete or a Pecoock rose to a higher and better level, but too seldom to alter the general condition. Even these were able to do but little good, under the pressure of unspiritual duties attached to their office, and with their huge dioceses stretching far beyond the power of any human being to reach them with effective influence.

¹ *The History of the Norman Conquest of England, its Causes and its Results.* By Edward A. Freeman. Vol. v, pp. 332-333. Oxford and New York, 1876.

Yet the theory of the historic position of the monarchic episcopate and its spiritual authority current during the Middle Ages was not that its preëminence was matter of original intention and divine right. When the doctrine of transubstantiation attained a general acceptance, it elevated the priest to such a height of spiritual power and prerogative as made the difference between the bishops and the other priests seem relatively insignificant, and prepared people to hear that that difference was an innovation upon an original equality. The authority of Jerome on this point had come to be accepted generally throughout the west; and his statements on the subject had worked their way into the text-books of theology and the canon law. And in an age which placed the traditions of the Church on a level with the Scriptures in point of authority, no one saw in this belief any reason for altering or abolishing the episcopal system of rule. That question could arise only when a higher authority for the Scriptures came to be asserted and widely accepted.

Among Jerome's contemporaries in the fifth century we find John Chrysostom in the eastern church (in his homily on Philippians i: 1), Theodore of Mopsuestia (350-428), and his disciple Theodoret (393-458), in agreement with Jerome, through their independent study of the New Testament. In the west Augustine of Hippo (354-430) says in a letter to Jerome that: "After the names of honor, which the custom of the Church hath now obtained, the office of a bishop is above the office of a priest" (*Secundum honorum vocabula, quæ jam ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, episcopatus presbyterio major est*), implying, as Bishop Jewell says, that this is "not by the authority of the Scriptures."

In the next (sixth) century there are in agreement with Jerome, Gregory the Great (543-607), Primasius (A. D.

553) in his treatise on Heresies, Theophylact of Simocatta (570–630), and to some degree, Isidore of Seville (570–636). This last, in the seventh book of his *Etymologies*, says:

Presbyter is Greek for elder, so named not only on account of age, but also on account of the honor and dignity which the presbyters have received. Hence with the ancients, bishops and presbyters were the same, because the name is one of dignity, and not of age. Presbyters as well as bishops are called priests, because they minister in sacred things; and yet, though priests, they have not attained to the height of the pontificate, since they do not sign the forehead with chrism, nor give the Spirit, which, as the Acts of the Apostles shows (!), belongs to the bishops alone.¹

I leave the compiler Isidore to settle his differences with Isidore and with Luke. In his treatise *Concerning Ecclesiastical Offices*, he says of presbyters: "To these, as to the bishops, the stewardship of the mysteries of God has been intrusted, for they preside over the churches of Christ, and are associated with the bishops in administration of his body and blood; likewise in teaching the people and in the duty of preaching; but only on account of authority ordination of clerics has been reserved to the chief priest, lest the discipline of the Church being claimed by many, might dissolve its harmony and cause scandals." The second Synod of Seville, held in his time, A. D. 619, to dispose of some irregularities in the church of Cordova, is found echoing Jerome. It says of presbyters: "For although many services of the ministry are common to them with the bishops, they know that some are forbidden to them by new and ecclesiastical rules (*novellis et ecclesiasticis regulis prohibita sunt*), as the consecration of presbyters and deacons and virgins." Dr. Stillingfleet's *Irenicon*, pp. 338–339.

In the eleventh century the Greek expositor Œcumenius

¹ Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, lxxxii, 292.

maintained Jerome's view in the east. In the west this is done by Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109), and by Bernard of Constance (A. D. 1088), one of Hildebrand's supporters, in his treatise *Concerning the Office of Presbyters* (*De Officio Presbyterorum*). He quotes Jerome, and adds:

Since then in old times (*antiquitus*) presbyters and bishops are said to have been the same, there is no doubt that they possessed the power of binding and loosing, and other things now peculiar (*specialia*) to the bishops. But after the presbyters were restrained from the episcopal eminence, that began to be unlawful, which ecclesiastical authority assigned to the bishops for its execution.

Near the close of the century, in A. D. 1091, Pope Urban II presided at the Council of Beneventum, which adopted a canon:

Let no one be chosen bishop, unless he be found living in holy orders. But we call the diaconate and the presbyterate holy orders. These alone, indeed, the primitive Church is said to have had. As to these alone we have the injunction of an Apostle.¹

The twelfth century saw the beginnings of the effort to reduce the doctrine and discipline of the Latin church to systematic form. The latter was the work of the Tuscan canonist Gratian, of the Benedictine order. His *Decretum*, compiled about A. D. 1151, at once became the text-book of the west, and was made the subject of countless commentaries. He adopted, as authoritative on the relations of the bishop and the presbyter, the language of Jerome, that of Isidore and the canon of the Council of Beneventum. In this he was followed by the canonists generally down to the last quarter of the sixteenth century. The great Ghibelline canonist, Antonius de Rosellis of

¹ Nullus deinceps in episcopum eligatur nisi qui in sacris ordinibus vivens inventus est. Sacros autem ordines dicimus diaconatum et presbyteratum. Hos siquidem solos primitiva legitur Ecclesia habuisse. Super his solum præceptum habemus Apostoli. (J. D. Mansi: *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*, xx, 735f.)

Padua (1400–1467), is quoted in this sense. So Nicolo Tedeschi (1389–1445), Archbishop of Palermo, in his *Commentary on the Decretals*, says that “formerly presbyters ruled the church in common, and ordained priests” (*Olim presbyteri in commune regebant Ecclesiam et ordinabant sacerdotes*). As late as A. D. 1570, Giovanni Paolo Lancelotti, in his *Institutes of Canon Law*, written at the instance of Pope Paul V, repeats Jerome’s statements without a question.

What Gratian did for canon law, just about the same time Peter the Lombard did for dogmatic theology in his *Four Books of Sentences* (*Sententiarum Libri IV*), which also became the text-book of hundreds of commentators, especially after the Council of the Lateran (1215) commended it. In treating the sacraments he followed the authority of Jerome, in making bishops and presbyters one order, and in asserting their original equality he says: “With the ancients bishops and presbyters were the same. . . . The canons excellently judge that there are only two holy orders, to wit, the diaconate and the presbyterate, because these are all the primitive Church is said to have had, and for these only we have the authority of the Apostle.” Alexander of Hales (ob. 1245) and John Bonaventura (1221–1274), the first systematic theologians of the Franciscan order, both agree with him in following Jerome. The latter says: “The episcopate is not properly an order, but an eminence or dignity of order; nor is any new character conferred in it” (*Episcopatus proprie non est ordo, sed ordinis eminentia vel dignitas; nec in eo novus character imprimitur*).

His still greater friend, the Dominican Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274), did not complete his *Summa*, so that the discussion of the sacraments given in ordinary editions is taken from his commentary on Peter the Lombard’s

Sentences. The fortieth "question" is "Whether the Episcopate Is an Order?" (*Utrum Episcopatus Sit Ordo?*) and it is handled in his usual method of offering first the reasons on one side, and then the reasons on the other, and concluding with a "solution" of the problem. He takes no interest in the historical discussion, and therefore makes no reference to Jerome. Dionysius the Areopagite is an authority sufficient for him. His second reason for the affirmative is from the bishop possessing the power to confer the sacraments of ordination and confirmation, which priests do not, since "order is nothing else than a degree of power of dispensing spiritual things." To those who deny that ordination and confirmation are sacraments, and hold they may be dispensed by a presbyter, the argument is worth little. He admits that the power of the priest to officiate in the eucharist, the highest act of worship, tells heavily against the claim of the episcopate to rank as a distinct order (*Ordinatur omnis ordo ad Eucharistiæ sacramentum. Unde cum Episcopus non habeat potestatem superiorem Sacerdote, quantum ad hoc episcopatus non est ordo*). So he compromises, stating that it both is and is not an order, according to what you have in mind. If this be the great things of Christian worship, then it is not an order; if it be the less, it may be called an order (*Ordo prout est sacramentum imprimens characterem, ordinatur specialiter ad sacramentum Eucharistiæ, in quo ipse Christus continetur, quia per characterem ipso Christo configuramur, et ideo detur aliqua potestas spiritualis Episcopo in sui promotionis respectu aliquorum sacramentorum; non tamen illa potestas habet rationem characteris, et propter hoc Episcopatus non est ordo, secundum quod ordo est sacramentum quoddam*). This shows the force of what has been said of the way in which the new conception of the eucharist brought priesthood up to episcopate.

Among later theologians of the Middle Ages, Jerome's view of this question is to be found in the *Summa Theologiæ* of William of Auxerre (ob. 1223), in the *Commentary on the Sentences of Peter the Lombard* by William Durand of St. Pourcain (ob. 1233), and in those by Peter Aureolus (1280–1322). Richard Fitzralph, the Archbishop of Armagh, whose writings suggested to John Wyclif criticisms of current abuses, maintains Jerome's view of the episcopate in his curious work on *The Errors of the Armenians* (1360). So did Pierre d'Ailly (1350–1420), Archbishop of Cambrai, who, along with Archbishop Nicolo Tedeschi, the Sicilian canonist, took a leading part in the proceedings of the Council of Basel.¹

In the age of the revival of learning the new scholarship and the freer spirit of investigation strengthened the tradition which began with Jerome. Erasmus, the first editor of his works, writes to Albert the Pious of Bavaria: "I can recall no one of the age of Jerome who calls any one a priest, who was not also a bishop, while Jerome assures us that in the age of Paul presbyters and bishops were the same." His friend and benefactor, Dr. John Colet (1477–1519), the famous Dean of St. Paul's, presents the same view. He is commenting upon the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, an apocryphal production which did much to give currency to the claims of monarchic episcopacy to apostolic origin and a divine right. Yet he appeals to Jerome as one who "proves by good evidence" that the office of priest was the highest in the primitive Church. "Still from the number of priests, though equal in office

¹The subject of the survival and persistence of the Hieronymian tradition in the mediæval Church of the west deserves an exhaustive treatment. The notices I have given are based on Richard Field's *Of the Church, Five Books* (Oxford, 1635; and Cambridge, 1847), vol. iv, pp. 150–152; Gieseler's *Church History*, vol. i, pp. 56–57 (Philadelphia, 1836); A. W. Dieckhoff's *Luther's Lehre von der kirchlichen Gewalt* (Berlin, 1865), pp. 60 ff.

and rank, the first disciples and followers of the Apostles, immediately after the apostolic times (*statim post Apostolos*) made choice of one, and placed him at the head, for the settling of disputes and appeasing of strife, and for putting an end to contentions by his opinion and sentence, that the Church might abide in harmony. And he is not so much superior to other priests in office and dignity, since he performs no act more exalted than does every priest. He then began to be specially called a bishop—a name which under the Apostles belonged to all priests, until there was chosen the one I have just mentioned.”¹

The earlier Roman Catholic theologians of the period of the Reformation took no new ground in the matter. Alfonso de Castro (1483–1542), who accompanied Philip II to England, and who wrote a controversial work, *De Hæresibus*; Gasparo Contareni (1483–1542), the lay cardinal who labored for a reconciliation of the Protestants with the papacy; Dominicus a Soto (1484–1560), the greatest Spanish theologian at the Council of Trent; and George Cassander (1515–1566), who wrote of Protestantism in an irenic spirit,—all these accepted Jerome’s view of the origin of episcopacy. In the twenty-first session of the Council of Trent (1562) the Italian bishops maintained the correctness of Jerome’s view, against the Spaniards, declaring that the superiority of the bishop over the presbyter is due to a papal grant, and is not inherent in his office.

It was Michael de Medina (ob. 1580), a Spanish Franciscan, who attended the Council of Trent, that first took alarm at this tradition inherited from Jerome, in view of John Calvin’s contention that the Church could

¹ *Two Treatises on the Hierarchies of Dionysius*, by John Colet. Now first Published, with a Translation, Introduction, and Notes, by J. H. Lupton (London, 1869), pp. 83–84, 219–220.

dispense with diocesan episcopacy without departing from either scriptural precedent or patristic authority. The Spaniard went so far as to declare that "those fathers" who taught this were "substantially heretics, but that the dogma had not been condemned in these fathers out of respect for them" (*Illos Patres materiales hæreticos, sed in his Patribus ob eorum reverentiam hoc dogma non esse damnatum*). Cardinal Bellarmin naturally objected to this as "very inconsiderate judgment" (*sententiam valde inconsideratam*), and took the safer way of explaining away those awkward sayings of the fathers, scholastics and canonists; as well he might when the orthodoxy of Jerome, Anselm, Urban II and Bonaventura was at stake. In this he has been followed by later Roman Catholic canonists, not excepting the learned Oratorian, Jean Morin (1655), and the Jansenist, Z. B. van Espen (1700). When the Bishop of Chartres, in this last year, ventured to say, with Jerome, that there was no difference between bishops and priests under the Apostles, his chapter complained of this to the Assembly of the Gallican Church, which condemned his assertion as erroneous, rash, scandalous, etc. But the "tradition of the Church," from Jerome in the fifth century to Lancelotti in the sixteenth, is against the claim of the episcopate to originality in institution, and a superiority by divine right to the presbyterate. Cardinal Newman says that "apostolical succession, its necessity and its grace, is not an Anglican tradition, though it is a tradition found in the Anglican Church." It is fair to ask whether it is a Roman Catholic tradition.

Of course, the church in England—there was as yet no Church of England—during those eleven centuries held no different doctrine from that of Jerome, Gratian and the Lombard, as to the origin and worth of the distinction

between bishop and priest. Archbishop Anselm, Robert Pullen (ob. 1147), Oxford professor, who died at Rome chancellor of the church, and probably cardinal; Richard Fitzralph, who taught at Oxford before becoming primate of Ireland; and his disciple, John Wyclif, agree with Jerome.

Nor did the agitations of the Reformation produce any alteration in this respect. In 1540 Henry VIII submitted to the commissioners appointed to draw up a statement of Christian doctrine, seventeen questions, of which the tenth was, "Whether bishops or priests were first; and if the priests were first, then the priest made the bishop?" We have answers from both the friends and the opponents of the Reformation, who had a place on that commission. Cranmer's answer is that "The bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion." His chaplain, Richard Cox, afterwards leader of the anti-Puritan party in "the Troubles at Frankfort," and finally an Elizabethan bishop, answers, "Although by Scripture (as St. Hierome saith) priests and bishops be one, and therefore the one not before the other, yet bishops, as they be now, were after priests, and therefore made of [*i. e.*, by] priests." Dr. John Redman, a graduate of Paris, and professor of theology at Cambridge, thinks that "they be of like beginning, and at the beginning were both one, as St. Hierome and other old authors show by Scripture; wherefore one made another indifferently."

On the other side of the great controversy of the time was Dr. Roger Edgeworth, fellow of Oriel, and a writer on Church discipline. He "thinks it no inconvenience that the priests in the primitive Church made bishops. Even like as soldiers should choose one among themselves to be their captain, so did priests choose one of themselves

to be their bishop, for consideration of his learning, gravity and good living." He also had been reading Jerome. Edmund Bonner, at that time Bishop of Hereford, and afterwards of London, says: "I think that bishops were first; and yet I think it not of importance whether the priest then made the bishop, or else the bishop the priest, considering (after the sentence of St. Jerome) that in the beginning of the Church there was no (or if it were, very small) difference between a bishop and a priest, especially touching the signification."¹

In the Elizabethan church, down to 1589, this was the belief of all parties. Bishop Jewell, who stands preëminent for his patristic learning, tells Dr. Harding: "Saint Hierome's words be plain enough: 'A priest and a bishop is all one thing'; and before that by the working of the Devil parts were taken in religion, and some said, 'I hold of Paul'; some, 'I hold of Apollos'; and some other, 'I hold of Peter'; the churches were governed by the common council of the priests." "Saint Hierome saith, 'Let bishops understand that they are above priests rather of custom than of any truth or right of Christ's institution.'"²

Besides Cranmer, Cox, Redman and Jewell, we find among the disciples of Jerome in this matter Thomas Becon, Dr. John Rainolds, Richard Hooker, Dr. Richard Field, Francis Mason, Bishop John Cosin and Bishop Edward Stillingfleet, each of them an ornament in point of learning to the Church of England.

I have dwelt on this point at some length, because of the effort made by some Anglicans to have Jerome's judgment regarded as the eccentric opinion of a solitary doctor, and

¹ John Strype's *Memorials of Cranmer*, Appendices XXVII and XXVIII. Archbishop Cranmer's *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters* (Parker Society), pp. 115-117. *Church and State under the Tudors*, by Gilbert W. Child (London, 1890), pp. 293-4. Dr. John J. McElhinney's *The Doctrine of the Church: A Historical Monograph* (Philadelphia, 1871), pp. 167-169.

² *The Works of John Jewell* (Parker Society). Third portion, pp. 272 and 294.

as destitute alike of authority and of influence on the subsequent teaching of the Church. It has been, on the contrary, the prevailing judgment of western Christendom from that great scholar's time, down almost to the close of the great century which embraces the years of the Reformation. Even after the separation of the Teutonic churches from the Roman obedience, it remained the judgment both of those who disowned the pope and of those who remained loyal to him, until the exigencies of controversy suggested to Michael de Medina and to Richard Bancroft, at about the same time, to stigmatize as heresy what had been for eleven centuries an unbroken tradition of the Christian west.

Dr. Charles Wordsworth, the "Bishop of St. Andrews," speaks of the statement that bishops are not a different and superior order to presbyters as a part of the papal conspiracy to make all bishops dependent upon the pope for their rights. He also quotes the nonjuror, Charles Leslie, to that effect.¹ Will he assert that Jerome, and the long line of patristic and scholastic theologians who were of his mind in the matter, were engaged in that conspiracy? And how was it that the view of Jerome was put out of court by papalists like Bellarmine, so that it ceased to be heard of when the papal power attained the greatest influence over the Latin church?

¹ *A Discourse on the Scottish Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1861), pp. 137-140.

CHAPTER VIII

TUDOR ANGLICANISM

The Reformation of the sixteenth century rent the national churches of Teutonic Europe from "the Roman obedience," as the Latin churches in the eleventh century had been rent from communion with the Greek. The time had come for the Teutonic peoples to cast off the leading-strings of an authority which had been helpful to them at an earlier time, but which had become a hindrance to their growth in Christian life and order. They were now to work out their solution of the great problem of constituting Christ's kingdom among men, according to the character of their thought.

Throughout the countries affected by the Reformation, diocesan episcopacy existed in its least historic form. It was the region of Christendom most remote from the cradle of Christianity. Its Church system was the farthest removed from that urban and pastoral episcopate which had flourished in the early patristic period. It had originated at a time when that was disappearing from Greece and Italy, to make room for a diocesan episcopacy fashioned after the imperial and military methods of Rome. It had been conformed from the first to the model either of Roman provincialism or of Teutonic kingship. It was a prelacy rather than an episcopacy, and therefore alien to the spirit and maxims of the New Testament.

Long before the Reformation this diocesan prelacy had come to be regarded as among the abuses of the Church.

Not only among the small reforming parties of the Middle Ages, but even by many of the most loyal sons of the Church, the insolence of "the proud prelates" had been an object of censure. That any real reformation must affect this system of ecclesiastical rule was the common belief of all who accepted the Reformation. As a consequence the members of the prelatic hierarchy on the Continent, with very few exceptions, adhered to the Bishop of Rome; and when any one of them did come to the help of the Reformers, there was little disposition to accept his office along with his person.

In Germany George Polentz, Bishop of Samland, in 1523, and Erhard von Queis, Bishop of Pomesania, in 1524, became Lutherans; and their North German sees were filled by Lutherans who bore the episcopal title until 1587. In 1524 Matthias of Jagow, Bishop of Brandenburg, accepted Protestantism. In 1536-1542 Hermann von Wied, Archbishop of Cologne (Koeln), strove to introduce the Lutheran reformation into his diocese, but was stopped by the Emperor Charles V, and deposed. In 1548 Pietro Paolo Vergerio, Bishop of Istria, embraced Lutheranism and removed first to Switzerland and then to Tübingen, where he died in 1565, a Lutheran pastor. Throughout Protestant Germany the authority of the local prince as *summus episcopus* replaced that of the bishops in the Lutheran churches.¹

In Scandinavia the course of events was different. All the Danish bishops adhered to the Church of Rome, and were extruded by King Christian III in 1534. Superintendents were appointed to their sees, and to these the title of bishop was afterwards given. In Sweden the

¹Dan. Heinr. Arnoldt's *Kurtzgefasste Kirchengeschichte des Königreichs Preussen* (Königsberg, 1769), pp. 253-254; 258-259. *Geschichte der Reformation*, von H. E. F. Guericke (Berlin, 1855), pp. 180, 193-194, 218-219, 221 (n. 4), 222.

Roman Catholic Bishop of Westeraas in 1531 consecrated the reformer Lars Peterson Archbishop of Upsala. In Norway the Roman Catholic bishops were expelled by Christian III in 1531, but the Bishop of Oslo accepted the Reformation and was made Bishop of Oslo and Hammer, while the other sees were filled by Lutherans. In Iceland Ogmundr Palsson, Bishop of Skalholt, in 1539 consecrated as his successor Gizur Einarsson, who inclined to Lutheranism, and who afterwards accepted the Lutheran Reformation. But none of these countries took such steps for the maintenance of an unbroken succession as indicated their belief in any divine authority for episcopacy, or would satisfy Greek or Roman canonists, or Anglican theorists. Lutheran ministers ordained by the Augustana (Swedish) Synod of America, on returning to Sweden, are admitted to pastoral positions in the national church on the same footing as those who have been ordained by Swedish bishops.¹

No bishop cast in his lot with the Reformed churches of the European continent. In France Guillaume Briconet, Bishop of Meaux, and Gérard Roussel, Bishop of Oléron, showed marked sympathies with the Reformation, but both clung to the Roman obedience. In Scotland Adam Bothwell, Bishop of the Orkneys, and Alexander Gordon, Bishop of Galloway, accepted the Reformation, and served as "superintendents" in the plan for "planting and reforming kirks," which the first General Assembly adopted. It is disputed whether or not this office of superintendent was meant to be permanent. The language of the first *Book of Discipline* (1560) seems to indicate that it was not. It says:

We consider that if the ministers whom God hath endowed with his singular graces amongst us, should be appointed to

¹ Guericke, pp. 224-227. Bishop L. A. Anjou's *History of the Reformation in Sweden* (New York, 1859), pp. 243-244; 277-281; 638-641.

severall places there to make their continuall residence, that then the greatest part of the realme should be destitute of all doctrine. . . . And therefore we have thought it a thing most expedient at this time, that from the whole number of godly and learned men, now presently in this realme, be selected ten or twelve (for in so many provinces we have divided the whole), to whom charge and commandment should be given to plant kirkes, to set, order and appoint ministers as the former order prescribes, to the countries that shall be appointed to their care where none are now. . . . Nothing we desire more earnestly, than that Christ Jesus be universally once preached throughout this realme, which shall not suddenlie be, unlesse that by you men be appointed and compelled, faithfully to travel in such provinces as to them shall be assigned.

Yet Dr. Herbert Story is right in saying that, "there is no reason to believe that those who instituted the office contemplated its early abolition"; for the first *Book of Discipline* itself says: "In this present necessity, the nomination, examination and admission of the superintendent cannot be so straight as we require, and as afterwards it must be."¹

It was from England, first in 1610, and again in 1661, that the Stuart kings obtained "the apostolical succession" for the kirk. Two of their first series of bishops, Alexander Lindsay of Dunkeld and John Abernethy of Caithness, signed the National Covenant in 1638, and were continued in the exercise of their ministry as pastors of parishes; while two others, Bishops Fairlee of Argyle and Graham of the Orkneys, submitted to the new order of things. The church of Scotland offers no plea of "necessity" for her want of diocesan bishops. Twice she had the opportunity of retaining that sort of episcopacy

¹ *The Apostolic Ministry in the Scottish Church*, by Robert Herbert Story (Edinburgh and London, 1897).

Yet John a Lasco, who was the first to introduce the office of superintendent into the Reformed Church, treated it as not only permanent in character, but of divine authority. He says: "Superintendentis seu inspectoris ministerium—Græci *Episkopen* vocant—esse divinam ordinationem in Christi ecclesia, per ipsummet Christum Dominum inter ipsos etiam Apostolos institutam, dum Petro confirmandi reliquos fratres in fide provinciam peculiariter demandaret."

on such terms as she might think best, and twice she cast it out.¹

In the era of the Reformation there was no general belief in the divine right of the monarchic episcopate in any part of Europe, or among any class of theologians on either side of the great line of demarcation. When Luther said, "The bishop is not superior to the presbyter by divine right"; and "Only according to human order is one above another in the outward Church"; he was but repeating what he had learned from accepted text-books of the canon law, which followed the teaching of Jerome. Down to the close of the sixteenth century both the friends and the enemies of the Reformation were in agreement on that point, as they were when questioned by Henry VIII in 1540.

Almost at the same time the representatives of the counter-Reformation on the Continent, and the High Anglicans in England, began the change of front. The spokesman of the latter was Dr. Richard Bancroft, then a canon of Westminster, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, who preached his famous "Sermon at Paule's Crosse the 9 day of Februarie, being the first Sunday in the Parliament, Anno 1588," in which he asserted a divine right for episcopacy. This was followed, five years later, by Dr. Thomas Bilson's book, *The Perpetual Government of Christes Church*, which undertook to show that the principle of "superiority" of one above others had been the uniform rule in God's administration of his Church, from the days of Moses to those of modern "primates and metropolitans."

This shift of position is generally admitted, but Dr. Walter Farquhar Hook, in a note to his sermon on *Hear*

¹ *The Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution*, by John Parker Lawson (Edinburgh, 1844), pp. 54-64; 66-71; 615-616.

the Church (London, 1848), alleged an utterance of Archbishop Cranmer's in 1548, as putting that great and good man on Anglican ground. This is found in a "Catechism set forth by the most Reverend Father in God, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan." The preface says that it was "overseen and corrected" by Cranmer, but it is nowhere said that he was the author. It is in fact a translation from the Latin of Justus Jonas (1539), and this, in turn, is a translation of the German sermons on Luther's Short Catechism, which were appended to the *Kirchenordnung* of Nuremberg (1523).¹ The passage Dean Hook quotes reads:

The ministration of God's word, which our Lord Jesus Christ himself did first institute, was derived from the Apostles unto others after them, by the imposition of hands and giving the Holy Ghost, from the Apostles' time to our days, and this was the consecration, orders and unction of the Apostles, whereby they, at the beginning made bishops and priests; and this shall continue in the Church unto the world's end.

The Latin of Justus Jonas reads:

Atque sic ministerium verbi (quod Dominus noster Jesus Christus ipse instituit) transmissum est ad posteros, per impositionem manuum, et communicationem Spiritus Sancti, usque in hanc horam. Et hæc vera est Apostolica consecratio, ordinatio, et unctio, qua consecrandi sunt Sacerdotes inde ab initio, quæ et in Ecclesia manebit usque ad finem mundi. Quicquid præterea additum est ceremoniarum, sine necessitate inventum et additum est ab hominibus.

¹ *Catechismus, das ist Kinder-Predig. Wie die in der gnedigen Herren Marggraffen zu Brandenburg und eins Erbarñ Raths der Stat Nürnberg Oberkeit und Gebieten, allenthalben gepredigt werden. Den Kindern und Jungen leuten zu sonderem nutz also in schrift verfast. Nürnberg, 1523.*

Catechismus pro pueris et iuventute in Ecclesiis et ditione Illustriss. Marchionum Brandeborgensium et inclyti Senatus Norimbergensis, breviter conscriptus, e germanico latine redditus, per Justum Jonam, addita epistola de laude Decalogie. Viteberg, 1539 and 1543. Octavo.

Catechismus; That is to say a shorte Introduction into Christian Religion for the synguler commoditie and profyte of childe end yong people. Set forth by the moste reverende father in God Thomas Archbyshop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitane. Gualterus Lynne excudebat, 1543.

From the resemblance of the first and third titles, I infer that the English translator had the German before him, as well as the Latin.

Both the Lutheran doctor and the Anglican archbishop (or his translator) were keeping the middle way between the two extremes of their time. The Anabaptists, on the one hand, demanded a direct ordination by the Holy Spirit, without regard to Church order; the Romanists, on the other, demanded much more in the way of ceremony than the apostolic records would warrant. The rendering of "sacerdotes" by "bishops and priests" is simply an adaptation of the words of a popular manual to the state of things which "children and young people" would see in their own country. It is no evidence that Cranmer had changed his mind since his answer to King Henry in 1540, or since his "Declaration" of 1536, in which he says:

The truth is that in the New Testament there is no mention of any degrees or distinctions in orders; but only of deacons and ministers, and of priests or bishops.

All these utterances of the martyr archbishop belong to the reign of Henry VIII, when he was under the influence of the Lutheran reformers. After the accession of King Edward he came into closer relations with Calvin and the reformers of his school, accepted the Calvinistic doctrines of the sacraments, and embodied these in the second Edwardine Book of Common Prayer. In 1550, between the first and the second book, appeared *The Form and Manner of Making and Consecrating Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons*, commonly known as *The English Ordinal*. From his friend and contemporary, Bishop John Bale, we learn that the preface to the *Ordinal* was Cranmer's work. It has the marks of that stately and impressive style which we find in his acknowledged writings, and to which the Book of Common Prayer owes so much of its literary charm. It opens with the famous sentence:

It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture, that from the Apostles' time there hath been these three orders

of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons; which offices were evermore held in such reverent estimation that no man by his own private authority might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined and known to have such qualities as were requisite for the same; and also, by public prayer, with imposition of hands, admitted thereto.

Much ingenuity has been employed in reading into this statement what is neither said nor meant by it. As it is the only declaration on the subject to be found in the formularies of the Church of England, the High Anglicans have naturally made the most of it, and even more than the most.

(1) They interpret it to mean that no other form or kind of Church government than that by bishops, priests and deacons has been known to the Church since the days of the Apostles. It certainly does not contradict Dr. Lightfoot's view that in the first half of the second century the churches of Rome, Corinth and Philippi were still under presbyterial government, although—in his view—episcopal government already existed in Asia through the action of the Apostle John.

(2) They interpret it to mean that the Church of England holds that episcopacy is necessary to the existence of a Christian church. But, as Dean Lefroy¹ points out, the *Ordinal* of 1550 elsewhere speaks of the necessity of priests and deacons in the Church, and directs that the people shall be instructed on this point; but neither it nor the revised *Ordinal* of 1662 says anything of the kind about bishops, although on this point light was more needed than on the other.

(3) They interpret it to mean that the Church of England does not regard the presbyterially governed churches of Scotland and the Continent as portions of the Catholic

¹ *The Christian Ministry*, pp. 332-334, n.

Church, but as mere schisms from that body. It was not so understood by any representative of the Church of England down to the Restoration, with the possible exceptions of Archbishops Laud and Neale and Jeremy Taylor. Even the champions of episcopacy in that time—Hooker, Andrews, Hall, Cosin, Bramhall, etc.—anxiously repudiate the charge of sitting in judgment on the Reformed churches beyond the sea. In the Book of Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, drawn up in 1604, we shall see that the Church of Scotland is mentioned expressly as a branch of the Church Catholic, although down to 1610 the Kirk had none but presbyterial government and ordination.

(4) They interpret it to mean that the authority of the Christian ministry comes through the succession of bishops from the time of the Apostles, maintained by the imposition of hands on each by other bishops at his consecration, along with the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost"; and that sacerdotal power is conveyed to presbyters by the use of those words, with the imposition of a bishop's hands, and with the declaration, "Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained." Here indeed falls the greatest stress of their theory. "It is a matter of very great importance," says Dr. Charles Gore, "to exalt the principle of the apostolic succession above the question of the exact form of the ministry in which the principle has expressed itself, even though it be by apostolic ordering." But Dean Lefroy very aptly replies that this is just the opposite of what the Church of England has done in the *Ordinal*. "The Church has emphasized the apostolicity of the ministry, . . . but is silent about the succession. She emphasizes that which is of less importance. She ignores that which is accounted greater." Nor has

there been any such continuity and uniformity in the use of forms as the succession theory assumes. The liturgical researches of the great Oratorian, Jean Morin (*De Sacris Ordinationibus*, 1655), show that there has been no continuous use of the language, "Whose sins," etc. None of the Greek ordinals use them; and out of thirty-seven Latin ordinals, only two, and those the latest, employ them.¹ Even as to the imposition of hands, the silence of the *Apostolical Constitutions and Canons*, and other early documents, leaves it very doubtful whether this was generally used; and we have seen one liturgical writer of the early Middle Ages declare that there was no authority for the usage, and especially none in Roman tradition. "In the New Testament," writes Dr. Cranmer,² the author of the declaration we are discussing, "he that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest, needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointing thereto is sufficient."

Archbishop Cranmer lived in communion and correspondence with the Protestant Churches of the Continent—first the Lutheran and then the Reformed—from before his accession to the primacy to the time of his martyrdom. He invited Martin Butzer, Paul Fagius, Immanuel Tremellius, and other Reformed scholars to aid in the work of the English Reformation. He wanted to make John Knox an English bishop, and, failing in that, he accepted him as one of the chaplains of King Edward VI. He and his associates in the preparation of the first Edwardine Book of Common Prayer (1549) made free use of the Lutheran liturgies, especially that prepared for Nuremberg by his kinsman by marriage, Andreas Osiander (1533), and that proposed by Archbishop Hermann von Wied for Cologne (Koeln) in 1543, and translated into

¹ *The Christian Ministry*, by Dean Lefroy, pp. 391–396.

² *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters* (Parker Society), p. 117.

English in 1547. From the Genevan liturgy of John Calvin (1538–1541), and the suggestions of Martin Butzer, came most of the variations found in the second Edwardine Book (1552). The first book is substantially Lutheran; the second substantially Calvinist, in accordance with the archbishop's own change of theological position between 1549 and 1552, under the influence of "my lord of London, Doctor Ridley," as he said in his examination at Oxford in 1555.¹

The period of the Marian persecution and exile (1553–1558) developed sharp antagonism between Anglicans and Puritans in the matter of liturgic usages, but not as to the government of the Church. Even the Anglican party among the exiles in the English church at Frankfort, after driving out Knox, Knollys and Whittingham by enforcing the English liturgy, organized their church after the model of Geneva, with pastor, elders and deacons, and wrote to Calvin to justify their proceedings.² The friends of the Genevan discipline wished to see the Church attain a greater measure of independent action through the creation of national and local synods, and the vigorous exercise of discipline upon public offenders. But Elizabeth would have neither. She resolved to maintain the old hierarchy, without any other restriction upon its powers than its complete subjection to her royal will. She would not even tolerate the meetings of the clergy for mutual instruction and edification, called "Prophesyings," and she suspended Archbishop Grindal from the exercise of his office because he refused to suppress them at her bidding. It was part of her political programme to keep up

¹ *The Lutheran Movement in England*, by Dr. H. E. Jacobs (Philadelphia, 1890).

² *A Brief Discours off The Troubles Begonne at Frankfort in Germany, Anno Domini 1554, about the Booke off Common Prayer and Ceremonies* [by William Whittingham]. (London (1575), 1846, pp. cxvii–cxviii.)

a system of ecclesiastical pomp, by way of showing the Catholic sovereigns of the Continent how little she had departed from the mediæval tradition. Archbishops Parker and Whitgift, who moved about their province with a grand escort of knights and men-at-arms, were bishops after her heart.

It was not easy for the queen to establish the English hierarchy on its new basis of Erastian subjection to the sovereign, and power to dictate to everybody else. Not one of the bishops in actual charge of English and Welsh sees at her accession would assist her in this. Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff, was the only one who would recognize her as "supreme governor as well in spiritual as in temporal things," the title adopted at the persuasion of Thomas Lever instead of her father's "supreme Head of the Church." But Anthony of Llandaff had held his diocese under her father, her brother and her sister, and his assent did not count for much. As to helping in consecrating a new archbishop to fill the place left by the martyrdom of Cranmer and the death of Pole, that he would not, and his refusal seems to have been forgiven, possibly on account of his age.

Bishops Bourn of Bath and Wells, Tunstall of Durham and Poole of Petersborough were also asked, and refused to act. To Bishops Bonner, Turberville, White, Watson, Thirlby, Brookes, Baines, Heath, Oglethorpe, Morgan, and Thornton she did not apply, as she knew what their answer would be. Bishops Scott, Pate and Goldwell had fled the kingdom. So a fresh commission was issued to six bishops without sees to perform the consecration, and four of the six complied. These were:

(1) William Barlow, successively Bishop of St. Asaph (1535-1536), St. David's (1536-1542), and Bath and Wells (1548-1553). He had resigned the last at the accession

of Queen Mary, and recanted, but escaped to the Continent. Not only is there no record of his having been consecrated bishop in 1535, but the chronology of his movements in the diplomatic service of King Henry leaves no room for the transaction. Nor did he feel the need of it, for he had declared in a sermon that "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, or the best in England."¹

(2) John Scory also had been removed from the see of Chichester at the accession of Mary; and he also had recanted, but had escaped to the Continent, and made his way to Geneva. He preached at the consecration, on the text 1 Peter v: i: "The elders among you I exhort, who am also an elder." I do not remember hearing of that text being used on any other such occasion.

(3) Miles Coverdale, made Bishop of Exeter by King Edward, had been removed by Queen Mary, but allowed to retire to the Continent. His Puritan sympathies were shown by his refusal to wear the episcopal vestments even at the consecration, and by his never performing another episcopal act.

(4) John Hodgkyn had been made Suffragan-Bishop of Bedford in 1537, to relieve Bishop Stokesley of some of the burdensome duties of the see of London. After that bishop's death, in 1537, he seems to have fallen back into the ranks of the parish priests, from which he was re-

¹ Bishop Barlow's movements in 1535 are traced in an article in *The Methodist Review* by Rev. Richard J. Cook. High Anglicans take comfort from his *Dialogue on the Lutheran Factions* (1531, 1553, 1897) as indicating antagonism to the continental reformers, and thus going to show sound Anglo-Catholic sympathies, and a probability that he was correctly consecrated. It proves nothing of the sort. In the situation of affairs in 1531 scandal at the expense of Luther and the Lutherans was a marketable article in England, and Barlow was not the man to miss his chance. Bishop Stokesley of London ordered his clergy to procure copies. Equally well timed was its reprint in the year when Mary came to the throne.

called for this service. He took off the episcopal vestments before the consecration was completed, and never acted as bishop again.

It is for canonical casuists to decide whether these three Puritans and one Erastian really acted with the "intention" to consecrate Matthew Parker a bishop in the sense recognized by Roman Catholics and Anglicans. The former also object that neither in the prayer preceding imposition of hands, nor in the words spoken with that act to the person to be consecrated, does the old *Ordinal* mention any office to which he is set apart, so that all that was said might have been spoken with equal propriety at the ordination of a presbyter. At the revision of the *Ordinal* in 1662 this was corrected by changing the address to read "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God." But in the meantime more than two hundred bishops had been consecrated by a form which left it undefined whether they were to be bishops or not.

I shall not here dispute the contention that there is no break in the history of the English church, in the transition from being the church *in* England to being the Church *of* England, which was effected under the Tudors. But no such continuity as Mr. Freeman and his school claimed for that church can be based upon the succession of its bishops. The hierarchy Elizabeth found at her accession was swept out of office literally to the last man, that feeble old "Vicar of Bray," Anthony of Llandaff, who constitutes the one common member of the episcopate of 1558 and that of 1561. Nine sees, it is true, were vacant by death when the bishops were required to assent to the new system or to be "deprived." But seventeen were still occupied by canonical bishops, sixteen of whom the queen put out with the strong hand, because they

would not take the oath of obedience to her as "the only supreme governor of this realm, as well in spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal," and renounce the jurisdiction of the pope. To exhibit the gravity of the change I shall give a list of Marian and Elizabethan bishops of those seventeen sees:

MARIAN	SEES	ELIZABETHAN
Cuthbert Scott	Chester	William Downham
Richard Pate	Worcester	Edwin Sandys
Ralph Baynes	Lichfield and Coventry	Thomas Bentham
Edmund Bonner	London	Edmund Grindal
James Turberville	Exeter	William Alley
John White	Winchester	Robert Horne
Gilbert Bourne	Bath and Wells	Gilbert Berkley
Thomas Watson	Lincoln	Nicholas Bullingham
Thomas Thirlby	Ely	Richard Cox
James Brookes	Gloucester	Richard Cheney
David Pole	Peterborough	Edmund Scambler
Nicholas Heath	York	Thomas Young (1561)
Cuthbert Tunstall	Durham	James Pilkington
Owen Oglethorpe	Carlisle	John Best
Thomas Goldwell	St. Asaph's	Richard Davies
Henry Morgan	St. David's	Thomas Young (1560)
Anthony Kitchin	Llandaff	Anthony Kitchin

Five of the "deprived" had been bishops under Henry VIII, and had acknowledged him as "supreme Head of the Church of England," viz., Bishops Pate, Bonner, Thirlby, Heath and Tunstall. Seven others of the sixteen had held Church preferment in his reign, and must have made the same acknowledgment. But apart from his quarrel with the pope about the divorce, Henry stood on Roman Catholic ground, being no heretic, but a schismatic Roman Catholic, while Elizabeth was driven by her position as the daughter of Anne Boleyn to make common cause with the Reformers. The Convocation of the Church of England, meeting in 1559, drew up five articles declaring for the Romanist position, and including the supremacy of the pope; but Elizabeth ignored Convoca-

tion, and proceeded through her Parliament to reduce the Church to her obedience, and through a committee of divines to revise the worship of its congregations. Everything was done in defiance of the episcopal bench, and without any canonical process against those who were swept from it by her sole authority, to make room for the queen's nominees.¹ It was not until 1597, when Archbishop Parker and the other prelates of this creation were all dead, that the deprivation of the Marian bishops was declared legal by act of Parliament, and the legality of the Protestant succession affirmed.

Partly through policy, to conciliate Continental rulers by showing them how little she had altered the outward form of the Church, and partly through her personal tastes for formality and splendor, Elizabeth stopped the changes in the order and worship of the Church far short of what the Protestant part of her people and clergy desired. The statesmen of her reign generally wished for a more thorough reformation, in both government and ritual. Sir Francis Knollys, her kinsman and Treasurer of the Household; Lord Burghley (Sir William Cecil) and Sir Francis Walsingham, her two great Secretaries of State; Sir Walter Mildmay, her Chancellor of the Exchequer; the Earl of Huntington, her President of the North; Lord Grey of Wilton and the Earl of Essex, both Lords Lieutenant of Ireland; the Earl of Leicester, her prime favorite; his worthy brother, the Earl of Warwick; his still more worthy nephew, Sir Philip Sidney; and Sidney's great friend Edmund Spenser, were all on the side which came to be nicknamed Puritan. The poet upholds as an ideal churchman Bishop Grindal, who endured virtual deposition rather than do her bidding, and who spoke his mind to her with the freedom of Ambrose to

¹ *Church and State under the Tudors*, by Gilbert W. Child, pp. 180-190.

Theodosius, or of Andrew Melville to King James. For even her bishops of the earlier creation were no zealots for her system. Jewel of Salisbury, the most able and learned of them, especially in the field of patristic scholarship, accepted and retained the office with great reluctance, and expressed his admiration for the thoroughness of the Scottish reformation, and for the Church of Geneva, where he had seen "four thousand people and more receiving the holy mysteries together at one communion."

During the first thirty years of her reign nothing was heard of those claims to a more apostolic ministry than was possessed by the Reformed churches of the Continent and of Scotland. Nor did the laws favor such claims. The statute 13 Elizabeth, Cap. XII ("An Act for the Ministers of the Church to be of sound Religion"), enacts that:

Every person under the degree of a bishop, which doth or shall pretend to be a priest or minister of God's holy word and sacrament, by reason of any other form of institution, consecration or ordering, than the form set forth by Parliament in the time of King Edward the Sixth, or now used, . . . shall in the presence of the bishop or guardian of the spiritualities of some one diocese where he hath or shall have ecclesiastical living, declare his assent and subscribe to all the Articles of Religion, . . . and shall bring from such bishop or guardian a testimonial of such assent or subscription, and openly on some Sunday in the time of public service afore noon, in every church where by reason of any ecclesiastical living he ought to attend, read both the said testimonial and the said Articles, upon pain that every such person . . . shall be *ipso facto* deprived.¹

This covers the case both of Roman Catholic clerics conforming to the Church of England, and (as Bishop Cosin points out) that of ministers of the other Reformed churches entering the service of the Church of England. In neither case is a reordination required or even author-

¹ *Church and State under the Tudors*, by Gilbert W. Child, p. 407.

ized. All that is exacted is a subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. Nor was the law a dead letter. Besides many which have escaped notice, because there was nothing extraordinary to call attention to them, there are on record several cases in this and the next reign. Two of these are notable:

(a) Archbishop Grindal in 1582 issued a license to preach and to administer the sacraments to a Scotchman named John Morrison, stating that he had been ordained "by the imposition of hands, according to the laudable form and rite of the Church of Scotland."

(b) Hadrian Saravia, a minister of the Dutch Church, removed to the Channel Islands in 1550, but returned to Leyden as professor of divinity in 1582. Six years later we find him in England, and rector of the parish of Tattenhall in Cheshire, and afterwards of that at Great Chart, where he died in 1613. He was a eulogist of episcopacy, and a friend of Richard Hooker, to whom he administered the communion the day before his death, in 1600. He urged those of the ministers of the Channel Islands who were born subjects of the queen to accept episcopal ordination, but he never received it himself.¹

Three cases are alleged as having an opposite bearing from those I have mentioned; but they prove the same thing.

(c) Among the Marian exiles, William Whittingham had supported Knox in "the troubles at Frankfurt" with Dr. Cox and the advocates of the disputed ceremonies. He followed Knox to Geneva, and when the reformer returned to Scotland in 1558, Whittingham was called to the pastorate of the church of English exiles in that city. He had not been ordained, and believed he was fitter for civil than for ecclesiastical service; but Calvin overcame

¹ *Church and State under the Tudors*, by G. W. Child, p. 300.

his reluctance and he accepted the office. As ordination "by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" was the usage at Geneva, it may be assumed that he received this. After filling other responsible places in the Church of England, he was made Dean of Durham in 1563. Dr. Edmund Sandys, Archbishop of York, who quarreled with everybody, had a dispute with Dean Whittingham as to his right of visitation of Durham Cathedral. In 1577 he procured the appointment of a commission of three—himself, the Earl of Huntington and Dean Hutton of York—to report upon charges brought against the Dean of Durham. The others voted to report in Dr. Whittingham's favor. Next year he got the commission reconstituted by adding twelve members, and before this it was alleged that the dean had not been ordained properly even according to the use of Geneva, so Dr. Sandys proposed to deprive him. The Earl of Huntington, who was President of the North, protested against this as an insult to the Reformed churches abroad, and laid the matter before the queen, who seems to have ordered a stay of proceedings. Archbishop Whitgift is authority for the statement—often repeated—that it was only the dean's death on June 10, 1579, which prevented his removal. But as the Archbishop of York had proposed this some half-year before, and as nothing was doing with his report, this is more than improbable. In fact Dr. Whitgift was busy at the time with troubles on the Welsh frontier, and knew nothing at first hand about what was happening at Durham.

From Strype we learn that Dr. Whittingham produced a certificate, signed at Geneva by eight persons, stating that he had been chosen to "the office of preaching the word of God and ministering the sacraments" "by the suffrages of the whole congregation," and "was admitted

minister, and so published, with such other ceremonies as are used and accustomed." It was objected by Dr. Sandys and his party that "there was no mention of a bishop or superintendent, nor of any external solemnities, nor so much as of imposition of hands." It was answered by Dr. Whittingham that in the certificate "there was mention in general of the ceremonies of that church; and that he was able to prove his vocation to be the same that all the ministers of Geneva had." The Earl of Huntington then said that he could not in conscience agree to deprive him for that cause only; for "it would be ill taken by all the godly and learned both 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." Dean Hutton, afterward Archbishop of York, boldly averred that "Dean Whittingham was ordained in a better sort than even the archbishop himself."¹

(d) Thomas Cartwright, a scholar of singular learning and ability, and the senior fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, held the Lady Margaret Professorship of Divinity in that university in 1569-70, although only in deacon's orders. He drew large audiences to his lectures, and in discoursing on the Apostolic Church referred to the difference between its plan of government and that of the Church of England, expressing a hope that a closer conformity would be attained. As the university then stood, it was impossible to get at him; so new statutes were devised, taking the control out of the hands of the members of the university generally, and giving it to the Heads of Houses. Dr. Whitgift, the vice-chancellor, first removed him from his professorship, and then had him expelled from his fellowship, on the ground that he had violated

¹ Child's *Church and State under the Tudors*, pp. 228-230. Neal's *History of the Puritans* (New York, 1849), i, 185. Strype's *Whitgift*.

his oath in not applying for "priest's orders" when he became senior fellow. Dr. Cartwright proceeded to Holland, and was ordained by a Dutch presbytery, and afterwards united with other English ministers in forming a presbytery at Antwerp, which was still a Protestant city and a great resort of English merchants. These invited him to exercise his ministry among them, which he did, until his return to England on the capture of the city by the Spaniards in 1585, when all Protestants were expelled from it.

During a visit to England, in 1572-73, he engaged in controversy with Dr. Whitgift as to the right government and discipline of the Church, defending the Genevan positions. On his return in 1585 he took part in a secret movement to set up in England a voluntary association, partly for unity of action on the part of those who desired these reforms, and partly for the exercise of mutual admonition in the direction of a better discipline of social life. This movement was betrayed to the bishops by a weak brother, and Dr. Cartwright was arrested and, along with others, was taken before the Court of High Commission, and there required to take an oath to answer all questions the court should put to them. This the prisoners refused to do, as being neither authorized by English law nor by natural justice; and they were kept under imprisonment in the Fleet prison, where Dr. Cartwright remained for nearly two years, to the injury of his health. Lord Burghley at last secured his liberation, and he returned to his charge at Warwick, where the Earl of Leicester had made him the master of the hospital—a clerical position—in 1585. Here he labored till his death in 1603, except for a visit to the Channel Islands in 1595-98, whither he was invited by the royal governor, Lord Zouch, that he might assist in organizing the churches of that Norman-French

population. He had already taken part in this work in 1676, when invited from Amsterdam by their churches.

The charges brought against him before the Court of High Commission in 1590 declare that:

He being a minister (at least a deacon), lawfully called, according to the godly laws and orders of this Church of England, hath forsaken, abandoned and renounced the same orders ecclesiastical, as an Anti-Christian and unlawful manner of calling unto the ministry or deaconship.

He, departing this realm into foreign parts, without license, as a man discontented with the form of government here by law established, the more to testify his dislike and contempt thereof, and of the manner of his former vocation and ordination, was contented in foreign parts, as at Antwerp, Middleburgh, or elsewhere, to have a new vocation, election, or ordination, by imposition of hands unto the ministry, or unto some other order or degree ecclesiastical, and in other manner and form than the laws ecclesiastical of this realm do prescribe.

By virtue or color of such his later vocation, election, or ordination, becoming a pretended bishop or pastor of such congregation as made choice of him, he established, or procured to be established, at Antwerp and at Middleburgh, among merchants and others, her Majesty's subjects, a certain consistory, seminary, presbytery, or eldership ecclesiastical, consisting of himself, being bishop or pastor (and so president) thereof, of a doctor, of certain ancients, seniors, or elders, for government ecclesiastical, and of deacons for distributing to the poor.

By the said eldership, and the authority thereof, certain English-born subjects were called, elected, or ordained by imposition of hands, to be ministers or ecclesiastical doctors (being not of that degree before), as Hart, Travers, Grise, or some of them; and some that were also ministers afore according to the orders of the Church of England, as Fenner, Acton, were so called, and likewise ordained elders; and some others were ordained deacons, in other manner and form than the laws ecclesiastical of the realm do prescribe and allow of.

To these charges Dr. Cartwright offered no denial, nor did he deny his connection with the private meetings of ministers who desired a farther reform of the Church of England, while he denied that these meetings assumed any ecclesiastical authority, such as ordination or excommunication. It was such a voluntary association as high

Anglicans now form freely, and sometimes with quite as much privacy, in the Church of England, and nothing is thought of it. But in the Elizabethan period the freedom of individual action had not been won for even High Churchmen by "dissenters"; and these new "prophesyings" were as much feared and detested as were those for which Archbishop Grindal had suffered.

With the interruption of his arrest in 1590-92, Cartwright exercised his ministry in England and in the Channel Islands until his death; and yet his only ordination to the presbyterate was that he received in Holland. The *Ordinal* of 1549 conferred the right to preach on presbyters, but not upon deacons unless "he be commanded by the bishop." There is no evidence that Dr. Cartwright ever received any such license, and his own principles, from which he never swerved, must have forbidden him to apply for it. The efforts of the English prelates to suppress his activity awakened a general resistance among the most prominent lay churchmen of the time; and even King James, who had called him to a professorship at St. Andrews when he was laboring at Antwerp, wrote to the queen in 1591 to protest against the treatment this eminent champion of the Protestant cause was receiving at the hands of her bishops. It was probably the fear of what that king might do on coming to the English throne which made Archbishop Whitgift yield to the pressure of Burghley for his release. Leicester and Walsingham urged him in 1582 to write his *Confutation of the Rhemish Translation of the New Testament*, and the latter gave him a hundred pounds for the purchase of the books he needed. But Dr. Whitgift managed to suppress it, and it did not appear until 1618.¹

¹ *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Cartwright, D.D.*, by the Rev. B. Brook (London, 1845). Fuller's *Church History of England*, ii-iii.

(e) Walter Travers, although a doctor of divinity of Oxford, could obtain neither ordination nor permission to preach because he did not feel free to use a few of the ceremonies prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer. He also proceeded to the Continent, and—as we have just seen—was ordained by the English presbytery at Antwerp, and exercised his ministry among the English merchants. He returned to England in 1581, and was chosen by the lawyers their afternoon lecturer at the Temple Church in London. When the mastership of the Temple Church fell vacant in 1584, the benchers asked Dr. Whitgift, then Archbishop of Canterbury, to give Travers the place. This the primate refused to do, unless he would subscribe the three new articles against non-conformity, and submit to reordination by a bishop. As Dr. Travers refused both, the place was given to Richard Hooker. He refused reordination on the ground that he would thus cast doubt on the validity of the marriages and baptisms he had performed, and would impugn the sufficiency of the orders of “the other churches of the gospel.” And he appealed to the provisions of the Statute 2 Elizabeth 13, which required of those who had been ordained in the Reformed churches of the Continent no more than a subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, adding “which also was so found in Mr. Whittingham’s case, who, notwithstanding such replies against him, enjoyed still the benefit he had by his ministry, and might have done so to this day, if God had spared his life so long.” Yet he went on preaching in the Temple Church until Dr. Whitgift silenced him for answering from the pulpit what he thought erroneous in Hooker’s morning sermons at the Temple, although he himself had done the same with Dr. Cartwright’s sermons at Cambridge. Archbishop Adam Loftus of Dublin, in 1595, called Dr. Travers to

the provostship of Trinity College in that city; and there he had James Ussher as his pupil and his friend. Like all such places in that time, this was a clerical position; but his Presbyterian ordination was no obstacle to the appointment.¹

A fine fraternal spirit was shown in the treatment accorded to the churches of Protestant refugees from France and the Low Countries, which were settled in London, Sandwich, Maidstone, Colchester, Canterbury and Norwich. These brought with them industries which England lacked, including market-gardening and several branches of manufacture, and thus contributed to the welfare of the country. The charters given them by Elizabeth placed them under the care of the bishop of the diocese in which they were planted, but this only to enable them to enforce the discipline and maintain the worship of their own communion, and not to bring them into conformity with the Church of England. Some of their laxer members sought to escape the severe and effective discipline of their church sessions by joining the parish churches. But even the High Anglican bishops, down to the period of Archbishop Laud's ascendancy, resisted this and constrained such recalcitrants to conform to the Genevan order.²

Throughout Elizabeth's reign both the royal government and the hierarchy of the Church of England regarded that church as one of a sisterhood of churches, united in confession of the gospel and in resistance to the counter-Reformation represented by the Jesuit Order. They saw in their differences from other Reformed churches matters of only secondary importance, while those on

¹ Fuller's *Church History of England*, iii, 125-132. Child's *Church and State under the Tudors*, pp. 230-233. See also Strype's *Whitgift* and Brooks' *Cartwright*.

² *Church and State under the Tudors*, by Child, pp. 202-203, 210-211.

which they agreed were the great things of Christ's kingdom. Tendencies were already at work which one day would destroy this harmony, would isolate the Church of England from the other Reformed churches as completely as from the Latin and Greek churches, and would divide England into hostile ecclesiastical camps. But it was not until the reign of Charles I that these tendencies became dominant in the councils of either Church or state.¹

¹ *The Constitutional History and Constitution of the Church of England*. Translated from the German of Felix Makower (London, 1895). Pp. 177-182: "*The Relation of the Reformed Church of England to other Christian Churches of Modern Times.*"

CHAPTER IX

STUART ANGLICANISM

The accession of James VI of Scotland to the throne of England in 1603 proved to be the opening of a new age in both Church and state to both countries. At the opening of the six Stuart reigns the bounds of the royal prerogative were undefined; at their close the English Constitution had taken the shape of substantial democracy under monarchic forms. At their opening Church and state were almost coterminous, the whole body of the English people being in the Anglican communion, and, whatever the desire of the majority for a farther reformation, men of all shades of thought clung to the Church of England as a chief bulwark of the cause of the Reformation. At their close England was rent into two antagonistic bodies, the Establishment and Nonconformity, and has so continued down to our own time. The two transformations are closely related, but while the English state has come to rest and equilibrium after the devastations of a civil war and the expulsion of the Stuart dynasty, ecclesiastical England has not emerged out of the antagonisms of the seventeenth century, and is only beginning to ask how she may do so. And the matter is the graver as this state of division and antagonism has been transplanted to America, and to all the colonies of the British Empire. While none of the countries of the Reformation have quite escaped ecclesiastical division,

none, except possibly Holland, presents such a scene of disunion as do England and America.

While many causes have contributed to this unfortunate result, the greatest was that the Church of England came under the control of statesmen and churchmen who were out of sympathy with the body of the people, and who mistook the temper of Englishmen in the matter of religious coercion. While English liberty undoubtedly was advantaged by the unwisdom which pressed the royal prerogative to the utmost, and thus provoked a reaction which hardened into established rules for the restraint of executive power, English religion has lost far more and gained far less in the rending of sympathies and the perpetuation of strife.

While King James, at the very outset of his reign, showed his decided prepossession for the High Anglican party, yet this was not on grounds, and with regard to questions, which concern us here. He, indeed, had acquired a life-long dislike of Presbyterianism, and labored to bring the Church of Scotland into conformity with that of England as regards episcopal government and the introduction of a few Anglican usages. But even in these things he used a great degree of caution, although he could not divest them of a foreign character, or make palatable to the Kirk the Erastian principles on which he was acting. His successor, with Archbishop Laud as his trusted adviser, went farther than did his father, largely because he had no acquaintance with the temper of the Scottish people, and because Laud and his school upheld the royal prerogative for the control of both Church and state. The final outburst of 1637 was against a policy which subjected Scottish nationality to the dictation of English churchmen, and against the assumption of the omnipotence of royal authority in the regulation of the Church, no less

than against the objectionable Romanizing features of what the people called "Laud's liturgy." It was an assertion of the right of the realm and of its kirk to self-government, against Anglicanism and Erastianism allied for the degradation of both.

During the first Stuart reign, and before Dr. Laud had acquired the place of adviser to the king, the Tudor policy was maintained in the recognition of the other Reformed churches as in communion with the Church of England, and of their ministry as valid despite its lack of episcopal ordination.

(1) The *Constitutions or Canons Ecclesiastical* adopted by the Convocation of 1604 for the Province of Canterbury, in their fifty-fifth article direct all preachers, before sermon, to pray "for the holy Catholic Church of Christ, that is, the universal congregation of Christian people, dispersed and scattered throughout the world, but especially for the Churches of England, Scotland and Ireland." Yet at that time, and for six years afterwards, the Church of Scotland was a Presbyterian Church, for her nominal bishops had no authority, and no ordination beyond that conferred on them "by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."¹

(2) As for the Reformed churches of the Continent, the same friendly relations were maintained as in the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth. Nobody thought of claiming for the Church of England a character which would break the bonds of sisterhood in which she had lived for more than half a century, and to which she owed so much in

¹ *Constitutiones sive Canones Ecclesiasticæ. . . . ex regia Autoritate tractati et conclusi in Synodo inchoata Londoni Anno Salutis 1603, Ab Regia Majestate approbati, rati, habiti et confirmati, ejusdemque cum magno Sigillo Autoritate promulgati* (London: 1604). Canon 55: *Omnes Concionatores & Ministri in aditu suæ Concionis, Lecturæ & Homiliæ populum hortabuntur, ut secum in precibus concurrat in hunc et similem modum, idque (quantum licet) summaria brevitate: 'Precamini pro Christi sancta Ecclesia Catholica, id est, pro universo cœtu Christiani populi per orbem terrarum diffusi ac disseminati, specialiter vero pro Ecclesiis Angliæ, Scotiæ & Hiberniæ; etc.*

the years of the Marian persecution. The liveliest sympathy was felt for the sufferings of Continental Protestants, and aid was sent them in the distresses which attended war and persecution. The Church of Holland was troubled with the rise of Arminianism, and invited her sister churches to meet her in a general synod at Dort in 1618, to discuss the matter. King James, as head of the Church of England, sent thither five dignitaries of that church, two of them already bishops, and two afterwards made such. They, along with the other delegates, took an oath to decide the questions at issue according to the word of God; and at the close, they gave their assent to the Belgic Confession of 1562 (which the synod adopted), with exceptions to its statements about the government of the Church, claiming that that of the Church of England is founded upon apostolic institution.

It will not do to object that this was the act of King James, and not that of the Church of England. He had been acknowledged by the bishops and other clergy of the church as its "supreme governor in all cases ecclesiastical and civil." It was done by the same authority as Elizabeth had used in displacing the sixteen bishops she found in possession of sees in the Church in 1558, and in replacing them with others of her own selection by 1562.

Nor was King James's action without precedent. In the last quarter of the sixteenth century the Lutherans of Germany were drawing sharply the line of separation between themselves and the Reformed Churches, especially in the matter of the nature of the real presence in the sacrament, and the doctrine of predestination. The Formula of Concord was drawn up for this purpose, and there was planned a national synod of the Lutheran churches for its adoption, to meet in 1578. Queen Elizabeth had already asked the King of Denmark to intercede

with the Elector of Saxony to prevent any condemnation of the doctrine of the Church of England, and had met with a polite rebuff from that representative of unqualified Lutheranism. Her government appointed several theologians of high standing in the Church of England, to proceed to Schmalkald and attend this synod. But the plan for a synod fell through, as Martin Chemnitz would not attend it unless he were given security that there should be no alteration of the Formula of Concord. That statement of Lutheran doctrine was adopted by most of the Evangelical churches of Germany individually, and not by united action.¹

(3) The reception of ministers of the Reformed churches of the Continent to clerical positions in England, without reordination, continued under James I, as provided in the Act of Elizabeth 13. Bishop Hall says of this: "I know those more than one, who by virtue only of that ordination they have brought with them from the other Reformed churches, have enjoyed spiritual promotion and livings." Bishop Cosin writes from France in Commonwealth times, to justify his holding communion with the Reformed Church of France: "If at any time a minister so ordained in their French churches, came to incorporate himself into ours, and to receive a charge of souls among us in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have done so of late, and 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 had been void."² As the religious troubles in France and the Low Countries drove many such into

¹ The correspondence is given in Leonard Hutter's *Concordia Concors* (Wittenberg, 1621), and in Rudolph Hospinian's *Concordia Discors* (Geneva, 1678). The negotiations are described in Heinrich Heppe's history of the Formula of Concord. The Queen wrote to the King of Denmark that the only hope of the Papacy was in the discord of the Protestants (*unicam salutis sitæ spem positam esse videt Romanus Anti-Christus in nostris dissidiis*).

² Child's *Church and State under the Tudors*, p. 299.

England, the number of presbyterially ordained rectors must have been considerable. "More than one," says Bishop Hall; "many," says Dr. Cosin. Known cases are:

(a) Guillaume de Laune, who rendered the Book of Common Prayer into French for the use of the churches in the Channel Islands, made application to Dr. John Overall, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield (1614-1618), for installation in a benefice to which he had been appointed, and offered to submit to reordination if that he had from the Classis of Leyden were thought insufficient. Bishop Overall replied: "Reordination we must not admit, no more than a rebaptism; but in case you find it doubtful whether you be a priest capable to receive benefice among us, or no, I shall do the same office for you that I should do for one who doubts of his baptism, according to the Book of Common Prayer, 'If thou hast not already,' etc. Yet for mine own part, if you will adventure upon the orders you have, I will admit your presentation, and give you institution into the living howsoever." De Laune afterwards was admitted to a benefice without any reordination.¹

(b) Isaac Casaubon, the most erudite scholar of that age, was attracted to the Church of England by its deference to patristic antiquity. He came to England in 1610, and, although a layman, was given a prebendal stall in Canterbury Cathedral. He became the intimate friend of Bishop Andrewes, who confirmed his son Meric Casaubon, but the father was received to communion without any such ceremony. He defended Andrewes against Romanist criticism in his notable *Epistle to Fronto Ducæus*. That great and devout bishop was on terms of close friendship with other Continental Protestants—Francis Junius, the great founder of Germanic philology; Daniel Heinsius, the

¹ Child: 297-298.

first Latin poet of his age, secretary to the Synod of Dort, and a philologist of European fame; Hugo Grotius, the great ornament of the Arminian party; Philip Cluverius, the first who brought science and method into the study of ancient geography; Thomas, the great Dutch Orientalist, whom he tried to attract to England; and Pierre du Moulin.

(c) Pierre du Moulin, at one time pastor of the famous French church at Charenton, as near Paris as a Huguenot church would be allowed, came to England in 1615, and assisted King James in his *King's Declaration for His Royal Right*. He was also given a prebendal stall at Canterbury, but went back to Sedan as professor of theology. Bishop Andrewes had some correspondence with him as to the claims of episcopacy to apostolic origin, which the bishop defended. But he also wrote: "Though our government be of divine right, it follows not that without it there is no salvation, or that a church cannot exist. He must be blind who does not see churches existing without it. He must be made of iron who denies them salvation. We are not those iron people. We make a wide difference between those things."¹

(d) His son, Peter du Moulin, also a minister of the Reformed Church of France, became rector of St. John's Church in Chester in 1625. He supported the Royalists in the Civil War, and was rewarded with a canonry at Canterbury and a royal chaplaincy at the Restoration. He was one of Milton's antagonists in the controversy as to the execution of Charles I.²

(e) Marco Antonio de Dominis, former Archbishop of Spalatro, during his Anglican period and residence in England (1616-1622), asked Dr. Thomas Morton, Bishop of Durham, to reordain a friend of his who had been

¹ Child's *Church and State under the Tudors*, pp. 300-301.

² Child, p. 301.

ordained in one of the foreign Reformed churches, that he might have "freer access to ecclesiastical benefices in England." Bishop Morton wrote to him that this could not be done without very grave scandal to the Reformed churches, for which he did not care to be responsible.¹

(f) Gerard John Vossius, a minister of the Reformed Church of Holland, whose genius gave a new life to the study of classic antiquity, was invited over from Leyden by James I, and given a canonry at Canterbury, in 1629. His son, Isaac Vossius, also a minister of the Reformed Church of Holland, was the discoverer of the Medicean manuscript of the Ignatian epistles, in which was found the shorter recension of the Greek. Bishop Pearson, who defended the genuineness of that recension, invited him to England in 1670, and in 1673 he was made canon of Windsor. It was of him that Charles II said: "Here is a learned divine, who believes everything but the Bible."

(g) In 1610 King James summoned to London John Spottiswoode, Andrew Lamb and Gavin Hamilton, three of the Scottish ministers whom he had invested with the title of bishop, and had them consecrated by the Bishops of London (George Abbot), Ely (Launcelot Andrewes), Worcester (Henry Parry), and Rochester (Richard Neale). To avoid the appearance of reviving claims of the Archbishops of York and Canterbury to jurisdiction over Scotland, they were excluded, but Dr. Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, was present. "A question was raised," says Archbishop Spottiswoode, "by Dr. Andrewes, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish bishops, who, as he said, 'must first be ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop.' The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained that 'there was no necessity, seeing that

¹ Child: pp. 298-299.

where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise it might be doubted if there was 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."¹

This is the testimony of an eyewitness and a participant. But Dr. Peter Heylin, who was ten years old when this took place, gives a version of what was said which some Anglican historians much prefer. It is that Dr. Bancroft removed the scruples of Dr. Andrewes by the argument that episcopal orders could be conferred at once even on a layman, alleging the cases of Ambrose and Nectarius. When four other Scotch ministers were made bishops in 1661, Dr. Sheldon, Bishop of London, insisted on reordaining two of them, James Sharp and Robert Leighton, because they had been ordained by a presbytery, although Sharp appealed to the precedent of 1610, and Leighton said, "I am persuaded I was in orders before."²

(4) The kindly relations to the "alien churches" in England lasted through the reign of James I. Shortly after the king's accession, Bishop Vaughan was welcomed by them to his new diocese of London. They reminded him that their churches were granted by charter from pious King Edward VI, in the year 1550; that although they had been dispersed by the persecution under Queen Mary, they had been restored to their privileges by Queen Elizabeth in 1558, and had been in uninterrupted possession of these for nearly half a century. "It appears from our records,"

¹ *History of the Church of Scotland*, by Archbishop John Spottiswoode (Edinburgh, 1851), iii, 208-209. This is the "Precedent of 1610," to which the Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops referred in 1909.

² *The Episcopal Church of Scotland*, by J. P. Lawson, pp. 715-716.

they said, "how kind and friendly the pious Grindal was to us; and what pains the prudent Bishop Sandys took in composing our differences. We promise ourselves the like favor from your lordship." Bishop Vaughan replied: "I thank you, most dear brethren, for your kind address. I am sensible of the merits of John a Lasco, superintendent of your churches, and of the rest of my predecessors in this bishopric, who had reason to take your churches, which are of the same faith with our own, under their patronage, which I also am ready to do. I have known your churches twenty-five years to have been beneficial to the kingdom and serviceable to the Church of England, in which the Devil, the author of discord, has kindled the fire of dissensions, into which I pray you not to pour oil, but to endeavor by your councils and prayers to extinguish."

The king himself said to a deputation from these presbyterially governed churches: "I am sensible that you have enriched this kingdom with several arts and manufactures; and I swear to you that if anyone shall give you the least disturbance in your churches, upon your application to me, I will revenge your cause; and though you are no subjects of mine, I will maintain and cherish you as much as any prince in the world."

The Anglican bishops acted in the same spirit. We find Dr. John King, Bishop of London, forbidding members of the alien churches to evade their discipline by withdrawing to the parish churches, and Dr. Harsnet, Bishop of Norwich, constraining one man to submit to their discipline and contribute to their support. Dr. Andrewes, in a published sermon, praised them for the care they took of their poor, "so that not one of these is seen to ask on the streets."

The position of the churches in the Channel Islands was similar to that of the alien churches. Their people had

received the principles of the Reformation from the French churches of Normandy, and they naturally adopted the Genevan regimen and discipline. In one of their churches the queen expressly sanctioned this, but enjoined the use of the English Book of Common Prayer in the rest. The governors of the islands found this impracticable, and the Genevan discipline and worship were set up by synods held under the countenance of the queen's representatives. On his accession King James made a grant under the privy seal, stating that his predecessor "did permit and allow to the Isles of Jersey and Guernsey, parcels of the Duchy of Normandy, the use of the government of the Reformed churches of the said duchy," and ordering that "our said isles shall quietly enjoy their said liberty in the use of ecclesiastical discipline there now established." But Dr. Bancroft induced the king to disregard his promise, and to enforce upon the people of Jersey the worship and government of the Church of England, with the result that many left that island for Guernsey, and others for France or Holland. Yet the persistence of the people in their preference for the Genevan discipline was too much for the Bishop of Winchester, to whose see the islands were attached. It was revived during the Civil War, and continued in use down to the nineteenth century.

When Dr. William Laud became the primate of the Church of England and the trusted adviser of Charles I, he spared no pains to isolate the church from fraternal relations with the Reformed churches of the Continent,¹

¹ Dr. Laud was the first to enunciate the exclusive theory now so generally held by High Anglicans. "In his exercise for the degree of B.D. (in 1604) he maintained that there could be no true Church without diocesan bishops. Dr. Holland, the Regius Professor of Divinity, 'openly reprehended him in the schools for a seditious person, who would unchurch the Reformed Protestant Churches beyond seas, and sow division between us and them, who were brethren, by this novel Popish position' (Prynne). Heylin says that 'Laud was shrewdly rattled by Dr. Holland as one that did endeavor to cast a bone of discord between the Church of England and the Reformed Churches beyond the seas.' (Dean Lefroy.)

and to bring the alien churches in England into conformity to the Anglican government and ritual. He sent to ten of their congregations, numbering between five and six thousand communicants, a number of inquiries as to the liturgy they used in their services, how many of them were natives of England, and whether these conformed to the English ceremonies. The aliens protested against this claim to visitation as a violation of the charters, which had been twice confirmed by the reigning king and five times by his father. Dr. Laud seems to have reached the conclusion, based on neither facts nor documents, that the liberties granted these churches were to apply only to the first generation of their members, and that neither Edward nor Elizabeth nor James I could have meant any more than this. And of this he must have assured Charles I, as he also pleaded it on his trial in 1644.

When the aliens alleged the records against Laud's theory, the king answered roughly, "We must believe our Archbishop of Canterbury," and gave orders that those who had been born in England should conform to the national Church. The effect of this was to wreck their churches, some being shut altogether, and others reduced to a handful by the emigration of their members to the Continent. It also injured the country by destroying the industries they had brought with them at their first coming. In Norwich, Bishop Wren, always the echo of his patron, Dr. Laud, "passionately and furiously proceeded against them," Clarendon says; and three thousand workers in wool and cloth went over-sea to Holland. In Canterbury some thousand English workmen lost their employment through the migration of their alien employers. It was not charged upon these Protestant aliens that they had given any offence, even by showing sympathy for the Puritan party in England. Their

offence was their exercise of the hated discipline of Geneva, and their presuming to be churches of Christ without episcopal ordination of their ministers. Haman could have no peace while this Mordecai sat in the gate! "The bishops grew jealous," says Clarendon, "that the countenancing another discipline of the church here, by order of the state, would at least diminish the reputation and dignity of the episcopal government, and give some hope and countenance to the factious and schismatical party in England to hope for such a toleration."

At the impeachment of Archbishop Laud by the House of Commons in 1644 it was alleged, as confirmatory of the suspicion of his being a papist, that he "sowed discord between the Church of England and foreign Protestants, not only by taking away the privileges and immunities of the French and Dutch churches in these kingdoms, but by denying their ministers to be true ministers, and theirs true churches." His answer was: "As to the French and Dutch churches in this kingdom, I did not question them for their ancient privileges, but for their new encroachments, for it was not the design of the queen to harbor them, unless they conformed to the English liturgy; now I insisted on this only with respect to those who were of the second descent, and born in England; and if all such had been obliged to go to their parish churches as they ought, they would not have done the Church of England so much harm as they have done since." The representatives of the Commons replied: "As to the French and Dutch churches, who were settled by charter in the reign of King Edward VI, Mr. Bulteel's book,¹ of the manifold troubles of these churches by this

¹ *Relation of the Troubles of the Three Forraign Churches in Kent, caused by the Injunction of W. Laud, A. D., 1634.* London, 1643. J. Bulteel was a minister of the Walloon Church in Canterbury. He enumerates ten foreign Reformed churches in England, with a membership of 5213 persons.

archbishop's persecutions, evidently proves that he invaded and diminished their ancient immunities and privileges in all parts; and that he was so far from being their friend, that they accounted him their greatest enemy."

Dr. Laud was equally concerned to break off England from every degree of fellowship with the Reformed churches abroad. He evidently thought that even High Churchmen like Andrewes had been too tender in consideration of their defect in the matter of episcopal government. When Bishop Hall was preparing his *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, to meet the storm of opposition to diocesan prelacy which arose in England after the insurrection in Scotland, he submitted the manuscript to Dr. Laud for correction. The archbishop writes to him (November 11, 1639): "You say that where episcopacy hath obtained, it cannot be abdicated without violation of God's ordinance. Never was there any church yet, where it hath not obtained; the Christian faith was never yet planted anywhere, but the very first feature of the body of a church was by, or with, episcopacy; and wheresoever now episcopacy is not suffered to be, it is by such an abdication, for certainly it was there *in principio*. In your second you grant that the presbyterian government may be of use, where episcopacy may not be had. I pray you to consider, whether this concession be not needless here, and itself of dangerous consequence. Next I conceive there is no place where episcopacy may not be had, if there be a church more than in title only." And again (January 4, 1640): "You do extremely well to distinguish the Scottish business from the state of the foreign churches; but yet to those churches and their authors you are a little more favorable than our case will now bear."

This represents a new point of view, and, whatever his faults, Dr. Laud had the courage of his convictions.

Throughout his period of supreme influence with Charles, he labored to draw the line on the Continent as strictly as at home. He got the king to issue orders to the diplomatic representatives of the kingdom that they must cease to commune with the Reformed churches, and must have an Anglican chaplain to minister to the spiritual needs of their suite, and their resident "nationals." He next undertook to enforce conformity upon the "factories" of English and Scotch merchants resident at commercial centers on the Continent, prescribing that only episcopally ordained ministers, and those conformable to the English liturgy, be allowed to minister to them, and all others to be discharged within three months. Those whom he would allow were not to hold "classical assemblies," and to ordain ministers, "because by so doing they would maintain a standing nursery for nonconformity and schism." But the English ministers in the Low Countries replied in a petition setting forth the impossibility of obeying the king's order, and the risk they would run of losing the contribution the Dutch Government made for their maintenance. So the point was waived.

The Princess Elizabeth, wife of the unfortunate Elector of the Palatinate, wrote to her brother the king asking for a collection for the relief of the Reformed ministers and people of that principality, who had been driven out by the Catholic League for their religion. The king had a brief drawn up in the usual language, stating that these sufferers were such "for their sincerity and constancy in the true religion, which we together with them profess, and which we are all bound in conscience to maintain to the utmost of our powers." It also was said of them that they "might have enjoyed their estates and fortunes if they would have submitted themselves to the anti-Christian yoke, and have renounced or dissembled the

profession of their religion." When this was submitted to Dr. Laud, he objected that these Palatines were not of the same religion as the Church of England, being Calvinists and having no episcopal ordination. Also that the phrase "anti-Christian yoke" was an unworthy reflection on the Church of Rome, and would reflect upon the Church of England, whose orders were derived from hers. So a colorless appeal was substituted, which met with no success. When Dr. Sibbes and others of the "conformable Puritans" sent out a private appeal asking for a more generous aid to these Protestant sufferers, Dr. Laud brought them before the Court of High Commission. Of that court he was the president, and it invariably acted on his suggestion; so he had their collection stopped. It was alleged at his trial that he refused to allow the Confession of Faith of the Palatine Church to be printed in English; and to this charge he made no answer.

When the controversy over episcopacy broke out, on the eve of the Civil War, both parties looked to the Reformed churches on the Continent for moral support. The old-fashioned High Churchmen would naturally expect those churches to maintain that friendly attitude toward the Church of England which had existed in the reigns of Elizabeth and James. But the members of the alien churches, now scattered over France and the Low Countries by Archbishop Laud's intolerance and King Charles's faithlessness, and the Puritan refugees driven from their ministry in England to find safety on the Continent, had diffused the intelligence that the royal school of theologians denied the existence of a valid ministry apart from episcopacy.¹ This served to rally the foreign Pro-

¹An important contribution to the defence of the popular cause was the book *Rerum nuper in Regno Scotiæ Gestarum Historia* (Dantzig, i. e., Amsterdam, 1641). It is a compilation from Robert Baillie's letters to his cousin William Spang, the pastor of the Scottish church at Campvere, Holland, translated by him into very fair Latin. Pages 143-184 are an account of the episco-

testants to the support of the party of reform. Only Jean Diodati of Geneva and Moise Amyraut of Saumur suggested even an accommodation. Gerard Vossius of Leyden, the first classical scholar of his age, David Blondel, who was to succeed him, Claude de Saumaise, who was to bear the brunt of Milton's wrath for his attack upon the regicide of 1649, Jan Hoornbeek of Utrecht, the ablest controversial theologian of his day, and others besides, either refused to meddle in the fray or entered the lists for Presbyterian ordination or discipline. The Reformed churches stood for Geneva against the new Canterbury which Laud had created. "This animosity," says Clarendon, "proved of unspeakable inconvenience and damage to the king throughout all these troubles, and of equal benefit to his enemies."

The theory of early Anglicans as to the Church and its ministry corresponded to the practice of the Church before the accession of Archbishop Laud. It is true that Dr. Bancroft in his famous sermon of 1589 effected a new departure in claiming for the diocesan episcopacy of England an apostolic origin and historic tradition, of which the early English Protestants had known nothing. Archbishop Whitgift, who was ready to agree to the abolition of episcopacy if the queen willed it, is said to have remarked on that sermon that it had done much good,

pacacy of Scotland and England, and its contrasts to the pastoral episcopate of the early Church. Stress naturally is laid upon the servile political principles of the Anglican churchmen, a subject I have avoided. Dr. Littledale (*The Petrine Claims*, pp. 147-148), speaking of the servile temper introduced into the early Church, after the empire became Christian, says: "The like phenomenon is visible on a smaller scale in the adulation with which the Anglican clergy, already demoralized by nearly a century of the Tudor tyranny, greeted the accession of James I, in their joy at finding that he had no mind to favor the Presbyterianism in which he had been raised; but they had the advantage of receiving their chastisement somewhat sooner, in the overthrow of their polity as a consequence of their identification of Church interests with the unconstitutional action of Charles I." The school of Laud never could have attained any large influence in England but for the shelter Charles I gave it from both the canons of the Church, the laws of the land, and the convictions of the English people. Dr. Littledale should not kick down the ladder by which his party climbed to recognition and power.

although for his part he rather wished it than believed it true. That it furnished what seemed stronger ground for resisting the Puritans may have induced the weaker minds to accept and support its teaching. But we have no right to assert this of others, who now formed a body of convinced Episcopalians, some asserting a divine right for that form of government, and others contenting themselves with insisting upon its apostolic origin. But even the former did not presume to sit in judgment upon the other Reformed churches, and to declare them destitute of a valid ministry. They had too much respect for the attitude of the Church of England, and too much regard for the spiritual work and life they saw in the Scottish and Continental churches, to allow of this. So far as I can find, only Archbishops Laud and Neale and Bishop Taylor advanced toward this attitude of denial. Dr. Laud, in his defence before the House of Lords, said:

To the objection of the foreign Protestant churches, I deny that I have endeavored to sow discord between them, but I have endeavored to unite the Calvinists and Lutherans; nor have I absolutely unchurched them. I say, indeed, in my book against Fisher (the Jesuit), according to St. Jerome, 'No bishop, no Church';¹ and that none but a bishop can ordain, except in cases of inevitable necessity; and whether that be the case with the foreign churches, the world must judge.

Jeremy Taylor, in his work *Of the Sacred Order and Offices of Episcopacy* (1642), shows himself even narrower than his patron, Dr. Laud. He says: "Supposing that ordination by a bishop is necessary for the vocation of priests and deacons, as I have proven it is, and, therefore, for the founding and perpetuating of a Church, either God hath given to all churches opportunity and possibility of such ordinations, and then, necessity of the contrary is

¹ The representatives of the Commons corrected this quotation. Jerome had said "*Ubi non est sacerdos, non est ecclesia*" ("Where there is no priest, there is no church"). What I have already quoted from Jerome makes it impossible that he should have identified the existence of the Church with the episcopate.

but pretence and mockery; or if he hath not given such possibility, then there is no Church there to be either built or continued, but the candlestick is presently removed." However, he also says: "But shall we then condemn those few of the Reformed churches, whose ordinations always have been without bishops? No, indeed, that must not be; they stand or fall to their own Master. And though I cannot justify their ordinations, yet what degree their necessity is of, what their desire of episcopal ordinations may do for their personal excuse, and how far a good life and a Catholic belief may lead a man in the way to heaven, although the forms of external communion be not observed, I cannot determine."

These are the utterances of the small handful of extreme Anglicans of the school of Laud, in opposition even to the position of High Anglicans like Drs. Bancroft, Andrewes, Hall, Cosin and Bramhall. Even these fall short of the language used after the Restoration, and revived in the last century. They involve a criticism of the Church of England no less than of the Reformed churches generally. To show the general consensus of Anglican opinion against this school, I have given in an appendix in a chronological order, the testimonies of a series of divines of the Church of England, between Cranmer and Bramhall, which should be compared with the *Catena* of Anglican testimonies for the apostolical succession, which Dr. Newman prepared for one of his *Tracts for the Times*. It will go to explain why the author of that *Catena*, in his later years, declared that "apostolical succession, its necessity and its grace, is not an Anglican tradition, though it is a tradition held in the Anglican Church." It is, in fact, nothing but the "private judgment" of a minority of Anglican theologians, on a point on which the Church of England has never spoken its mind;

and it was not the prevalent judgment in the great period between the accession of Edward VI and the return of Charles II to the office and duties of "Defender of the Faith."

In the closing decades of that period the passions of the Civil War and the mutual reprisals of the Anglican and the Puritan parties changed the situation radically, and possibly permanently. The early Puritans had been merely dissatisfied members of the Church of England, asking for the removal of a few offensive ceremonies, for the withdrawal of prelatie pomp and jurisdiction from the bishops, for their association with the clergy in national and diocesan synods, and for the erection of a more efficient discipline for both clergy and laity. They neither wished to leave the church, nor to abolish or alter radically its liturgy, nor to eradicate episcopacy. They were distinct from the small body of Separatists or Brownists, who in America were represented by the Pilgrim Fathers, and who rejected the very idea of a national Church.

The Puritans seem to have been the greater number of those in England who really cared for the things of the Spirit; and if they had been met in a conciliatory spirit by the statesmen and the churchmen of their time, all differences might have been disposed of without sacrifice of principle on either side. Even after the turmoil of the Civil War the major part of them would have accepted a settlement of the Church which would have cost the Anglicans nothing. The new Act of Uniformity still reserved to the king the power to admit to the Church foreign Protestant ministers, without reordination, as was done in the case of the younger Vossius and others. But no such recognition was extended to the presbyterian ordination of Richard Baxter or Philip Henry. They were excluded by the demand that they should confess

their ministry a nullity, and their ministerial acts a profane presumption.

The settlement of 1662 was effected in the spirit of Dr. Sheldon, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, with the wish and hope of excluding as many of the Puritans as possible. He told the Earl of Manchester that he had been afraid that too many of the Puritans would conform, "but now we know their minds, we will make them all knaves if they conform." Not that he and his associates looked forward to the division of England between established and free churches. They were confident of the ability and the willingness of the royal government to compel uniformity, and of the ultimate submission of the English people to the national Church. They mistook both Charles II and the English people. He had had enough of exile, and he was resolved to go to no extreme which might lead to civil war. They had tasted the sweets of religious liberty under the Protector, and they never again would yield to ecclesiastical coercion.

Between the restoration of the Stuarts and the accession of the House of Hanover, the high church party worked out Laud's theory with a thoroughness which would have startled even him. Cyprian of Carthage became their master and their model. The Cyprianic conception of the Church, as a visible corporation, constituted in the bishop, and within whose bounds alone, and at the instance of whose priests alone, the Holy Spirit confers grace and salvation, was accepted heartily, although it lies under the condemnation of the Synod of Arles, and, by implication, of that of Nice. Dr. Henry Dodwell's *Dissertationes Cyprianicæ* (1682), Bishop Fell's edition of Cyprian's works (1682), Bishop Sage's *Principles of the Cyprianic Age, with Regard to Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction, Asserted* (1695), and Dr. Nathaniel Marshall's

Translation of the Genuine Works of St. Cyprian (1717) are among the indications of their excessive regard for the martyr bishop and his theories. For had not Cyprian resisted a pope, and handed over to Satan those who resisted the bishops?

This was a much narrower view of the nature and extent of the Church than the papacy ever had sanctioned; but it suited the temper of the times and of the school. It culminated in Dr. Dodwell's *Epistolary Discourse, Proving from the Scriptures and the First Fathers that the Soul is a Principle naturally Mortal, but Immortalized actually by the Pleasure of God to Punishment or Reward, by its Union with the Divine Baptismal Spirit.*¹ *Wherein is Proved that None have the Power of Giving this Immortalizing Spirit, since the Apostles, but only the Bishops* (London, 1706). In his *Separation of Churches from Episcopal Government Proved Schismatical* (1679) he already had warned the dissenters that they placed themselves outside the covenant of mercy and the ark of safety, where the floods of divine wrath might at any moment sweep them to destruction; and assured them that to be within a Church governed by bishops was a better evidence of a state of salvation than any good works done outside it. Nor did he now, as some have supposed, dispose of them by annihilation at death. That favor he reserves for pagans and unbaptized children, while unbelievers and dissenters are to be kept in existence by the express will of God, that they may receive unending damnation in the lowest depth of hell!

¹ It does not seem to have occurred to any of those who denied the validity of baptism conferred by any but a bishop, or an episcopally ordained priest, that their royal model, "Charles the Martyr," was baptized by a Presbyterian minister, who received his orders from a presbytery. It might even be worth while to compare the quality of the grace conferred in baptism by a Roman Catholic bishop on James I; by a Presbyterian minister upon Charles I; and by Episcopal bishops upon Charles II and James II. Presbyterians do not admire Charles I, and with good reason. But they are willing to stand by the comparison.

The efforts of James II to Romanize the Church of England brought about something like a truce between churchmen and nonconformists. Even Dr. William Cave reminded the latter that the Church of England had passed no judgment on those churches which have dispensed with episcopacy. Several others of the participants in the great controversy with Rome during that reign rejected the propositions that episcopacy is essential to the being of a church, and baptism is valid only when conferred by bishops or those they have ordained. Dr. Sancroft, the primate, urged his brethren to cultivate friendly relations with the nonconformists, and to pray with them for the union of all the Reformed churches, at home and abroad. The persecutions in France, following the Revocation of Nantes, 1685, brought a great immigration of Huguenots, pastors and people; and the former seem to have been admitted to minister in several of the London churches, which were frequented by their people. A livelier interest in the Reformed churches on the Continent sprang up, and schemes of "comprehension" were discussed for the restoration of the nonconformists to the Established Church.

The most promising of these came in the years after the Revolution of 1688, largely through the efforts of Dr. John Tillotson, the new Archbishop of Canterbury. In the struggle between the Church of England and the king, in the years before the Revolution, the nonconformists generally had refused to make common cause with the Roman Catholics against the Anglican Church, although the king tried to win their support by an illegal indulgence of their worship. It was felt that this entitled them to some consideration, and a law extending toleration to their worship was passed by Parliament. This marked the end of the effort, begun in 1662, to coerce the noncon-

formists into conformity; and in the breakdown of one half the policy of Dr. Sheldon and the Earl of Clarendon, the other half was involved. It never had been their intention to acquiesce in the permanent division of the kingdom between several communions. Nor had the more "conformable" Puritans lost either hope or desire of returning to the communion of the national Church. The Presbyterians generally and the greater part of the Congregationalists were prepared to accept a reunion on the following terms: (1) The recognition of presbyterian ordination performed in England, as the law permitted with that ordination when performed in France under the terms of the Act of Conformity of 1662. (2) The optional (in place of the compulsory) use of the cross in baptism, kneeling at the Communion, and the wearing of the surplice.

A bill to enact these concessions was proposed in Parliament, but at the instance of the House of Lords the plan was referred to a royal commission, while at that of the House of Commons the question was referred to the Convocation of the Church. The commission prepared a measure involving some alterations in the Book of Common Prayer. The bishops generally were favorable, Bishop Beveridge being an exception. Mr. Hunt says that both the toleration bill and the comprehension "had the approbation of the nonjuring bishops," who had refused to acknowledge William and Mary as the sovereigns of the English nation, and therefore "the supreme rulers" of its Church. But the lower House of Convocation was of an entirely different temper. After hearing a sermon from Bishop Beveridge against all alterations, it chose as its prolocutor Dr. William Jane, the uncompromising head of the High Church party. The plan formulated by the royal commission did not even come to a vote. The

question continued to undergo discussion in the early years of Queen Anne's reign, but the dominant party was Jacobite in its sympathies, felt no gratitude to the non-conformists for aiding in the defeat of King James, and had no motive for reversing the policy of Sheldon.¹

It might have been expected that the accession of the House of Hanover to the throne of England, with the hearty support of the nonconformists, would have reopened the question of comprehension. But the two first Georges, and their English advisers, were more anxious to "let sleeping dogs lie" than to take any risks out of gratitude to their friends. Some hopes of action grew out of a friendly conference between the primate, Dr. Thomas Herring, and Dr. Phillip Doddridge, a nonconformist who had a half-dozen bishops among his correspondents. But this also came to nothing. "I can tell you of certain science," wrote Bishop Warburton, "that not the least alteration will be made in the ecclesiastical system. The present ministry were bred up under, and act entirely upon, the maxims of the last. And one of the principal of theirs was, Not to stir what is quiet." So the situation created by the quarrels of the seventeenth century came to be accepted as part of the natural order of English life.

From the disappearance of the Nonjuring party, the interest in questions of Church order and government was very slight. It was revived in the colonies in a languid way by the proposal to establish an American episcopate, instead of leaving the Episcopal churches of that large district in the hands of the Bishop of London. At home

¹ The violence of the party almost exceeds belief. It is well known that some of them took seriously De Foe's *Shortest Way with Dissenters* (1702), namely, to hang them. Dr. John Jortin tells of hearing a preacher say: "If anyone denies the uninterrupted succession of bishops, I shall not scruple to call him a downright atheist;" and adds: "This, when I was young, was sound, orthodox, and fashionable doctrine." He was sixteen at Queen Anne's death.

the rulers of the Church managed to repeat the blunder of the previous century in dealing with Methodists. They detached these from the Church of England, and created a new rival in the affections of the English people. At the close of every century since the Reformation, English religion presents a more lamentable spectacle of strife and division than at its beginning.

Near the close of the Stuart period a remarkable proposal came to the government of Queen Anne, from Friedrich, the first King of Prussia, who had been authorized in 1700 to add this title to that of Elector of Brandenburg. An inclination toward the Church of England had existed for some time in northern Germany, and had led Anthony Horneck and John Ernest Grabe to migrate to England, where they won recognition as authors, while Leibnitz published a brochure suggesting the introduction of "the venerable English hierarchy" into the Protestant churches of Germany. Friedrich was zealous for Christian union, first between the Lutheran majority of his own subjects, and the Reformed minority, to which the Hohenzollerns had belonged since 1619; and then between all the Protestant churches of Europe, against the persecuting government of France.

Friedrich had been convinced by Leibnitz of the importance of bishops as adjuncts to the state of a Christian king, and had conferred the title upon the two ecclesiastics—Reformed and Lutheran—who had officiated at his coronation. Bishop Jablonsky of the Moravian Church, who had visited England, and had been attracted by the worship and government of her church, was among his friends and advisers. At his suggestion steps were taken to assimilate the Prussian churches to the Anglican. The Book of Common Prayer was translated into German, and on Advent Sunday in 1706 its use was begun in the

royal chapel and the cathedrals, and allowed in all other churches. Copies of the translation were sent to Queen Anne, and to Dr. Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury. The queen and her advisers were very cordial in their reception of the book, and its accompanying suggestion of the adoption of episcopacy by the churches of Prussia. Dr. Tenison failed to receive his copy, and when his attention was called to it, made answer that he declined any correspondence with the Protestants of Germany. The reason he gave was that the university of Helmstadt had declared that it was lawful and proper for a Protestant princess to renounce her faith, when she had the prospect of a marriage with a Roman Catholic prince! It was not the university, but its professor, John Fabricius, who had made this declaration, and he had been retired from his chair for it, and for issuing it as the work of the university. Nor was the King of Prussia in any degree responsible for the doings of that university, which lay within the Duchy of Brunswick.

In 1710 the project was revived, at the instance of Bishop Jablonsky, who, by advice of the English ambassador in Berlin, now addressed Dr. John Sharp, Archbishop of York. He received the proposal for a closer union between the churches very heartily, as did Dr. John Robinson, then Bishop of Bristol, who had been English envoy to Sweden. The correspondence continued for two years, and then languished. The death of Friedrich in 1713 put an end to the project, as his successor—best known to us as the father of the great Friedrich—had no interest in such matters.

Had the discussion proceeded farther, a grave legal obstacle to the proposal of Bishop Jablonsky would have been brought into the light. As English law stood from the Reformation until 1786, no bishop of the Church

could consecrate anyone as bishop who was not a subject of the King of England, who did not acknowledge his supremacy over the Church, and who had not taken the oath of canonical obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Except that the law of 1786 allowed of the consecration of subjects of another state, the law continued thus until 1874, although latterly evaded, and even openly disobeyed, by English bishops. The Church of England was thus more insular than the country, and its episcopacy more narrowly national than had ever been known in any part of Christendom.

CHAPTER X

MODERN ANGLICANISM

The French Revolution seemed to many contemporary observers to be merely destructive of the existing order and the established beliefs of the civilized world. But the agitation of the mind of Europe which it produced, proved to be the beginning of a new era of construction and appreciation. In all the arts, in sociology, and in theology it was found to have

. wiped the slate
Clean for the ciphering of a nobler fate,

and to have made possible the justification of what was lasting and excellent in older methods of thought and action.

No single result of this great mental disturbance has been more far-reaching than the rise of Romanticism. This had its forerunners, indeed, in Johann Georg Hamann and Edmund Burke, each in his way maintaining the superior worth of what had stood the test of history, against novelties and "improvements" suggested by the analytic understanding. But the Romanticists were less occupied with general considerations of this kind than with the vindication and glorification of that period of history which the Illuminists of the century then closing had made the target of their contempt—the Middle Ages. As Friedrich La Motte Fouqué justly said, it is to be regretted that this was too often associated with an

unreasoning and unjust contempt for periods of not less greatness, especially the Reformation. Hence the secession of so many Romanticists to the Church of Rome—of the Stolbergs, Friedrich Schlegel, Werner, Brentano, Haller, Meinhold, Kenelm Digby, and others. But the school rendered a great service to mankind in the demolition of prejudices, in the restoration of Christian art, and in the awakening of a historic spirit, which passed beyond their party limits and transformed the intellectual activity of Europe.

Romanticism arising in Germany, soon found a welcome in Great Britain. Two Scotch Presbyterians, Sir Walter Scott and Edward Irving, may be regarded as the first who were animated by its spirit. But its greatest activity outside of literature was in the Oxford Movement, represented first by Dr. John Henry Newman's *Tracts for the Times* (1833–1841). The original purpose of that movement was limited to the defence of the Church of England against the encroachments of the Liberal party, which seemed to have acquired a lasting tenure of power through the Reform bill of 1832. England for centuries had been controlled by the nobles and gentry, who elected a majority of the House of Commons. Suddenly this control was transferred to the middle classes—to the peril, as was believed, of the Established Church. The reduction of the number of Protestant bishops in Ireland, and the appropriation of the income thus saved to the maintenance of schools, was taken to indicate a purpose to deal with Church property generally after the example of Henry VIII. The purpose of those who proposed the publication of the *Tracts* was to impress upon the new majority the various excellences and legal rights of the "Establishment," somewhat in the spirit of the old "High and Dry" churchmen, or at utmost to arouse

toward it something like the loyalty of the Cavalier party of the seventeenth century.

Genius, however, is always an incalculable force; and John Henry Newman had the sensitiveness of a man of genius to the tendencies of his time. He spread his sails more widely than did the Percivals and the Roses of his day, and was caught by winds which bore him in unexpected directions, and finally landed him in the Church of Rome, in company with a good number of his friends and disciples.

Very early in the series of the *Tracts*, the episcopal government of the Church of England, and the succession of these bishops by consecration and in authority from the Apostles, came to the front. This dogma of the Apostolic Succession was presented in the absolute fashion of the divines of the later Stuart reigns, and of their master and model, Cyprian of Carthage. That the spiritual grace of the New Covenant is confined to bodies governed by monarchic bishops, and holding the orthodox creeds elaborated by the six General Councils, was their conviction. That the diocesan bishops of the English Church were officials of the same kind with the urban and pastoral bishops of the early centuries, they never doubted for a moment. Their assumptions were challenged by members of their own communion, who pointed to gifts of the Spirit which had fallen on Christians outside this privileged circle, and were evidenced by sanctity of life, devotion to the common Master, fruitfulness in good works, and zeal for the truth. Of these things they cared to know as little as possible, and when they were pressed upon their attention, they explained by a reference to "the uncovenanted mercies" of God. As here and there a soul outside the bounds of the Old Covenant—a Rahab or a Ruth—had been touched by grace and allowed to share

in the benefits which properly belonged to the elect people, so under the Christian dispensation it might happen that some were saved through the unsearchable mercies of God, although they lived in no contact with the appointed channels of grace. But there could be no greater presumption than to count on such irregular and inexplicable favors. "Salvation is from the Jews," our Lord himself had said to the Samaritan woman. So salvation is of the episcopally ruled and directed.¹

A striking character of the movement was its conduct by an individual doctor, who, with no special calling or authorization, set himself to take care of the rulers of his Church and direct them into the ways of wisdom. When the *Tracts* ceased in 1841, at the request of the Bishop of Oxford, not a single English bishop, except Dr. Phillpotts of Exeter, was in agreement with their teaching as to the constitution of the Church and the rights of its rulers. From the bishops in their annual Charges had come the strongest language of protest and condemnation of the *Tracts*, in some cases amounting to an impeachment of the honesty and loyalty of their authors. If Dr. Newman was right, the English Episcopate showed itself remarkably incompetent for the teaching of its people as regards the very terms on which salvation is possible. The primate of that day, Dr. John Bird Sumner, in reply

¹ Not all of the party were so logical as this. Some of them stood rather with the earlier Anglicans in admitting that in "exceptional cases," and especially "cases of necessity," even an invalid ministry might be the channel of spiritual gifts. Thus Rev. William Denton, in *The Grace of the Ministry* (London, 1872), says: "The validity of ordinations given by presbyters in case of necessity has occasionally been supported by writers in the Church of England, and without censure. Nor does it seem that this opinion, if rightly understood, and discreetly advanced, involves any consequences injurious to religion; since, were it even admitted that presbyters might confer a valid ordination, this would not infer that ministers of sects and heresies are truly ministers of God; for no one would allow that the priests of the Arians, or the Monophysites, or Donatists, were ministers of Jesus Christ, though they had actually received a valid ordination so far as external form was concerned." If Athanasius had acted on this principle on the overthrow of Arianism, as Lucifer of Cagliari and the Meletian party in Antioch insisted that he ought, what would have become of the Church in the fourth century? And the Donatist bishops were offered full recognition if they would give up their extravagant principle as to discipline.

to a letter of inquiry as to the judgment of the Church of England on the validity of the orders of the Protestant Churches on the Continent, wrote:

I can hardly imagine that there are two bishops on the bench, or one clergyman in fifty throughout our Church, who would deny the validity of the orders of these Clergy, solely on account of their wanting the imposition of episcopal hands.

And when his view was challenged, he wrote again:

I knew that neither our Articles nor our formularies justified such an opinion. I knew that many of our eminent divines had disclaimed such an opinion; and I knew that such an opinion would amount to declaring that no valid sacramental or other ministerial act had ever been performed except under an episcopal form of government.

This note of an unbounded regard for Episcopacy in the abstract, along with a virtual disparagement of actual bishops, was not confined to Tractarians of the first age. While many, possibly a majority, of the Anglican bishops throughout the world to-day would accept what the bishops of 1841 denounced as novelties, the "Anglo-Catholic" is frequently keenly critical and often abusive of the "Right Reverend Father in God," for whom he claims a vast authority over everybody else. This alone would be sufficient proof of the fundamental difference in spirit and method, between the Church of the Fathers and the Church of England. In what corner of primitive Christendom could such a movement as that of the Oxford divines have been carried forward in the face of a general and emphatic disapproval from the bishops of that province? Or—to come to more recent agitations—in what primitive *paroikia* would a bishop have allowed the establishment of a style of public worship by his clergy which he regarded as canonically unlawful and doctrinally misleading? Or in what early see was it left to the presbyters to decide with whom that church was in com-

munion, and whom it regarded as schismatic or heretical?¹

In 1841 the government of the German state, which had made unavailing advances to the Church of England in 1707-1713, again opened the subject, but in a somewhat different way. King Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia, "the Romanticist on the throne" of the Hohenzollerns, proposed to the British government that an Anglican bishop should be appointed for Jerusalem, each government nominating alternately, with authority to take under his care other "Protestant churches," who chose to accept this arrangement. In the case of the German churches it was stipulated that their pastors hereafter should receive episcopal ordination, but that their subscription should be to the Confession of Augsburg, and not to the Thirty-nine Articles, and that they should continue the use of the liturgy required by German law in their churches.

Bishops Andrewes, Hall and Cosin would have found the proposal entirely acceptable, especially in view of the source from which it came, and the suggestion made at the time that this was a first step toward a farther approximation between the two Churches. Even Archbishop Laud and Dr. Dodwell hardly could have rejected it, especially as it was to be carried through with careful avoidance of proselytizing at the expense of the eastern communions. The English bishops consulted by the British government—Drs. Howley of Canterbury, Kaye

¹ The attitude of Dr. Newman and his party toward the Continental Protestants was shown in the case of Pastor Spörlein of Antwerp. He took breakfast with the great Tractarian and a number of his younger friends, and put before them some of his difficulties between rationalists in the consistory and pietists in the congregation. He was told that it was his duty to submit to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Antwerp, as there is no faith but that of the Church, and no salvation but in her communion. Even Dr. Pusey is said to have remarked that this was like telling a man who complained of toothache, that an infallible remedy would be cutting off his head. (See *A Memoir of Baron Bunsen by His Widow*, vol. i, pp. 613-614.)

of Lincoln and Bloomfield of London—gave it their unqualified approval; nor is it known that one of the whole bench would have done otherwise. Even friends of the Tractarian movement in some cases coöperated. Dr. Hook of Leeds subscribed to the fund to endow the new bishopric, and defended his action publicly; Mr. Gladstone, after some hesitation, became one of its trustees. But most of the party were filled with alarm. Dr. Pusey, who had spoken a good word for the German theologians against Dr. Rose in 1828, protested in a pamphlet unworthy of his learning and his general fair-mindedness. Mr. Palmer (of Worcester College) protested against any step which would identify the Church of England with Protestantism. Dr. Newman lodged with the primate and his own bishop his solemn protest against the transaction, which indeed helped to cut the ties that bound him to the Church of England. "This was the third blow," he says, "which finally shattered my faith in the Anglican Church. . . . As to the project, I never heard of any good or harm it has ever done, except what it has done for me. . . . It brought me on to the beginning of the end."¹

The Cyprianic theory of the Church and its ministry, which the Oxford movement revived in the Church of England, and which led to this stir over the Jerusalem episcopate, has been elaborated especially as a doctrine of Apostolic Succession. This makes its appeal to that love of historic continuity which the historians of the last century did so much to foster in Germany and in England, and which stands in such close relation to the Romanticist

¹ *Apologia* (New York: 1865), pp. 181-186. In Germany the project had no support outside the circle of the king's personal and official friends. When the see became vacant for the third time, in 1881, the Prussian government allowed the arrangement to lapse by making no nomination. The present king, Emperor William, has taken care to have German Protestantism represented in Jerusalem by purely German institutions.

In our own times the High Church party has moved toward an Anglican bishop for Egypt, ignoring the patriarchs who sit in what they call "the see of St. Mark."

tendency. But, like much else that has been treated as historic by scholars of that school, the Anglican theory rests upon assumptions which will not bear the test of close examination. I say the Anglican theory, for some sort of Apostolic Succession is held by all the Churches which belong to either the Lutheran or the Reformed groups, and by none more distinctly than our Presbyterian Church. The conveyance of authority to minister in word and sacrament is transmitted in our Church from one generation to another; and those who undertake to exercise these functions without ordination would be subjected to discipline. The Westminster Confession speaks of "the officers Christ hath appointed for the edification of his Church," and declares that "to these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by word and censures, and to open it unto penitent sinners by the ministry of the gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require." And it declares that no man may take to himself these offices, but limits them to those who are regularly called by the Christian people and ordained by the presbytery. A notable instance of loyalty to this principle occurred in Scotland in the years following the Revolution of 1688. Those of the Society People, or Covenanters, who did not feel free to join the Established Church were left pastorless by the return to that communion of all their surviving ministers. They went on in this condition, "edifying one another" in their societies, until the accession of Rev. John Macmillan in 1706; and he did not undertake to constitute a presbytery, or to ordain any ministers, until the accession of another ordained minister made this possible in what he thought an orderly way.

The Anglican theory of Succession, which is nowhere taught by the Church of England, begins with the assumption that the office of diocesan bishop dates back to the days of the Apostles, that it is one thing with the office of bishop in those urban churches of the Roman Empire, that it has duties higher in their nature and utility than the cure of souls, that it has been transmitted by an unbroken series of manual consecrations of men to this distinct office from the days of the Apostles to our own, and that submission to its rule is a part of loyalty to our divine Master, if not essential to our spiritual life. It elevates consecration and ordination to the level of a sacrament, teaching that with the laying on of hands of the bishops or bishop, a grace of sanctification is bestowed on the bishop or presbyter, as in baptism a grace of regeneration is conferred on the recipient of that ordinance. It teaches that the bishop and the priest ordained by him have exclusive power to administer valid sacraments, so that the recipients of these have a right to claim from God the conveyance of spiritual life. Thus the succession of bishops furnishes "less a channel of truth, than a channel of the means of grace" (Dr. Jelf).

Dr. Charles Gore, now the Bishop of Birmingham, is the latest exponent of the theory, and his work on *The Church and the Ministry* is another in the series of the attempts by himself and his friends to fuse with the High Church principles of Pusey and Keble those of Frederick Maurice and the earlier (positive) Broad Church teachers. His most general statement of the idea of Apostolic Succession is this:¹

The religion of Christ . . . is a religion which in its principles and essence is final—which contains in itself all the

¹ *The Church and the Ministry*. Sixth Impression. (London and New York: 1907.) Pp. 58-59; 63-64. In the earlier editions instead of speaking of "the fullness of the Spirit's presence and operation once for all granted to the Church," Dr. Gore wrote "the fullness of the once for all given grace."

forces which the future will need; so that there is nothing to be looked for in the department of religion beyond or outside it, while there is everything to be looked for from within. This essential finality is expressed in the once for all delivered faith, in the fullness of the Spirit's presence and operation once for all granted to the Church, in the visible society once for all instituted; and it is at least a tenable proposition that it should have been expressed in a once for all empowered ministry.

Let it be supposed that Christ, in founding his Church, founded also a ministry in the Church in the persons of his Apostles. These Apostles must be supposed to have had a temporary function in their capacity as founders under Christ. In this capacity they held an office by its very nature not perpetual—the office of bearing the original witness to Christ's resurrection and making the original proclamation of the gospel. But underlying this was another—a pastorate of souls, a stewardship of divine mysteries. This office, instituted in their persons, was intended to become perpetual, and that by being transmitted from its first depositaries. It was thus intended that there should be in every Church, in each generation, an authoritative stewardship of the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ, and a recognized power to transmit it, derived from above by apostolic descent. The men who from time to time were to hold the various offices involved in the ministry and the transmitting power necessary for its continuance might, indeed, fitly be elected by those to whom they were to minister. In this way the ministry would express the representative principle. But their authority to minister in whatever capacity, their qualifying consecration, was to come from above, in such sense that no ministerial act could be regarded as valid—that is, as having the security of the divine covenant about it—unless it was performed under the shelter of a commission, received by the transmission of the original pastoral authority which had been delegated by Christ himself to his Apostles. This is what is understood by the Apostolic Succession of the ministry.

[The bishops] are the guardians no doubt of the grace by which Christians live, of which, as much as of the truth, the Church is the rich treasury—*Depositarium dives* (Ireneus).

Throughout this statement we have a subtle blending of truth accepted by all, with the suggestion of questionable principles, and that "free use of unproved assumptions" which Dr. Hatch charged upon its author. It will be observed that he says nothing of episcopacy in this general statement, and elsewhere he declares that: "It is a matter of very great importance to exalt the principle

of the Apostolic Succession above the question of the exact form of the ministry, in which the principle has expressed itself." But the greater part of his book is taken up with an attempt to prove that the "threefold ministry" is of apostolic origin, and much of it to overcoming the objections to that view which are found in the early documents of Church history. Some of his solutions of palpable difficulties are deserving of praise for their ingenuity. Thus while trying to break down the threefold testimony of Jerome, Ambrosiaster and Eutychius as to the ordination by presbyters in the church of Alexandria, he proceeds to show that even if all that were true, it would not matter:

[The Alexandrian presbyters] were ordained, *ex hypothesi*, on the understanding that under certain circumstances they might be called, by simple election, to execute the bishop's office. They were not only presbyters with the ordinary commission of the presbyter, but also bishops *in posse*. Elsewhere there were two distinct ordinations, one making a man a bishop and another a presbyter; at Alexandria there was only one ordination, which made a man a presbyter and potential bishop.

All this being so clear and satisfactory, it is surprising that he and other champions of the threefold ministry have spent so much paper and ink in trying to get rid of facts which they say do not really tell against their hypothesis. Nor is the usefulness of this piece of ingenuity limited to the case of Alexandria. It serves equally well for the case of the Roman presbyters as described by Hermas, for the Corinthian as described by Clement, for those of Philippi as described by Polycarp, and so on to the end of the chapter. In the face of such a solvent it would be useless to heap up a hundred testimonies to the government of churches in the sub-Apostolic age by a plurality of presbyters. They would be found to be "potential bishops," and no obstacle to the theory of

a threefold ministry. So, indeed, Monsignor Duchesne, who seems to have originated the explanation, uses it to convert the troublesome presbyteries, found ruling sundry churches, into a "collegiate episcopate," on its way to an orderly resolution into a monarchic episcopate by inevitable law. Dr. Gore adopts from Prof. H. V. Stanton this theory of an inevitable growth into monarchic episcopate, which was suggested also by Dr. Newman. Prof. Stanton says:

It was by a common instinct that this organization was everywhere adopted. It was, as it were, a law of the being of the Church, that it should put on this form, which worked as surely as the growth of a particular kind of plant from a particular kind of seed. Everywhere there was a development which made unerringly for the same goal. This seems to speak of divine institution almost as plainly as if our Lord had in so many words prescribed this form of Church government. He, the Founder of the Church, would seem to have impressed upon it this nature.

This would have more force if it were not true that our Lord seems to have taken great pains to warn his Church against just such a development, as a natural tendency not to be accepted but resisted. And it would have still more force for Presbyterians and other Protestants if it were shown just where this natural tendency to the concentration of authority in a single person ceases to be legitimate. The elevation of the monarchic bishop above the rest of the presbyter-bishops of the early Church is a part of a great process, which reaches its culmination in the elevation of the Bishop of Rome to the position of monarch of the universal Church. Did our Lord impress upon his Church such a nature as results in the acceptance of a vicar of Christ as the head of Christendom?

Indeed, as Dean Lefroy has ably shown,¹ the episcopate described by Dr. Gore calls for a papacy to protect the

¹ *The Christian Ministry: Its Origin, Constitution, Nature, and Work. A Contribution to Pastoral Theology.* (London and New York.) Pp. 345-355.

Church against the schismatic tendencies of such an institution:

This succession is individual. It is not corporate. It is theoretically independent of the voice of the Church. . . . Such a succession—personal, charismatic, derivative—is schismatic in its tendency. Such a danger is guarded against in the Roman Catholic Church by the union of all the members of that body with its head, the Pope of Rome; but no such safeguard exists amongst those who, in the Anglican Church, advocate this charismatic claim. It connects a series of otherwise unconnected individuals. The bond of connection is consecration to the episcopal office. Each individual receives his apostolic commission from his predecessor, as he did from his. The gift comes from hand to hand. . . . It takes its rise, originally and exclusively, in individual life. It is the possession of an individual authority. It is transmitted by individual power. It is, as such, independent of the society, even though Christ instituted it.

It ignores the powers of the society. It takes no notice whatever of its natural rights as a society. It takes as little notice of its divine rights, which are implied in the perpetual presence of Christ. A number of individuals may be elected to office, by which "the representative principle" is recognized. The authority by which they act is from a source which is absolutely independent of the existing society. If it is exercised unduly, the society has no power to restrain it. If it be relaxed irregularly, the society has no power to invigorate it. The successor of the Apostles, possessed of prerogatives which are personal and private, may ordain whom he pleases. He can give the authority to his nominee. The faithful may not need the exercise of the authority. They may even chafe under the existing rule. They have no power to restrain the individual, who is disconnected from them, and who derives his authority from a series of persons, every one of whom ruled in absolute independence of the natural rights which belong to any society, and in equal independence of the spiritual rights belonging to the divine society.

That this peril really exists is shown by the history of the Anglican Church itself. The Nonjuring schism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries derived its vitality from the leadership of a number of bishops and an Apostolical Succession, animated far more by political antagonism to the reigning house than by any religious motive whatever. In England it lasted as a school of warring ecclesiastics, after it had ceased to command the

fealty of any considerable body of the laity. It split the disestablished Episcopalian Church of Scotland into two antagonistic parties, by insisting that vacancies in the episcopate must be filled by a nomination from the Pretender. It even sought to perpetuate itself in America, first—it is alleged, though on grounds somewhat uncertain—by consecrating Rev. John Talbot of Burlington as bishop for the colonies in 1722; and then by consecrating Dr. Samuel Seabury as Bishop of Connecticut on the mere verbal request of a number of presbyters in that state, and negotiating with him a concordat which involved the maintenance of communion between that see and the Non-juror Church in Scotland.

Another schism, in another direction, has occurred in our own times in America. Bishop George David Cummins, the Assistant-Bishop of Kentucky, becoming dissatisfied with the sacramental teaching of the Prayer Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church, withdrew from its communion November 19, 1873, and, with the support of seven of its presbyters and a considerable body of laymen, took steps to organize a Reformed Episcopal Church. Six months later he was "deposed" from office by the senior bishop and others of the Protestant Episcopal Church. But in the meantime he had consecrated Dr. Charles Edward Cheney to the office of bishop, thus furnishing the new communion with a regular episcopate, whatever was the validity or invalidity of the subsequent act of "deposition." Bishop Cummins was "a live wire" at the date of that consecration; and while ordinarily, since the Council of Nicea, three bishops are required to consecrate, no Anglican authority disputes the validity of the consecration in 1723 of the Jansenist Archbishop of Utrecht by Bishop Varlet, who had been "deposed" for Jansenism; or that of the Old-Catholic Bishop Reinkens

by the Jansenist Bishop Heykamp of Deventer in 1873. For the Succession theory, by isolating the episcopal order from the Church, making it a divine gift to the individual bishop "from above," puts it into the power of any recipient of this gift to act with entire independence of the Church within which he received his consecration.

The side of the Apostolic office, which Dr. Gore declares was meant to be perpetual, he defines as "a pastorate of souls, a stewardship of divine mysteries." From the construction of this sentence it may be assumed that he means the latter phrase as synonymous with the former,¹ which is certainly the clearer of the two. Is there any description of ministerial service more exalted than this of the "pastorate of souls?" And is there any more alien to the work of a diocesan bishop than this? What kind of pastor of souls is Dr. Charles Gore to the diocese of Birmingham? I can claim blood relationship to some of his flock, but I should have been much surprised if I had heard them, in our free and familiar talk, which included their position as "Church people," claim any acquaintance with him as their bishop, or speak of having seen his face, unless it were in the chancel of a church on occasion of a confirmation. How much sleep has he lost (Hebrews xiii: 17) in his anxiety for their spiritual welfare, and by what process of ecclesiastical magic could he multiply himself among the people of that great community,

¹ The words with which the fourth chapter of 1 Corinthians begin have been separated most unhappily from those at the close of the third chapter, and thus have been made useful to the promoters of extravagant claims for the Christian ministry. "Wherefore," says the Apostle, "let no one glory in men. For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's. Let a man so account of us, as of the servants of Christ, the stewards of the mysteries of God. Here, moreover, it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful." It is the Church, not the ministry, not even the apostolate, that Paul makes much of here; and he includes Apollos, no less than Peter and himself, among the stewards of the mysteries, so that that title, in itself essentially an humble one, is not descriptive of the apostolate as distinguished from other offices in the Church.

so as to exercise the "cure of souls" over them? What would his flock say if they were told by an inspired prophet, "Do nothing without your bishop!" or were required by the same authority to consult him before entering on an engagement to marry? What does he know of the quarrels on the back streets of Birmingham, as Mr. Ruskin thinks he ought to know? I would not write thus if there were anything about his position and his discharge of its duties which was peculiar and personal to this devout, earnest and learned bishop. It is equally true of the whole Anglican episcopate in both the mother Church of England and all its branches. Direct, personal labor for the winning and upbuilding of souls was apostolic work. Direct, personal labor for the winning and upbuilding of souls is exactly what the Anglican bishop has to be excused from undertaking, and that to an extent which is not true even of the bishops of the Greek and the Latin communions. Diocesanism has attained its worst development here.

This, as Coleridge points out, was the main objection of the Thoughtful Puritans to the prelatie system of the Church of England in their efforts to secure a farther reformation: "It was prelacy, not primitive episcopacy, the thing, not the name, that the Reformers contended against. . . . Knox's ecclesiastical policy (worthy of Lycurgus) adopted bishops under a different name, or rather under a translation instead of corruption of the name *episcopoi*. He would have had superintendents." Richard Baxter's ideal, Mr. Hunt says, "was a bishop in every city, with the clergy of the district and the country churches under him. Twenty-six bishops all over England seemed to him an Episcopacy in name, without the reality. The parishes at that time were 9725 in number. In Lincoln diocese, in which Baxter then lived, there were

nearly 1100 churches. The diocese was 120 miles in length. Some other dioceses were equally large. London had parishes with populations from 20,000 to 50,000. It was impossible, Baxter said, for any man to do the work of a bishop among such vast populations, or over so wide a district of country. Yet not one of the six and twenty bishops had so much as a suffragan. Neither Scripture, the example of the early Church, nor the requirements of the Church of England, authorized such an Episcopacy as this."

Although the population of England went on increasing, sometimes by leaps and bounds, it was not until 1848 that Manchester was added; St. Albans and Truro in 1877; Liverpool in 1880; Newcastle in 1882; Southwell in 1884; Wakefield in 1888; Birmingham and Southwark in 1905. Some dozen colonial bishops are resident in England, acting as assistant bishops. And there are twenty suffragan bishops in the province of Canterbury, and eight in that of York. In all, there are seventy-seven bishops for the thirty millions of the English and Welsh people, or one to each four hundred thousand of the population. There are three cities with over one hundred thousand; fifteen with over fifty thousand; thirteen with over forty thousand; eight with over thirty thousand; twenty with over twenty thousand; and thirty-six with over ten thousand people, which are not episcopal sees, while twelve places of less than ten thousand population are episcopal cities, and thirteen are the homes of suffragan bishops. But even the addition of those ninety-five English cities to the list of episcopal sees would not effect any such extension of the episcopal order as would bring England and Wales into line with the churches of Syria, Asia, Greece, Italy and Africa in the age of Augustine of Hippo.

The American branch of the Anglican Church aban-

done the very idea of the urban constitution of the episcopate, while the American branch of the Roman Church has followed it pretty closely. In Colonial times the thirteen colonies were attached to the diocese of London. When American independence removed the obstacles to an American episcopate, the dioceses were conformed to the boundaries of the states. Down to 1839, when New York was divided, no bishop had less than a whole state for his diocese. Since that time twenty-three states have been divided by the erection of thirty-six additional dioceses, while twenty-five states and three territories remain undivided. This gives a total of eighty-two bishops, or one to each ten thousand communicants, and less than one to each million of the population. Eighteen dioceses take their names from cities; but these are no more urban in fact than are the others.

Very few of these dioceses have any right to be called episcopal sees, as the bishops generally have no churches of their own in which to set up their cathedras, and in which they ordinarily are to be found on the Lord's day, dispensing the word and sacraments to their people. After more than a century, such a church is in course of erection for the Bishop of New York; and the seventh bishop of that diocese has died, like Moses, in sight of such a resting place, but without entering it.

Very few American Episcopalians seem to be aware of the absurdity of such a system claiming apostolic or even early patristic authority for its existence. They start from the highly artificial episcopate of Great Britain, as that to which the Anglican communion stands committed; and they go on to outdo its unhistoric absurdity in the creation of still vaster dioceses on the scale of American dimensions. Bishop Whittingham of Maryland, although the graduate of no college or university, was justly es-

teemed as the most learned of the American bishops of his time. In 1863 he wrote to Bishop Alonzo Potter of Pennsylvania, with reference to the proposal to divide the diocese of Maryland: "I am thoroughly satisfied that to live and grow at all in this country, our Church must greatly diminish the size, and therefore multiply the number, of her dioceses; and I firmly believe that the adoption of the primitive standard of diocesan limits, by which, in ordinary circumstances, a bishop should be placed wherever a county court is held (the center of ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction being made the same), would, by depriving Presbyterian episcopacy of its one element of truth, bring back multitudes of the followers of parity into the fold of the Church. We need it as much for the restoration of the true pastoral office (both as exercised by presbyters and as overseen by bishops) as we do for the prosecution of the missionary trust. Neither can the Church have any genuine efficacy, until she have her country bishops, as well as city bishops; and the latter only with an average of more than from thirty to fifty congregations."

Rev. Jubal Hodges, in his defence of the claims of the Apostolate of the Catholic Apostolic Church,¹ writes: "There were no bishops in the days of the Apostles, ruling over hundreds of churches, as in the Anglican and American dioceses. . . . The angels, elders and deacons of St. John's and St. Ignatius' times, cannot easily be recognized in the traveling bishop of our vast states; in presbyters who do not surround him as helps, the *corona presbyterorum*, whose seats or thrones were around his in the early cathedral churches, but are now virtually his substitutes seeing his face but once a year; and in

¹ *The Original Constitution of the Church and its Restoration.* By a Presbyter of the Diocese of Pennsylvania. London: 1864.

deacons not chosen of the people, and standing as their representatives and guardians in each several flock, but transformed into a lower order, as it were, of the priesthood. . . . The true and perfect order of the worship of God requires the continual presence of the angel at his own altar, daily to offer intercession as the representative of Christ, the angel of the Covenant, and of the whole Church, in heaven; and it has deprived the people over whom the Holy Ghost has made him chief pastor, of the blessing which should flow from his constant presence among them, and spiritual oversight." This has an Ignatian and Cyprianic sound.¹

It is in the light of this truth of the pastorate being the highest of human services to the kingdom of Christ, that one must find a grave defect in this Anglican teaching in laying stress on an external and official fitness for the ministry, as outweighing personal and spiritual fitness. "The grace of the ministry" is not thought of as a graciousness of character, the outgrowth of a divine discipline of the man, but as the result of a ceremony, in which the minister has received an authority and a power, to which other men, who have not received this ordination, are strangers. It thus puts a bad priest above a good man, who has not received his priesthood at the proper hands, and severs the idea of spiritual efficiency from character. Even Jeremy Taylor was staggered by this teaching, and wrote:

Although it be true that the efficacy of the sacraments does not depend wholly upon the worthiness of him that ministers, yet it is as true that it does not depend wholly upon the goodness of the receiver; but both together, relying upon the goodness of God, produce all those blessings which are

¹ In a sermon preached in 1868 or 1869 before the Diocesan Convention of Pennsylvania, the preacher—Dr. Hoffman of Saint Mark's, if I mistake not—expressed a wish for the return of the time when "the parish and the diocese were coterminous," and the presbyter had not thrust himself into the work of the bishop.

designed. The minister hath an influence unto the effect, and does very much toward it.

Much is the loss when a wicked priest ministers.

Against this statement High Churchmen have protested, appealing to the saying of the Apostle, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the exceeding greatness of the power may be of God, and not from ourselves." But an "earthen vessel" is not necessarily a dirty vessel; and the Apostle is not speaking of wicked men under this simile, but of imperfect and fallible men, such as are the best of Christ's servants. To suppose that episcopal ordination can make a bad man an efficient minister of the new covenant, is to forget what is involved in the pastoral labors of such a minister. It is not administration of the sacraments, nor even the formal and public preaching of the word, which is alone at stake here. It is the pressure of his life and his influence upon the lives of his flock, in personal intercourse, which counts. He must feed them, as Bernard says, with his word and his life (*verbo et vita*). And even the ministry of the word cannot be efficient ordinarily or fully, except as it is through a consecrated man. The preacher must speak out of his own experience to reach the hearts of men. He must himself have the vision of divine realities, before he can bring his hearers to see them. Otherwise he is one of the blind leaders of the blind, of whose unsuccess our Lord leaves us in no doubt. And his solemn words as to the hirelings, who might intrude into the shepherd's work without having the shepherd's spirit, certainly bind together the pastoral work and spiritual fitness in all who undertake it. "The ruin of the Church," said one of the popes, "is when the people are better than their priests."

Turning from the minister to the people, what are we entitled to expect of those who enjoy the services of the

only valid ministry in the Church of Christ, as defined by this hypothesis of the Apostolic Succession? In what contrast must they stand to those who are cut off by "schism" from the channels in which alone flows "the grace by which Christians live," and who deny themselves access to those "valid sacraments," by which the spiritual life of men is begun and nourished? "Upon a true episcopal succession," says Dr. Liddon, "depends the validity of the Eucharist—one chief means of communion with our Lord." "That which in our belief and to our sorrow, the non-episcopal communities lack, is participation in those privileges, which depend upon a ministry duly authorized by Christ our Lord, and in particular the precious sacrament of his Body and Blood."¹ What fullness and purity of spiritual life, then, what warmth of love, what abounding in faith, what readiness for sacrifices, what zeal for the kingdom, what severance from the world, what hopefulness and confidence in the gospel, should they exhibit, who are so favored, in contrast to the lack of these fruits in others who bear the Christian name, but are not rightly rooted in the system for transmission of "the grace given once for all to the Church!" "By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?" It is our Lord's own test; and if this hypothesis of the Apostolic Succession of monarchic bishops be the appointed method for conveying grace to men, there should be palpable and unmistakable evidence

¹"A Father in Christ," a sermon preached in St. Paul's Cathedral at the consecration of two bishops. To Dr. A. K. H. Boyd of St. Andrews Dr. Liddon wrote: "Here in England the Episcopate forms a real barrier to union among Reformed Christians: all the Protestant bodies, which are loyal to the Puritan tradition, regard it with hereditary aversion. If it is not necessary it ought to be abolished in deference to the prejudices of millions of weak brethren: and I may add, in order to diminish the temptation to ambition and worldliness among ourselves. To this danger those of our clergy who have no real belief in Apostolical Succession and who consequently see in the Episcopate a mere earthly prize of professional success,—such and such an income, and a seat in the House of Lords,—are especially exposed. If I believed the Episcopate to be a matter of human institution, I should earnestly desire its abolition" (*Twenty-Five Years of St. Andrew's*, ii, 226-227).

of this fact in the superiority of those who share in its benefits.

Far be it from us to disparage the graces and worthiness of the men and women whose lives adorn the annals of the Anglican churches! The thought calls up names of the immediate past, which shine in the Church's firmament as stars bright with the undying Light of the central Sun. But almost every name suggests a parallel name among the Protestants of the Continent, or the Free Churchmen of England or the Presbyterians of Scotland and Ireland. The century we have seen to its close was the richest in martyrs of any in the Church's history. What communion had the monopoly of these? It was the richest also, I believe, in real saints; but none dare draw the line across which no saintship is to be recognized, or even is less abundant than on the hither side, and say, "Here ends the porphyry; here begins the flint." The broad facts of the spiritual history of recent times discredit the claim that one communion has an especial claim to be regarded as the nursery of sanctity or the field of service.

Nor does the Anglican Church put forward any such claim for herself. As Dean Lefroy shows,¹ neither her Articles, nor her Book of Common Prayer, nor her Homilies, nor her Canons know anything of this exalted privilege, which sunders her from the other Reformed Churches. She claims to be "a true and apostolical Church," but she follows the earlier Fathers in making this depend upon the purity of her doctrine, and not her inheritance of offices and forms. She regards episcopacy as a venerable form of Church government, with apostolic sanction; but she says not a word of its being indispensable to the being or even the well-being of a church. The Church of Rome and the Orthodox Church of the East leave nobody in

¹ *The Christian Ministry*, pp. 325-339.

doubt as to the character and extent of their claims upon the adherence of "all who profess and call themselves Christians"; but the Anglican Church is culpably silent, if her foremost champions have gauged correctly the measure of her demands upon the rest of Protestant Christendom. "Apostolical Succession, its necessity and its grace, is not an Anglican tradition," writes John Henry Newman, who spent ten years in trying to prove that it was, and then withdrew to the Church of Rome.

But the most objectionable feature of the hypothesis is that on which Dean Lefroy touches, when he says that it ignores the divine rights of the Church, "which are implied in the perpetual Presence of Christ." It is another form of that conception of the Church as widowed by the withdrawal of her Divine Spouse, and thus left to the sole protection of her officers, which we found in the teaching of the Cyprianic age. That is the common mark of all forms of hierarchical Christianity—the ecclesiastic has grown to his high importance because the Head of the Church has gone off to an infinite distance, and the official is his only representative left to mankind. "My sheep hear my voice." "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." This is the real presence, which we must oppose to the theory of a real absence, of the divine and human Head of the Church and of every man in its communion. If we lose this, we shall not find rest in the local bishop of any part of the Church, but in some universal bishop, whom we shall strive to raise to superhuman rank, asserting his infallibility today, and his sinlessness tomorrow, that he may be fitted to fill the place of the absent Saviour.

CHAPTER XI

OUTLOOK

To the Protestant Episcopal Church of America belongs the credit of having suggested the movement towards the restoration of Christian unity, which has found acceptance with the Anglican communions generally, on the basis of friendly conference with other Protestant bodies, and through an appeal to their Christian feeling in the matter.

The American branch of the Anglican Church was affected very early and strongly by the Oxford Movement. The *Tracts for the Times*, Dr. Newman's *Sermons*, and other important works of its literature were reprinted in America, and were read eagerly by the younger clergy especially. Thus arose an Anglo-Catholic party within the Church, which alternately gratified the old-fashioned High Churchmen by its zeal for liturgic worship and for episcopacy, and puzzled them by its equal readiness to sign the Thirty-nine Articles or the Tridentine Decrees.

Like their brethren of the same party in England, these Anglo-Catholics were embarrassed by some outstanding facts in the history of their own Church, such as the far too comprehensive language of Bishop White's Preface to the American Book of Common Prayer, and the repeated recognition of the validity of ministries not conferred by episcopal hands. Worst of all, however, was the name adopted by their Church on becoming independent of the Church of England. To Dr. White and his associates it seemed the exact designation of their

communion, as that Protestant Church which practised government by bishops. But to the Oxford school the very name of Protestant was Nehushtan—an abomination. Although their “royal martyr” always had declared himself a Protestant; although Dr. Laud on the scaffold had said, “I die in the Protestant Church of England”; and although the term had been used by Anglicans in the seventeenth century to distinguish themselves from Nonconformists, yet the word was now an offence. That the Anglican Church was not Protestant, and had nothing to do with Protestants,—that she was “Catholic” throughout, in her Liturgy, her Articles, her government,—and that whatever sounded otherwise, as some of the Articles did, was to be “taken in a Catholic sense,” was a principle with the Oxford school. With Hurrell Froude, they did “every day more and more hate the Reformers,” while using their words in devotion, and subscribing to their doctrinal statements in the Articles.

For a time it was supposed that the new presentation of the “Catholic” theory of the Church would exercise attraction upon the less favored churches of America, and that this Aaron’s rod would swallow up all the others. The “sects” were ignored, but their individual members were addressed as professing Christians, who were foregoing the best part of a Christian’s birthright through their isolation from an authorized ministry and valid sacraments. This hope has been disappointed for those who entertained it, and the action of the bishops in 1880 was accepted by all parties as a reasonable approach towards Christian unity. In the Declaration of that year it is said “that this Church does not seek to absorb other communions, but rather, coöperating with them on the basis of a common faith and order, to discountenance schism, to heal the wounds of the body of Christ, and to

promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world." It is hard to believe that no finer result will come from so auspicious a beginning than we have yet seen. Perhaps this is a grain of that wheat which must fall into the ground and die, else it will bring forth no fruit.

It is manifest that a sense of the evils which attend the divided condition of modern Christendom has been awakened in the churches, and that it is deepening. Much of this is due to the interest in foreign missions, which began to stir the American churches at the beginning of the nineteenth century. They were drawn out of a selfish and sectarian regard for their welfare as separate and contending bodies, and into a feeling for the good estate of the whole cause of the Master. They became gradually aware of the ugliness with which sectarian divisions are seen on the mission field, where the converts to Christ are puzzled themselves and puzzling their teachers as to the necessity of their adhesion to some system of faith and practice, which bears the stamp of its origination under circumstances widely different from those of the mission field. The brighter side of the story works to the same end. The heroic sacrifices for Christ's cause by great missionaries of various churches have awakened a sympathy and an admiration which ignore the bounds of sect and party, and make all Christendom feel its kinship on deeper lines of unity than those of rite and doctrine. The great bed-roll of the Church's heroes and martyrs is felt to be a common possession, and the myriads of converts are accepted as a common gain for all Christians.

The field of home missions has often been the scene of an intense sectarianism, and it is still our reproach through the waste of money in maintaining several feeble churches

of different names in a community where but one really strong church is possible. This has led to some agreements to leave the field to whichever of the contracting churches is the first to enter it, until the growth of population warrants the representation of both. Such arrangements suggest an extension of the method of mutual recognition by our churches, extending at last to a sort of federal system not unlike that under which we as a nation enjoy both local liberty and national order.

The divisions of our Protestant Christendom have been used by an overruling Wisdom to develop various types of Christian character, thought and organization, each of which may be found necessary to the completeness of the whole body in the day of their unity. The absorption of all these into any one of our present churches, to the effacement of all peculiarities but its own, would mean the loss of a century of history, and the impoverishment of our religious life for the sake of a dead uniformity. "We must set before us," says the Lambeth Conference of 1908, "the Church of Christ as he would have it, one Spirit and one body, enriched with all those elements of divine truth which the separate communities of Christians now emphasize severally, strengthened by the interaction of all the gifts and graces which our divisions now hold asunder, filled with all the fullness of God. We dare not in the name of peace barter away those precious things of which we have been made stewards. Neither can we wish others to be unfaithful to trusts which they hold no less sacred. We must fix our eyes on the Church of the future, which is to be adorned with all the precious things, both theirs and ours. We must constantly desire not compromise but comprehension, not uniformity but unity."

Yet the maintenance of all these in separate and isolated bodies, with no covenant of brotherhood to embrace

them all, is contrary to the common spirit of fraternal love, which grows in power among them all. We stand to-day very much where the Constitutional Convention of 1787 stood at the opening of its sessions, with one party calling for a single centralized government like that of England, and the other clamoring for the continuance of that state of things which had been already established, and under which the states were falling into prolonged and bitter strife. Is it not possible to reach a solution for our religious life, broadly corresponding to that Constitution, which grew out of the patriotism of men who laid aside party feelings for the good of the nation, and which has served us so grandly during the years since its adoption?

The Protestant Episcopal Church must be said to have abandoned the lead it took thirty years ago in this matter. I say this not only in view of the cessation of the negotiations with our own Church, of which I have spoken in the Introduction to this book, but still more in view of the proceedings of the last Lambeth Conference of the bishops of the Anglican communion. The Archbishop of Melbourne came to that conference with an olive branch from the Presbyterian Church of Australia, but received not the slightest encouragement to proceed. Everything that was done in the direction of Church unity was dominated by the idea of the Apostolical Succession of bishops.

Proposals, indeed, for union and intercommunion with the Moravian Church were held out, and were laid before its General Synod meeting the next year at Herrnhut. A similar but unauthorized suggestion was made to the Lutheran Church of Sweden. But in both these cases the suggestion was for the assimilation of their episcopate to that of the Church of England, through the removal

of any defect in their present succession of bishops, involving "the introduction of another line of ordination" than that now possessed, and with this inevitably a discrimination between the standing of one part of their clergy and that of another. On the other hand, there was a strong expression of desire at the Lambeth Conference for communion with the Syrian, Armenian and other Oriental Churches, none of whom show the smallest purpose to reciprocate. Thus the Anglican Church stands ready to practice communion with the Latin, Greek and Oriental Churches, which will have none of her, and will not even acknowledge the validity of her orders, much less the orthodoxy of her Articles, while she turns away from the Churches of her own speech and neighborhood, or treats their advances as to be entertained only when they have accepted her ecclesiastical system.

The only suggestion as to these latter is that the Anglican clergy should cultivate kindly personal relations with their ministry, as Dr. Sancroft suggested two centuries ago. But it is said that "it might be possible to make an approach to reunion on the basis of consecrations to the episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of 1610." For Presbyterians this was an unhappy suggestion, as "the precedent of 1610" was a chapter in the insolent encroachment of the Stuart kings upon the laws and rights of the Church of Scotland, and was set aside with emphasis by the Scottish Parliament and Assembly when they attained the control of the affairs of the realm by the uprising of 1637. It is only less offensive than "the precedent" of 1661, when Robert Leighton was required to submit to a ceremony which implied that his ministrations in the Church of Scotland had been irregular and invalid through those years in which he had been enriching our sacred literature with his matchless works of

devotion and exposition. For, as his Anglican editor, Rev. William West, says, his writings, "with scarcely an exception, belonged to the Presbyterian period of his life."

The cause of Christian unity, therefore, so far as the Anglican Church is concerned, has not advanced in any appreciable degree since 1880, and the reason for this is found in the assumption of the divine right of the "historic episcopate," and the hypothesis of an Apostolical Succession of manually consecrated bishops as the necessary channel of grace in the Christian Church. Both these are without warrant in either the Christian Scriptures, or the earlier monuments of Christian antiquity. The former is an institution evolved in the second Christian century, without either apostolic sanction or necessity in the life of the Church, and is no more a part of the Christian Church order than is the papacy, its child and heir. The latter is a conception first originated by Cyprian of Carthage, and elaborated from age to age by the later fathers, the Romanist canonists since 1570, and the Anglican polemics since 1589. Are these to remain the permanent obstacle to a reunion of our Protestant Christendom?

APPENDIX

I have met with three series of quotations from the fathers and doctors of the Church of England, in support of the Cyprianic hypothesis that no valid ordination exists except that by bishops possessing descent by successive consecrations from the Apostles, and that no valid sacraments exist except within a church governed by such bishops. The first is that prepared by Dr. John Henry Newman and published as the seventy-fourth of the *Tracts for the Times*. The second is given in *A Letter to the Archdeacon of Totness. In Answer to an Address from the Clergy of that Archdeaconry on the Necessity of Episcopal Ordination*, by Henry [Phillpotts], Lord Bishop of Exeter (London, 1852). The third is an article on *The Voice of the Church of England on Episcopal Ordination*, by Rev. Arthur Lowndes, in *Church Reunion Discussed* (New York, 1890). All three are so framed as to give the impression that the notable divines of the Church of England have been practically unanimous in the acceptance of the Cyprianic theory of the Church; but Mr. Lowndes deals more with documents (articles, canons, etc.) than with writers.

On the other side are a pamphlet by an anonymous convert to the Church of Rome, entitled *Apostolic Succession Not a Doctrine of the Church of England* (London, 1870); and an article by Dr. Perowne, Dean of Peterborough, which appeared in *Lippincott's Magazine* for January, 1890.

It is not here claimed that the writers now quoted are not Episcopalians, either by conviction of the excellence of that form of Church government, or by belief that has apostolic sanction, or both; although it will be seen that some of them do not hold to the latter. It is to show that many of the greatest and most honored of the doctors of the Reformed Church of England did not make for their Church that extravagant claim to exclusively valid orders and sacraments, which was developed by the later Stuart divines of the Church of England, and revived by the Oxford writers some sixty years ago. I have placed in brackets the letters N, P and L, where the writer in question has been claimed by either Dr. Newman, or Bishop Phillpotts, or Mr. Lowndes, or all of them.

1. Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop and Martyr (1489–1556). [L.]

In the New Testament he that is appointed to be a bishop or priest, needeth no consecration by the Scripture, but election or appointing thereto is sufficient.

The bishops and priests were at one time, and were no two things, but both one office, in the beginning of Christ's religion.

The truth is that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees or distinctions in orders, but only of deacons and ministers, and of priests or bishops.

2. William Barlow, Bishop (*ob.* 1563).

If the King's Grace, being Supreme Head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate and elect any lay man, being learned, to be a bishop, he so chosen should be as good a bishop as I am or the best in England.

3. Richard Coxe, Bishop (1500–1581). [L.]

Although by Scripture, as St. Hierome saith, priests be one, and therefore not the one before the other, yet bishops as they be now, were after priests, and therefore made of priests.

4. Thomas Becon, Presbyter and Doctor (1512–1567).

He denied the distinction between bishop and presbyter, maintaining that there are but two orders, bishops or presbyters and deacons. He advocated the restoration of what he called the good old custom of electing ministers, when the names of some "good and godly men" were submitted to the chief inhabitants of a town or parish, who after fasting and prayer, and hearing a sermon on the duties of pastor and people, proceeded to election. Then other ministers laid their hands 'on the head of him that was chosen, admitting him to the ministry (Hunt, i, 46).

5. Sir Francis Knollys, Treasurer to the Queen (1514–1596).

Concerning the superiority of bishops, I must needs say that my Lord Archbishop and the rest take a dangerous course against her Majesty's supreme government, for they do claim a superiority of government to be knit to their bishoprics *jure divino* directly.

6. John Phillpotts, Archdeacon and Martyr (1516–1555).

"He denied the succession of bishops to be an infallible mark by which the Church may be known. There may be a succession of bishops where there is no Church, as at Jerusalem and Antioch. . . . He allowed the Church of Geneva to be Catholic, and its doctrine apostolic, and the same was to be said of the Church of England as it stood in the days of King Edward." (Hunt, i, 35–36.)

7. John Jewel, Bishop and Doctor (1522–1571). [L.]

But M. Harding saith, the primates had authority over other inferior bishops. I grant they had so. Howbeit, they had it by agreement and custom; but neither by Christ, nor by Peter or Paul, nor by any right of God's word. Saint Hierom saith: *Noverint Episcopi se magis consuetudine quam dispositionis dominicæ veritate presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere ecclesiam regere.* ("Let bishops understand that they are above priests rather of custom than of any truth or right of Christ's institution; and that they ought to rule the Church all together.") And again: *Idem ergo est presbyter qui episcopus; et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent, et diceretur in populis, Ego sum Pauli, Ego Apollo, Ego Cephæ, communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiæ gubernabantur.* ("Therefore a priest and a bishop are both one thing; and, before that by the inflaming of the devil, parts were taken in religion, and these words were uttered among the people, 'I hold of Paul,' 'I hold of Apollos,' 'I hold of Peter,' the churches were governed by the common advice of the priests.") St. Augustine saith: *Secundum honorum vocabula, quæ jam ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, episcopatus presbyterio major est.* ("The office of a bishop is above the office of a priest (not by the authority of the scriptures, but) after the names of honor, which the custom of the Church now hath obtained.")

"Succession," you say, "is the chief way for any Christian man to avoid Antichrist." I grant you, if you mean the succession of doctrine. Therefore St. Paul saith: "In the latter days shall some depart from the faith." He saith not, They shall depart from their place, but "from their faith." And St. John saith, "If any man come unto you, and bring not this doctrine,

salute him not." He saith not, If he keep not his place, but, "If he bring not this doctrine." It is the doctrine whereby Antichrist shall be known, and not his place: for, as I have said, "he shall sit in the place of Christ."

Touching M. Calvin, it is great wrong untruly to report so reverend a father, and so worthy an ornament of the Church of God. If you had ever known the order of the church of Geneva, and had seen four thousand people or more receiving the holy mysteries together at one communion, ye could not without your great shame and want of modesty thus untruly have published to the world that by M. Calvin's doctrine the sacraments are superfluous.

8. John Whitgift, Archbishop and Doctor (1530–1604).

[L.]

If it had pleased her Majesty, with the wisdom of the realm, to have used no bishops at all, we could not have complained justly of any defect in our Church. If it had pleased her Majesty to have assigned the imposition of hands to the deans of every cathedral church, or some other number of ministers, which in no sort were bishops but as they be pastors, there had been no wrong done to their persons that I can conceive.

9. Richard Bancroft, Archbishop and Doctor (1544–1610). [N.]

"A question in the meantime was moved by Andrews, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish bishops, who, as he said, 'must first be ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop.' Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained that 'there 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." Abp. Spottiswoode (iii, 209).

10. Thomas Holland, Presbyter and Doctor (*ob.* 1612).

When William Laud in 1604, maintained the thesis that there could be no true Church without diocesan bishops, Dr. Holland, the Regius Professor of Divinity, "openly reprehended him in the Schools for a seditious person, who would unchurch the Reformed Protestant Church beyond seas, and sow division between us and them, who were brethren by this popish position." Dr. Heylin says that Laud "was shrewdly rattled by Dr. Holland, as one that did endeavour to cast a bone of discord betwixt the Church of England and the Reformed Churches beyond the seas." In 1608 Dr. Holland defended publicly the thesis "*Quod Episcopus non sit Ordo distinctus Presbyteriatu, eoque superior jure divino*" ("That the bishop's office is not a distinct order from that of the presbyter, and therefore superior by divine right").

11. John Rainolds, Presbyter (1549–1607).

Though Epiphanius says that Ærius's assertion is full of folly, he does not disprove his reasons from Scripture; nay, his argument is so weak that even Bellarmin confesses they are not agreeable to the text. As for the general consent of the Church, which the doctor [Bancroft] says condemned Ærius's opinion for heresy, what proof does he bring for it? It appears, he says, in Epiphanius; but I say it does not; and the contrary appears by St. Jerome, and sundry other who lived about the same time. I grant that St. Austin, in his book *Of Heresies*, ascribes this to Ærius for one,—that he said there ought to be no difference between a priest and a

bishop, because this was to condemn the Church's order, and to make a schism therein. But it is quite a different thing to say that by the word of God there is a difference between them, and to say that it is by the order and custom of the Church, which is all that St. Austin maintained. When Harding the papist alleged these very witnesses to prove the opinion of bishops and priests being of the same order to be heresy, our learned Bishop Jewel cited to the contrary Chrysostom, Jerome, Ambrose and St. Austin himself, and concluded his answer with these words: "All these and othermore holy Fathers, together with the Apostle Paul, for thus saying, by Harding's advice, must be held for heretics. Michael Medina, a man of great account in the Council of Trent, adds to the forementioned testimonies, Theodorus, Primarius, Sedulius, Theophylact, with whom agree Œcumenius the Greek scholiast, Anselm Archbishop of Canterbury, Gregory and Gratian; and after them how many, it being once enrolled in the Canon Law, and thereupon taught by learned men."

Besides, all that have labored in reforming the Church for five hundred years have taught that all pastors, be they entitled bishop or priests, have equal authority and power by God's word; as, at first, the Waldenses, next Marsilius Patavinus, then Wickliffe and his scholars, afterward Husse and the Hussites; and last of all Luther, Calvin, Brentius, Bullinger and Musculus. Among ourselves we have bishops, the Queen's professors of divinity in our universities, and other learned men consenting herein, as Bradford, Lambert, Jewel, Pilkington, Humphreys, Fulke, etc. But what do I speak of particular persons? It is the common judgment of the Reformed Churches of Helvetia, Savoy, France, Scotland, Germany, Hungary, Poland, the Low Countries

and our own. I hope Dr. Bancroft will not say that all these have approved that for sound doctrine which was condemned by the general consent of the Church for heresy, in a most flourishing time; I hope he will acknowledge that he was overseen when he avouched the superiority which bishops have amongst us over the clergy to be God's own ordinance.

12. Richard Hooker, *Presbyter* (1554–1600). [N. P. L.]

“Some do infer that no ordination can stand but only such as is made by bishops, which have had their ordination likewise before them, till we come to the very Apostles of Christ themselves.” “To this we answer that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop.” “Men may be extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways admitted unto spiritual functions in the Church. One is, when God doth of himself raise up any, whose labor he useth without requiring that men should authorize them; but then he doth ratify their calling by manifest signs and tokens himself from heaven. Another extraordinary kind of vocation is when the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep; where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give, place.”

“Although I see that certain Reformed Churches, the Scottish especially and the French, have not that which best agreeth with the Scripture sacred, I mean the government that is by bishops, . . . this their defect I had rather lament in such case than exaggerate.”

“Lest bishops forget themselves, as if none on earth

had authority to touch their states, let them continually bear in mind, that it is rather by force of custom, whereby the Church having so long found it good to continue under the regimen of her virtuous bishops, doth still uphold and maintain them in that respect, than that any such true and heavenly Law can be showed, by the evidence whereof it may of a truth appear that the Lord himself hath appointed Presbyters to be forever under the regiment of bishops, in whatsoever sort they behave themselves; let this consideration be a bridle unto them, let it teach them not to disdain the advice of their presbyters, but to use their authority with so much the greater humility and moderation, as a sword which the Church hath power to take from them."

13. Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop and Doctor (1555–1626).

[N.]

Nec tamen si nostra divini juris sit, inde sequitur vel quod sine ea salus non sit, vel quod stare non possit ecclesia. Cæcus sit, qui non videat stantes sine ea ecclesias; ferreus sit qui salutem eis neget. Nos non sumus ille ferrei; latum inter ista discrimen ponimus. Potest abesse aliquid quod divini juris sit (in exteriore quidem regimine), ut tamen substet salus. Non est hoc damnare rem, melius illi aliquid antepone.

Quæris tum peccentne in jus divinum ecclesiæ vestræ? Non dixi. Id tantum dixi, abesse ab ecclesiis vestris aliquid quod de jure divino sit; culpa vestra non abesse, sed injuria temporum.

14. Richard Field, Presbyter and Doctor (1561–1616).

A bishop ordained *per saltum*, that never had the ordination of a presbyter, can neither consecrate nor administer the sacrament of the Lord's body; nor ordain a presbyter, himself being none; nor do any act peculiarly

pertaining to presbyters. Whereby it is most evident that that wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter is not a distinct power of order, but an eminence and dignity only, specially yielded to one above all the rest of the same rank, for order's sake, and to preserve the unity and peace of the Church. Hence it followeth that many things which in some cases are peculiarly reserved unto bishops, as Hierome noteth, *potius ad honorem sacerdotii, quam ad legis necessitatem* ("rather for the honour of their ministry, than the necessity of any law"). [After mentioning as instances of this confirmation and the reconciliation of penitents, Dr. Field proceeds:] And why not, by the same reason, ordain presbyters and deacons in cases of like necessity? . . . For if the power of order and authority to intermeddle in things pertaining to God's service be the same in all presbyters, and that they be limited in the execution of it only for order's sake, . . . there is no reason to be given, but that in cases of necessity, . . . but that presbyters, as they may do all other acts, whatsoever special challenge bishops in ordinary course make upon them, might do this also. Who then dare condemn all those worthy ministers of God that were ordained by presbyters, in sundry churches of the world, at such times as bishops, in those parts where they lived, opposed themselves against the truth of God, and persecuted such as professed it? Surely the best learned in the Church of Rome in former times durst not pronounce all ordinations of this nature to be void. For not only Armachanus [Richard Fitz Ralph of Armagh], a very learned and worthy bishop, but, as it appeareth by Alexander of Hales, many learned men in his time and before, were of opinion that in some cases and in some times presbyters may give orders, and that their ordinations are of force. [He

quotes Alexander of Hales as stating that "some say an ordained person, when called upon by a pope, can confer that order which he himself has."]

15. Francis Mason, Presbyter and Archdeacon (1566-1621). [N.]

He wrote an able defence of the Orders of the Church of England against the Romanists. In 1621 Archbishop Ussher published what he described as an Appendix to that work, *The Validity of the Orders of the Ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, maintained against the Romanists*. He holds to the parity of bishops and presbyters in the matter of order, saying that "the bishop in his consecration receiveth a sacred office, an eminence, a jurisdiction, a dignity, a degree of ecclesiastical preëminence." "He hath no higher degree in respect of intension or extension of the character; but he hath a higher degree, that is, a more excellent place in respect of authority and jurisdiction, in spiritual regiment. Wherefore, seeing a presbyter is equal to a bishop in the power of order, he hath equal intrinsic power to give orders." In some sense episcopacy is of divine right: "But if by *jure divino* you understand a law and commandment of God, binding all Christian churches, universally, perpetually, unchangeably, and with such absolute necessity that no other form of regiment may in any case be admitted; in this sense neither may we grant it, nor yet can you prove it to be *jure divino*." As for the Reformed churches of the continent, they are under no obligation to seek for Protestant bishops, as they have "the substance of the office," and "you must give us leave to believe God from heaven approving their ministry by pouring down a blessing upon their labors."

16. Richard Crakanthorpe, Presbyter (1567–1624).

They [the Reformed Churches of the Continent] have not, I know, bishops distinct from presbyters, and superior to them, in the power of ordaining and excommunicating. But that inequality they teach not, as Ærius did, to be repugnant to the word of God. They do not condemn it either in our Church, or in the Church universal, existing now for more than fifteen hundred years. They judge that the admission of either equality or inequality is free and lawful both by the word and the law of God. In short, whether to sanction equality or inequality they judge to be in the judgment and the power of each church.

17. Francis Bacon, Viscount Verulam (1567–1626).

Some indiscreet persons have been bold in open preaching to use dishonorable 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.

18. Joseph Hall, Bishop and Doctor (1574–1656). [N.]

The sticking at the admission of our brethren, returning from the Reformed churches, was not in the case of ordination but of institution; they had been acknowledged ministers of Christ without any other hands laid upon them.

I know those more than one, who by virtue only of that ordination which they have brought with them from other Reformed churches have enjoyed spiritual promotion and livings without any exception against the lawfulness of their calling.

There is no difference in any essential matter betwixt the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation. We accord in every point of Christian doctrine

without the least variation; their public confessions and ours are sufficient convictions to the world of our full and absolute agreement. The only difference is in the form of outward administration; wherein we also are so far agreed that we profess this form not to be essential to the being of a church, though much importing the well or better being of it, according to our several apprehensions thereof, and that we all do retain a reverence and loving opinion of each other in our own several ways, not seeing any reason why so poor a diversity should work any alienation of affection in us one towards another.

19. John Davenant, Bishop and Doctor (1576–1641).

But in a disturbed Church, where all bishops have fallen into heresy or idolatry, where they have refused to ordain orthodox ministers, if orthodox presbyters be compelled to ordain other presbyters, that the Church may not perish, I could not venture to pronounce ordinations of this kind vain and invalid.

20. Thomas Jackson, Presbyter, Dean and Doctor (1579–1640).

We Protestants of the Reformed churches, who are, if not the only true Christians upon earth, yet the truest Christians, and the most conspicuous members of the Holy Catholic Church, as militant here on earth, dare not vouchsafe to bestow the name of Catholic upon any Papist.

21. James Ussher, Archbishop and Doctor (1581–1656).

For the testifying of my communion with these churches, which I do love and honor as true members of the Church universal, I do profess that with like affection I would receive the blessed sacrament at the hands

of the Dutch ministers in Holland, as I would do at the hands of the French ministers. ' .

22. John Bramhall, Archbishop (1594–1663). [N.]

Episcopal divines do not deny those churches to be true churches, wherein salvation may be had. We advise them, as it is our duty, to be circumspect for themselves, and not to put it to more question whether they have ordination or not, or desert the general practice of the Universal Church for nothing, when they may clear it if they please. Their case is not the same with those who labor under invincible necessity. What mine own sense is of it, I have declared many years since to the world in print; and in the same received thanks, and a public acknowledgment of my moderation, from a French divine.

23. John Cosin, Bishop and Doctor (1594–1672). [P.]

Though we may safely say and maintain it, that their ministers [those of the French churches] are not so duly and rightly ordained as they should be, by those prelates and bishops of the Church, who, since the Apostles' time, have had the ordinary power and authority to make and constitute a priest; yet that, by reason of this defect, there is a total nullity in their ordination, or that they be therefore no priests or ministers of the Church at all, because they are ordained by those only who are no more but only priests and ministers among them, for my part I would be loth to affirm and determine it against them. . . . 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 any absolute precept that either Christ or his Apostles gave about it. Nor can I yet meet with any convincing argument to set it upon a more high and

divine institution. . . . If at any time a minister ordained in these French churches came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have so done of late, and can instance in many others before my time), our bishops did not re-ordain him before they admitted him to his charge, as they must have done if his former ordination here in France had been void. Nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received among us, and to subscribe to the Articles established. And I love not to be herein more wise, or harder than our own Church is, which hath never publicly condemned and pronounced the ordinations of the other Reformed churches to be void, as it doth not those of the unreformed churches.

There have been both learned and eminent men, as well in former ages as in this, and even among Roman Catholics, who have held and maintained it for good and passable divinity, that presbyters have the intrinsical power of ordination *in actu primo*; though for the avoidance of schism (as St. Hierom speaks) and preserving order and discipline in the Church, they have been restrained ever since the first times, and still are (but where they take a liberty to themselves that was never truly given them), from exercising their power *in actu secundo*. And therefore that however their act of ordaining other presbyters shall be void, according to the strictness of the Canon (in regard they were universally prohibited from executing that act, and breaking the order and discipline of the Church) yet that same act shall not be simply void in the nature of the things, in regard that the intrinsical power remaineth, when the exercise of it was suspended and taken from them.

24. Herbert Thorndike, Presbyter (1598-1672).

The resolution of Gulielmus Antissiodorensis among the school doctors, is well known and approved; that the order of bishops, in case of necessity, may be propagated by presbyters, supposing that they never received power to do such an act from them that had it. My reason makes me bold to resolve further, that, in the case which is put, Christian people may appoint themselves bishops, presbyters and deacons, provided it be with such limits of power, to be exercised under such laws, as are appointed before by our Lord and his Apostles; and that, upon these terms, they ought to be acknowledged by the rest of the Church, whensoever there is opportunity of communicating with the same, . . . and that this acknowledgment of them would be effectual, instead of solemn ordination by imposition of hands of persons endowed with that power which is intended to be conveyed by the same.

25. William Sancroft, Archbishop (1617-1693).

From *Some Things to be more fully insisted upon by the Bishops in their Addresses to the Clergy and People of their respective Dioceses*:

More especially that they have a very tender regard to our Brethren, the Protestant Dissenters; that upon occasion offered they visit them at their Houses, and receive them kindly at their own, and treat them fairly wherever they meet them, discoursing calmly and civilly with them. . . .

And in the last place, that they warmly and most affectionately exhort them [the Dissenters] to join with us in daily fervent Prayer to the God of Peace, for an Universal Blessed Union of all Reformed Churches, both at Home and Abroad, against our common Enemies,


and that all they who do confess the Holy Name of our dear Lord, and do agree in the Truth of his Holy Word, may also meet in one Holy Communion, and live in perfect Unity and Godly Love.

26. Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop and Doctor (1635-1699). [N.]

They have either a very low idea of the work of a gospel bishop, or very little consideration of the zeal, activity and diligence which was then used in preaching, reproving, exhorting, in season, out of season, that think that one single person was able to undergo it all. Discipline was a great deal more strict then, preaching more diligent, men more apprehensive of the weight of their function, than for any to undertake such a care and charge of souls, that it was impossible for them ever to know, observe, or watch over so as to give an account of them. Besides, while we suppose this one person employed in the duties of his flock, what leisure or time could such an one have to preach to the Gentiles and unbelieving Jews in order to their conversion? The Apostles certainly did not aim at the setting up the honor of any one person, making the office of the Church a matter of state and dignity more than employment; but they chose men for their activity in preaching the gospel, and for their usefulness in laboring to add continually to the Church. Men that were employed in the Church then did not consult for their ease or honor, and thought it not enough for them to sit still and bid others work. . . . Public prayers were not then looked on as the more principal end of Christian assemblies than preaching, nor consequently that it was the more principal office of the stewards of the mysteries of God to read the public prayers of the Church, than to

preach in season and out of season. . . . However it is granted, that in the Apostles' times preaching was the great work; and if so, how can we think one single person in a great city was sufficient, both to preach to and rule the church, and to preach abroad in order to the conversion of more from their Gentilism to Christianity? Especially if the church of every city was so large as some would make it, viz., to comprehend all the believers under the civil jurisdiction of the city, and so both city and country the charge of one single bishop. I think the vastness of the work, and the impossibility of the discharge of it by one single person, may be argument enough to make us interpret the places of Scripture which may be understood in that sense, as of more than one pastor in every city. . . . In the most populous churches we have many remaining footsteps of such a college of presbyters there established in apostolic times.

I doubt not but to make it evident, that before these late unhappy times, the main ground for settling episcopal government in this nation, was not any pretence of divine right, but the conveniency of that form to the state and condition of this Church at the times of its reformation.



INDEX

- Acts of Apostles, 20-28, 43-44,
 111, 140, 151, 161
 Aerius of Sebasteia, 101, 142-
 144, 297
 Africa, Roman, 124, 125, 127,
 169, 175-176
 Agape (Love-Feast), 71, 86-87
 Alexander, Patriarch of Alex-
 andria, 131, 158
 Alexandria, the church of, 116,
 118, 128, 130-132, 140, 158,
 163, 271
 Alien churches in England, 231,
 241-242, 243-246, 255
 Ambrose of Milan, 172, 173, 222
 "Ambrosiaster." See Isaac of
 Rome
 American dioceses, 36, 277, 280
 Ancyra, church of, 51, 67-68,
 154; Council of, 159, 178
 Andrews, Dr. Lancelot, 6, 76,
 215, 238-239, 240-241, 242,
 246, 251, 266, 296-297, 300
 Angels of the seven churches, 36,
 39-40, 68, 279-280
 Anselm of Canterbury, 187, 189,
 192, 198, 203, 204, 298
 Antioch, the church in, 22-23,
 27, 78-79, 161
 Apocalypse, 33-34, 36, 39-40,
 97, 129, 170
 Apostles, the Twelve, 14, 20-21,
 24-25, 34-35, 57, 58, 97, 108,
 120, 127, 149. See Succes-
 sion
 Aquinas, Thomas, 47, 187, 188,
 189, 199-200
 Arianism, 155, 264n
 Arles, Synod of, 124 & n, 253
 Asia, Roman, 15, 19, 27-28, 39,
 62-63, 65-68, 85, 89-92, 108,
 109, 110, 111-114, 115, 116-
 118, 121-122, 142, 154, 168,
 170, 173-174
 Athanasius, 47, 86, 155
 Augustine of Hippo, 24, 139, 155,
 162, 167, 175, 176, 181, 185,
 196, 277, 295, 297-298

 BACON, Francis, Lord, 303
 Bæda, 107
 Bancroft, Dr. Richard, 143, 206,
 211, 240-241, 243, 249-250,
 251, 296, 299
 Baptism, Heretical or Schismati-
 cal, 124, 125, 253
 Barlow, Bishop William, 218-
 219 & n, 293
 Barnabas, 22-23, 37, 170
 Barrow, Dr. Isaac, 134
 Baur, Friedrich Christian, 75-
 76n, 77, 78, 102, 104, 136, 148
 Baxter, Richard, 183, 252, 276-
 277
 Becon, Thomas, 205, 294
 Bellarmin Card. Robert, 133,
 136n, 141, 203
 Bernard of Clairvaux, 187, 188,
 189, 281
 Bernard of Constance, 198
 Beveridge, Bishop William, 134,
 256
 Bilson, Dr. Thomas, 211
 Bishop for America proposed,
 2-4, 257; secured, 4
 Bishops, Primitive, 42, 44-46,
 49, 54, 57, 58-59, 69, 70-71,
 139-141; Monarchic, 81, 151,
 156-159, 272; Diocesan, 173-
 179, 207, 263; Urban, 100,
 165, 182, 269
 Bonaventura, Card. John, 188,
 199, 203

- Bonner, Bishop Edmund, 205, 221
- Book of Common Prayer, American, 4-5, 285; English, 213, 216-217, 258-259
- Bramhall, Dr. John, 6, 215, 251, 305
- Britain, Roman, 174, 176
- Bruce, Canon Robert, 73, 97, 184
- Bunsen, Freiherr Carl Christian Josias, 65, 66, 75, 77, 83, 266n
- Burkitt, Francis Crawford, 68-69
- CALDERWOOD, David, 167
- Calvin, John, 202-203, 213, 217, 224, 296, 298
- "Canons of the Holy Apostles," 133, 134-135, 177, 182
- Carthage, the church in, 119, 122-123
- Cartwright, Dr. Thomas, 226-227
- Casaubon, Isaac, 238
- Catholic Apostolic Church, 39, 279-280
- "Catholic Church," 63, 88, 104
- Chandler, Dr. Thomas Bradley, 3-4
- Channel Islands, 227-228, 242-243
- Charles I, 232, 243-249, 254n, 286
- Charles II, 240, 252-253, 254n
- Chorepiscopate, 178, 279
- Chrysostom, John, 24, 77, 79, 86, 196
- Church, Christ's presence in, 29, 146-150, 273, 284. His teaching of, 17-18, 146, 272, 284
- Church, conception of the, 88-89, 95, 96, 110, 119-121, 125-126, 148-150, 170, 263-264, 267-269, 272
- City, the unit of ancient society, 129, 151, 167-173; its government not monarchical, 150-151
- Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of, 2, 244, 245, 256
- Clement of Alexandria, 15, 24, 28, 52, 88, 92, 101, 103, 104, 116-118, 119
- Clement of Rome, 35, 42n, 44, 50, 53, 54-62, 74, 85, 89, 104, 106, 107, 109, 112, 114, 126, 145, 148, 165, 170, 177, 271
- "Clementines" (Homilies, Recognitions), 103, 106
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 276
- Colet, Dr. John, 201-202
- Colluthus of Alexandria, 159
- Confessors' Right to absolve the Lapsed, 123-124
- "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles," 52, 63, 82, 92, 99-100, 104, 106, 111, 114, 127, 133-136, 146, 157, 162, 165, 216
- Conybeare, F. C., 63, 88n
- Corinth, the church in, 35, 54-59, 105, 109
- Cosin, Dr. John, 6, 205, 215, 237, 238, 251, 266, 305-306
- Councils, 155, 180-181, 263; Ancyra, 51, 67-68, 154; Arles, 124n, 253; Nicea, 124, 158, 177, 274; Seville, 197; Trullus 133; Beneventum, 198; Constance and Basel, 189; Trent, 202; Vatican, 190
- Coverdale, Bishop Miles, 219
- Cox, Bishop Richard, 204, 224, 294
- Crakanthorpe, Richard, 303
- Cranmer, Abp. Thomas, 204, 211-217, 218, 293
- Cureton, Rev. William, 68, 76n, 77-78, 86, 92, 93-94, 119
- Cyprian of Carthage, 34, 36, 44, 88, 99, 101, 122-128, 133, 141, 148, 156, 157, 158, 163, 165, 175, 178-179, 182, 253-254, 263, 267, 280, 291, 292
- DAILLÉ, Jean, 75n, 89, 136n
- Davenant, Dr. John, 304
- Deacons, Scriptural, 21-22, 29, 30, 42, 71-72; Ecclesiastical, 30, 137-138, 139-140, 170

- Denton, Rev. William, 264n
 "Didache." See Teaching
 Dionysius of Alexandria, 88, 101, 128-130, 156
 "Dionysius the Areopagite," 135n, 200, 201
 Diotrefes, 15, 19-20, 40, 153
 Doane, Bp. William Crosswell, 12
 Docetism, 20, 87, & n
 Dodwell, Dr. Henry, 253, 254, 266
 Donatists, 124, 155, 175, 176, 181, 264n
 Dort, Synod of, 236
 Duchesne, Mgr. Louis, 61-62, 87n, 132, 272
- EBIONITES, 26, 36, 42, 101-105, 136, 154
 Ecclesia, the Christian, 20-22, 23-24, 27, 28-29, 30-32, 34, 36, 161
 Edgeworth, Dr. Roger, 204
 Egypt, the church in, 129-130, 168-169, 267n
 Elders, Jewish, 21, 41, 141; Christian, 21, 23, 24, 27-31, 33, 41, 120, 152; Celestial, 34
 Elizabeth, Queen, 156, 217-218, 231-232, 236-237, 241
 England, the church in, 190-191, 192-195, 203-205
 England, the Church of, 4, 7, 183-184, 205, 211-232, 234-242, 243-250, 251-258, 262-268, 269-274, 275-277, 282-284
 English Canons of 1604, 213, 235
 English Dioceses, 191-192, 276-277
 Epiphanius, 51, 67, 73, 106, 142-143, 143n, 297
 Erasmus, 136n, 201
 Erastianism, 180-182, 217-218, 220-222, 290
 Eusebius of Cesarea, 14, 37-38, 51, 67, 76, 79, 80, 81, 85, 86, 88, 94, 101-102, 103-104, 113, 139
- Eutychius of Alexandria, 130, 131-132, 158, 271
 Evangelists, 32, 37-39, 170
- FIELD, Dr. Richard, 201n, 205, 300
 Firmilian of Cesarea, 88, 156
 Freeman, Dr. Edward Augustus, 155, 193-195, 220
- GENEVA, the church of, 217, 223, 225, 226, 294
 Gibson, Mrs. Margaret, 69
 Gnosticism, 107, 110, 126, 154n
 Gore, Dr. Charles, 15, 20n, 60, 75, 166-167, 215, 269-273, 275-276
 Grabe, Dr. John Ernest, 134, 258
 Gratian, the Canonist, 141, 198, 298
 Gregory of Nazianzen, Bishop of Sasima, 174-176
 Grindal, Abp. Edmund, 217, 221, 222-223, 224, 229
 Grosstete, Bishop Robert, 188, 189, 195
- HALL, Dr. Joseph, 76, 215, 237, 238, 246, 251, 266, 303-304
 Hands, the Laying on of, 21, 22, 128, 158, 160-164, 216
 Harnack, Dr. Adolph, 43-44, 50n, 62, 75, 76 & n, 78, 81, 88, 90, 116n, 143n, 154n
 Hatch, Dr. Edwin, 42-44, 59, 62, 71, 74, 75, 150, 177, 182, 270
 Hebrews, the Epistle to, 32-33, 140
 Hegesippus, 36, 54, 101-106, 121
 Henry VIII, 191-192, 204-205, 211, 213, 218, 219, 221
 Heresy, Episcopacy no safeguard against, 85, 153-155
 Hermas of Rome, 38, 47, 50, 52-54, 73, 85, 104, 107, 112, 145, 165, 170, 271
 Heron, Dr. James, 43n, 46n, 52n

- Heylin, Dr. Peter, 125, 143, 241, 243n, 297
 Hippolytus of Rome, 51, 66-67, 88
 Hobart, Bishop John Henry, 6, 8
 Hodges, Rev. Jubal, 279-280
 Hodgkyn, Bishop John, 219-220
 Holland, Dr. Thomas, 243n, 297
 Hook, Dr. Walter Farquhar, 183, 184, 211-212, 267
 Hooker, Richard, 6, 76, 205, 215, 224, 230, 299
 Hort, Dr. Fenton John Anthony, 20n, 22, 23-24, 27, 29-30, 33, 40-41, 43n
 House of Bishops, American, 9, 10, 285, 286-287
 Hunt, Rev. John, 256, 276, 294
 Huntingdon, Henry Hastings, Earl of, 222, 225-226
 Hutton, Abp. Matthew, 225, 226
- IGNATIUS of Antioch, 36, 51, 63, 64-65, 72-73, 74, 75-100, 104, 111-112, 119, 126, 141, 145-146, 165, 182, 183, 240, 276, 280
 Ireland, the church in, 174, 179, 191
 Irenaeus of Lyons, 15, 28, 36, 37, 43n, 52, 54, 62, 73, 74, 77, 85, 86, 88, 92, 101, 104, 106, 107-116, 119, 121, 126, 156, 166
 Isaac of Rome ("Ambrosiaster"), 72, 101, 136-139, 158, 271
 Isidore of Seville, 197-198
- JABLONSKY, Bp. Daniel Ernst, 258-259
 Jackson, Dr. Thomas, 304
 James, the Lord's Brother, and Apostle, 24-27, 102-103, 146
 James VI and I, 229, 233-243, 254n
 Jelf, Dr. Richard William, 269
 Jerome (Eusebius Hieronymus), 24, 33, 39, 47, 67, 83, 101, 130-132, 139-142, 153-154, 159, 162, 196-206, 211, 250, 270, 295, 297, 298, 301, 306
- Jerusalem Bishopric (1841-1881), 266-267
 Jerusalem, the church in, 20, 24-27, 36; Council of, 24, 26-27
 Jewel, Bishop John, 196, 205, 223, 295-296, 298
 John, the Apostle, 15, 19-20, 28, 90, 92, 97, 109, 113-114, 115, 116-118, 121, 140. His Third Epistle, 15, 19-20, 145
 Justin Martyr, 50, 69-72, 86, 104, 177
- KITCHIN, Bishop Anthony, 218, 220, 221
 Knollys, Sir Francis, 217, 222, 294
 Knox, John, 163-164, 216, 224, 276
- LAMBETH Conference, 288, 289-290
 Lancelotti, Dr. Giovanni Paolo, 141, 199, 203
 Lasco, Johannes a, 210n, 242
 Laud, Abp. William, 2, 34, 125, 215, 231, 234, 235, 243, 250, 266, 286, 297
 Laune, Guillaume de, 238
 Lefroy, Dr. William, 190n, 214, 215-216, 272-273, 283, 284
 Leighton, Robert, 241, 290-291
 Liddon, Dr. Henry Parry, 59-60, 282n
 Lightfoot, Dr. Joseph Barber, 15, 19, 36, 51, 60, 63-66, 67, 68, 74, 75, 78, 80-81, 83, 84, 86, 87, 89-92, 97, 99, 111, 112, 114, 116, 130, 132, 142, 153-154, 214
 Lipsius, Dr. Richard Adelbert, 77, 81-83, 107-108
 Littledale, Dr. Richard Frederick, 106, 249n

- Luther, Martin, 25, 156, 185, 186, 211, 212, 298
 Lutheran bishops in Germany, 208; in Scandinavia, 208-209
 Lutheran Orders, 8-9, 209, 266, 298
- MARCION, 51, 67, 73, 104, 109, 127, 154
 Mason, Rev. Francis, 205, 302
 Medina, Michael de, 202-203, 206, 298
 Metropolitan Sees, 135, 177
 Moehler, Dr. Johann Adam, 127
 Montanists, 51, 67-68, 87, 98, 119, 123, 146, 154, 181
 Moravian Episcopate, 258, 289-290
 Morin, Jean, 136n, 216
 Morton, Dr. Thomas, 239-240
 Moulin, Pierre du, 239; Peter du, 239
 Muratorian Fragment, 52, 90, 104
- NEWMAN, Dr. John Henry, 10, 15-16, 203, 251, 262-266, 267, 272, 284, 285, 292
 Noetus of Smyrna, 50, 66-67, 154
 Nonjurors' Schism, 7, 273-274
 Novatian of Rome, 137-138, 162-163
 Novatus of Carthage, 159
- ORDINAL, the English, 213-216, 229; The Roman, 158, 162, 216
 Ordination, 128, 157-164, 305
 Origen, 38, 52, 55, 78-79, 86, 118-119, 126, 139, 177
 Overall, Dr. John, 238
 Oxford School, 2, 262-266, 267, 285, 293
- PALATINATE, churches of the, 247-248, 286
- Palmer, Bishop, 12-13
 Palmer, Sir William, 174, 267
 Papacy, the Roman, 127-128, 133, 150, 151, 182, 185, 186, 189-190, 272-273, 291
 Paphnutius, the Abbot, 159 & n
 Parker, Abp. Matthew, 218-220, 221, 222
 Paroikia (Parish), 89, 170-171, 172, 265
 Pastoral Office, 30, 32, 44-49, 116, 182-184, 190-191, 193-194, 269, 275-276, 280-281
 Paul, the Apostle, 18, 19, 22-24, 35, 43-44, 55, 66, 72, 79, 104, 146, 170, 275n
 Pearson, Dr. John, 75n, 77, 134, 240
 Peschitto, the Syriac, 50, 68-69
 Peter, the Apostle, 18-19, 26, 45-46, 79, 92n, 98, 126, 140, 170
 Peter the Lombard, 188, 199
 Philippi, the church in, 29-30, 63-66, 83, 84, 140
 Phillpotts, Bishop Henry, 264, 292
 Philpot, John, 294
 Polycarp of Smyrna, 15, 30, 44, 50, 62-66, 79, 83, 84, 85-86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 104, 107, 109, 110-111, 112, 113, 115, 153, 165, 170, 271
 Polycrates of Ephesus, 73, 90-91, 92
 Preach, License to, 186-187, 229
 "Precedent of 1610," 240-241, 290
 Presbyterian Church of America, 9-12; of Australia, 289
 Presbyters, Ordination by, 130-136, 256
 Presbytery of Lystra, 23-24
 "Prophecyings" in the Church of England, 218, 229
 Prophets in the early Church, 22, 23, 52-54, 96, 98
 "Protestantism" a Nehushtan, 267, 285-286
 Prussia, Friedrich I, King of, 258-260; Friedrich Wilhelm IV, 266-267

- Purchas, Rev. H. T., 20, 114-115, 145
 Puritans, 204, 217, 219-220, 222, 228-229, 230, 244, 248, 252-253, 276
 Pusey, Dr. Edward Bouverie, 266n, 267, 269
- RAINOLDS, Dr. John, 205
 Ramsay, Sir William Mitchell, 50, 90, 151
 Redman, Dr. John, 204
 Reformed Churches on the Continent, 214, 216, 223-224, 225, 231-232, 235-240, 243n, 246-248, 250, 255, 297, 298-299, 302, 303, 303-304, 304, 304-305, 305-306, 307
 Reformed Episcopal Church, 274-275
 Rhodon, 51, 67-68, 86
 Ritschl, Dr. Albrecht, 77, 103, 104, 148, 154n
 Roman Empire, 19, 150-152, 179-182. Emperors: Domitian, 58, 102; Trajan, 15, 36, 76, 79, 80-81, 82, 88; Hadrian, 81; Antoninus Pius, 81; Decius, 148; Diocletian, 179
 "Roman Peace," 168, 180
 Romanticism, 261, 267-268
 Rome, the church in, 52-55, 56, 58, 60, 62, 67, 70-74, 85, 92-93, 105-107, 108-109, 112, 121, 154, 171-172; Linus, Cletus, Anacletus, 106, 107, 109, 112; Anicetus, 73, 105, 110; Soter, 72; Victor, 73, 91, 110-111; Callistus, 171; Fabianus, 137, 172; Cornelius, 125, 128 & n, 158, 163; Dionysius, 172; Marcellus, 172; Liberius, 155; Siricius, 172; Leo, 160; Gregory VII, 179, 189, 192; Urban II, 198, 203
 Rothe, Dr. Richard, 14-15, 60, 104, 142, 178n
 Ruskin, John, 48-49, 100, 276
- SACERDOTALISM, 87, 99-100, 122, 128, 143, 148-149, 157, 284
 Salmon, Dr. George, 15, 19, 35, 51, 52, 54, 67, 72-73, 75, 79, 90, 105, 112, 113, 143n, 145, 150
 Sancroft, Dr. William, 255, 290, 307
 Sanday, Dr. William, 13, 72, 75, 165-166
 Sandys, Abp. Edmund, 221, 225
 Saravia, Hadrian, 224
 Schism and Episcopacy, 139-140, 151-152, 155-156, 273-275
 Scory, Bishop John, 219
 Scotland, Reformed Church of, 49, 183-184, 209-210, 214-215, 223, 224, 234-235, 240-241, 246, 268, 276, 290-291, 299. Its Books of Discipline, 163-164, 209-210
 Scott, Sir Walter, 184, 262
 Scottish Episcopal Church, 7, 274
 Seabury, Dr. Samuel, 6-8, 100, 274
 Sharp, Abp. John, 259
 Sheldon, Abp. Gilbert, 241, 253, 256, 257
 Smith, Canon Travers, 76n, 84-85, 89, 98, 99
 Smyrna, the church in, 63, 66-67, 96, 109, 110, 121, 151
 Spottiswoode, Abp. John, 240-241, 296, 297
 Stanley, Dr. Arthur Penrhyn, 15, 40, 47-48, 53, 106
 Stanton, Dr. Vincent Henry, 272
 Stillingfleet, Dr. Edward, 159, 160, 197, 205, 308
 Story, Dr. Herbert, 210
 Strabo, Walfried, 173, 188-189
 Succession, Apostolic, 34-35, 98-99, 108, 109, 110, 114, 120-121, 121-122, 126-127, 155, 215-216, 263, 267-275, 282, 291
 Sumner, Abp. John Bird, 264-265

- Superintendents, Scottish, 209-210, 276
 Synagogue, the Jewish, 21, 31
- TAYLOR, Dr. Jeremy, 215, 250-251, 280-281
 "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" ("Didache"), 38, 39, 50, 51-52, 90, 136, 165
 Tertullian, 15, 28, 36, 38, 39, 52, 80, 88, 101, 104, 106, 126, 177
 Thompson, Dr. Hugh Miller, 36
 Thönissen, Konrad, 60-61
 Thorndike, Dr. Herbert, 307
 "Threefold Ministry," 58, 65, 83, 94, 95, 96, 97-98, 99, 111, 134-135, 184, 279
 Tillotson, Abp. John, 255
 Timothy, 23-24, 30-32, 36-37, 138
 Titus, 30, 32, 36-37, 170
 Travers, Dr. Walter, 230-231
- "UNCOVENANTED Mercies," 251, 263-264 & n, 282
 Uniformity, English Acts of (1571, 1662), 223, 230, 237, 252, 256, 306
- Ussher, Dr. James, 76-77, 231, 302, 304-305
- VAUGHAN, Bishop Richard, 241-242
 Venables, Canon Edmund, 143-144
 Venantius, Bishop of Timisa, 149
 Villages and village churches, 68, 168, 177-178
 Vossius, Gerard John and Isaac, 77, 89, 92, 240, 249, 252
- WARBURTON, Bishop William, 257
 Whiston, Rev. William, 133n, 134
 White, Dr. William, 5-6, 8, 285
 Whitgift, Abp. John, 76, 218, 225, 226-227, 229, 230, 249-250, 296
 Whittingham, Dr. William, 217, 224-226, 230
 Whittingham, Bishop William Rollinson, 278-279
 Wied, Hermann von, Abp. of Cologne, 208, 216-217
 Wordsworth, Bishop Charles, 206
- ZAHN, Dr. Theodor, 78, 83-84, 86, 87