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Hadrian Saravía went over to the Reformation sometime during the middle decade of the sixteenth century and soon thereafter became a minister in the Dutch Reformed Church. However, he had not served many years in the Reformed Church before he began to have serious doubts about the "Genevan-type" governments which it had, and, significantly enough, these doubts focused in the area of ecclesiastical polity because he felt a parity of authority among ministers was not capable of producing a sufficient degree of order and harmony in the Church. Although he remained a minister in, or in some way associated with, the Reformed Church for the better part of a period of twenty years after he actually had changed his views about ecclesiastical government, he apparently became more and more convinced during this time of the necessity of an authoritarian ordering of the ministry such as that which would be found in a hierarchy of ministers. Also, very early in this same period he became convinced that the three-fold ordering of ministers in the Anglican Church was the best kind of arrangement along these lines — this encouraged him to spend a large part of those two decades studying or working in England. His break with the Dutch Reformed Church came in 1567 when he took part in an unsuccessful revolt against the government in Leyden, and, subsequently, he became an English citizen and a minister in the Church of England.

Saravía offered many arguments from the Scriptures and from the patristic writings in support of his views on ecclesiastical polity. Bishops and presbyters, he said, could be proved from both of these eras in Church history because they had been instituted by the Lord and established by the Apostles. Apostolic authority was seen to be essential to the Church in all ages and he felt the absence of the Apostolate could be found in the preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the sacraments, and the proper exercise of authority in ecclesiastical government. All ministers were thought to be equal in the first two of these three points, and bishops superior to presbyters in the third point. Saravía did not make any claims for an exclusive ordering of the ministry although some of the principles which he laid down in these arguments have been cited by later theologians for such claims. The reasons why he did not do so were primarily two-fold: (1) he consistently adhered to the over-riding purpose of trying to prove to his former colleagues in the Dutch Reformed Church that they differed with the Church of England only in the area of the relation of the ministry and of ecclesiastical polity, and that they would be much better off if they would adopt the Anglican system of government; (2) his prior interest in and commitment to an authoritarian structuring of the ministry did not necessarily preclude such exclusive claims, but it was of much greater importance to him than was a precise and binding definition of the ordering of the ministry.

The unusual attention which Saravía gave to authoritarianism eventually led him to the point that he was willing to relativize the importance of the ministry in order to absolutize the civil power. He had been slightly Erastian even in the Elizabethan period when he had taught the Church and State to be joined in a Christian Commonwealth; however, this Erastianism became much more pronounced in the last decade of his life, and surprisingly enough, this even caused him to say that ministers representing Christ's work as Mediator were inferior to kings and magistrates representing Christ's work as Ruler and King. This serious Christological error probably arose out of his undue emphasis on the necessity of some being in authority and others being in subjection to them. During this same period he gave full support to the contention of James I that kings ruled de jure divino.
The great emphasis which Saravia gave to the necessity of Apostolic authority remaining in the Church and the importance of its being properly administered by the ministry also led him to develop a doctrine of Missions to the Heathen. This was entirely based on the Great Commission given in Matthew 28:19-20 for he felt this passage to be a full summary of the essence of Apostolic authority. It was, he said, just as important for the Church to continue carrying the Gospel to the heathen in all ages as it was to preach that Gospel or to baptize in lands which were already Christian. One of the most significant features of his interpretations about Apostolic authority, whether in regard to the ministry or to missions, was the fact that he saw this as having been given by the Lord to the whole body of the elect in all ages and not simply to the Apostles or to any one group within the Church. This meant that Saravia consistently put his ecclesiology above his doctrine of the Ministry and that he tied it very closely to his doctrine of Missions. The latter doctrine proved to be a unique contribution to Christian thought for he was actually the first Protestant or Anglican to develop such a doctrine.

Saravia's doctrine of Missions to the Heathen was attacked by several theologians during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but, as far as is known, it did not exert any positive influence on a single person during this period. This factor may well explain why he mentioned this doctrine only in his earlier writings. Later we find that his interest seemed to be centered in oecumenical efforts to heal the divisions in the Church. He called several times for a general council and wrote his most thoroughly developed doctrinal treatise towards this end. Following the example set many years earlier by Martin Bucer, Saravia became convinced that the doctrine of the Lord's Supper was the most divisive doctrine of his time so he wrote his treatise "De sacra Eucharistia" to try to prove that there were no inherent differences between the Lutheran and Zwinglian conceptions of the Supper. Like Bucer, Saravia may well be called a pioneer in oecumenicity because of this far-sighted approach to this problem.
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TO MY WIFE
PREFACE

It would be presumptuous for one who has come to this task from a somewhat different theological background to say that he has been completely able to be objective about the Anglican doctrines which Saravia held. In many of the tenets which have been examined I have been aware both of similarities and of dissimilarities with my own theological position, but I have tried to be as unbiased and as fair in my conclusions as possible and to keep an open mind that I might learn from him. This task has been made considerably easier by the decision to devote the first seven chapters to an examination and analysis of Saravia's doctrines in regard to his contemporaries and colleagues, and to reserve my personal critique for the last chapter. However, as this study has progressed there has been an awareness of a growing sense of appreciation for him and of a consanguinity with the theological tradition he represented. The result has been that the differences discovered have been far outweighed by the bonds of unity and purpose which have been seen afresh as binding together all people in all ages who are "in Christ Jesus our Lord." In a sense then I have looked on this work as a kind of oecumenical dialogue and do not feel that this effort has in any way detracted from my own commitments and convictions.

A second difficulty of which I have been made aware in this study and which I have not been able fully to resolve, is that of reading contemporary thought and meaning into sixteenth century ideas and doctrines. In this age when the Church is making a very commendable effort to understand and to demonstrate its essential unity there is a commensurate obligation to examine de novo the doctrines of the Reformation and post-Reformation eras. To accomplish this it seems to me that we must make a determined effort to think through the reformers'
thoughts step by step, seeking the same balance and finding the same emphasis which they originally gave them. The necessity of this in correctly assessing Saravia's doctrines will be seen from time to time in these chapters.

So many people have helped in my research and in the production of this thesis that I could not possibly thank them all. However, there are some whose contributions have been especially noteworthy and I'm glad to take this opportunity to thank them. First of all, I wish to express my sincere and deep appreciation to my advisors, Professor T.F. Torrance and the Very Reverend Reginald Foskett. Both of these men have been considerate and thoughtful counselors in conferences and their suggestions have proved to be invaluable correctives when I have mistakenly begun to follow unproductive paths in my research. Not only do I want to express profound appreciation for these conferences, but also to register my gratitude for the considerable benefit which I have received from their lectures and writings. A particular word of gratitude is due Professor Torrance, who, knowing my interest in missions, suggested the theology of Hadrian Saravia as a subject worthy of study.

There have been several people who have provided invaluable assistance in regard to the languages which have been involved in this study. Mrs. Ian Moir was particularly kind in tutoring me in Latin and I shall ever be mindful of her patience and good spirit in undertaking this task. Others have helped with the translation of this and other languages, both in books and manuscripts, and I would like to express my gratitude to the following: Messers Francis Carroll and W.F. Bauermeister who helped with the translation of Dutch and French, and Messers Stanley Simpson, Michael Richards, and Julian Russell who assisted with the translation of some of the Latin which has been involved in this work. Mr. Russell was particularly helpful in this way and I shall gratefully remember the many sessions he and I have had together in this undertaking.
My thanks are due also to the Rev. R.A.S. Barbour and to Miss E.R. Leslie for their guidance and help throughout my study in New College. Likewise, I am grateful to the librarians and staffs of several institutions for their thoughtful assistance in many ways - first and foremost of whom would be Dr. J.A. Lamb and his colleagues in this college. To their names should be added the librarians and staffs of the University of Edinburgh library, the National Library of Scotland, the Lambeth Palace Library, the Bodleian Library, and the British Museum.

My warmest thanks are due to my wife for the many ways in which she helped to make this thesis possible. Her advice and encouragement have been invaluable, and her typing of the first draft of all of the chapters made it possible for me to complete this work in a much shorter time than would have otherwise been feasible.

Finally, I wish to express my appreciation to Misses J. Newbigging and D. Wise of the Hanover Copying Office for their fine work in preparing this final copy of the thesis.

In closing let me draw the reader's attention to the use of American spelling and the general style and format for a thesis as suggested in Turabian's Manual for Writers of ... Theses and Dissertations. The abbreviations which have been used are: P.S. for Parker Society; L.A.C.T. for Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology; S.P.C.K. for Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; S.J.T. for Scottish Journal of Theology; and L.C.C. for Library of Christian Classics.

Luke B. Smith

Edinburgh
October 25, 1965
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INTRODUCTION

A HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE LIFE AND THEOLOGY OF
HADRIAN SARAVIA

Introduction

For the past three centuries the name of Hadrian Saravia has been almost unknown to all in the Christian Church except those with specialized interests in his times and in the doctrines about which he wrote. This has been unfortunate, for he has deserved both remembrance in and recognition by the Church. Saravia was not one of the foremost thinkers or leaders of his times, as one might describe a Richard Hooker or a Lancelot Andrewes, but he was distinguished and competent enough to stand next to such men, and, occasionally even to display gifts of theological perception far more advanced than that of theirs; e.g., in his doctrine of Missions to the Heathen. He was one of that unknown number with whom the Church has been blessed throughout its history, who can be said to have been instrumental in influencing its thought far beyond the repute which they ever received in their own lifetimes, or even in later centuries. The purpose of this thesis, though, is not just to show that more credit is due to this man, but also to investigate the content of the theology of one whose thought has not been known well enough and to seek to determine what we might still learn from him.

To begin this study we need to examine the historical events relevant to Saravia's life and to see how he acted upon and reacted to them. His theology cannot be properly understood apart from the times in which he
lived; and, conversely, it might also be noted that that very important period of history will never be sufficiently real and meaningful to us without a greater knowledge of the thought and activities of those like himself who had a major role in shaping it. We shall see that much can be learned in both of these ways in this study of Saravia's life and theology, for he served as a kind of bridge between different periods of time and between different streams of Reformed theology. The first of these "bridges" was made possible by the unusual length of his life, which was eighty-two years. This was almost twice the life expectancy of the average man in those times, so Saravia's longevity gave him a greater breadth of experience than that of most of his contemporaries. In many centuries this fact would not have been of any particular significance, but in Saravia's case and in the sixteenth century it made a great deal of difference. It meant that in his adult life he was able to span from the days when the Reformation was still in its formative period to those at the end of that century and at the beginning of the seventeenth century when the disciples of the reformers had begun to alter and sometimes even to change radically the interpretations of the thought of their mentors.

Another way in which Saravia's life could be thought of as a "bridge" is the manner in which he made the transition from the Dutch Reformed to the Anglican Church, for he did this with remarkably little alteration in his theology apart from his views on church polity. It was this change, though, which accounted for the lack of knowledge about him in later centuries, for it literally divided his life in half: scholars in the Netherlands seem to have lost interest in him after he became an Anglican, and those in England who have studied his works do not seem to have given sufficient
consideration to that part of his life spent in the Netherlands. When both halves are placed together it is much easier to understand both his theology and his life.

The Background of the Reformation in the Low Countries

The religious and political soil in which the seeds of the Reformation in the Low Countries were sown was quite different from that of any other countries going through the same revolution. The ground there had been broken and prepared by a type of biblical humanism for almost a century before the Reformation began in earnest. This preparation dated back to the founding of an order with an Augustinian theology, called the Brethren of the Common Life, by Gerard Groote and Florentius Radewyns in 1378. The influence of the Brethren spread rapidly through the Low Countries and into neighboring areas. Everywhere it took root it had a profound effect upon the intellectual life of the scholars. In Holland, the mixture of mysticism and charity which were the strong elements of the theology of this order had the particular effect of encouraging classical and Christian learning to flourish side by side. This humanistic tradition made the Netherlands Erasmian before Erasmus, and probably even made Erasmus Erasmian because he was Dutch. This kind of biblical humanism encouraged a climate conducive to rather extreme theological diversity in the Low Countries; this made for more of a heterogeneous situation in religion there than in any other country in Europe except Poland. It was precisely this which caused the scholars of the Netherlands in the nineteenth century to speak of a "tertium genus reformationis!" for they believed that there had been an

---

autochthonous kind of reformation in their country, quite apart from Lutheranism or Calvinism. Professor Bakhuizen vanden Brink has shown that this should be called "biblical humanism" and should not be thought of as a different or separate kind of reformation.

A second factor in the diversity of religious development in the Low Countries was the lack of any strong political unity. Nationalism had been gaining strength since the reign of Charles the Bold of Burgundy when he began holding meetings of the States-General in 1465. The oppressive rule of the Spanish monarchs in the first half of the sixteenth century greatly encouraged nationalistic feelings in the people. The time that Saravia spent in the Netherlands was during the reign of Charles V and Philip II, both of whom practised tyranny in the name and for the sake of religion.

The moderate humanistic tendencies of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries partially gave way in the sixteenth century before the onslaught of several powerful forces. The first of these which we want to consider was Lutheranism. The treatises of Luther were being sold in the bookstalls of the Netherlands as early as 1520. These were quickly condemned, and by 1523 the long list of that nation's martyrs began with two Antwerp Augustinians, Henry Voes and John Esch. The strength of Lutheranism was first felt in the northern provinces because of the close ties of that section with Germany in commerce. Also, the students of those provinces were accustomed to go to the universities of Germany, so they, along with the

1. J.A.B. vanden Brink [sic], "Bible and Biblical Theology in the Early Reformation," S.J.T., XIV (1961), 348-49. The second part of this article is in Vol. XV (1962) and is correctly listed under the name of J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink.
traders, brought the Lutheran doctrines back to their homes in Friesland, Groningen and Overyssel. Having gained its first foothold in these areas, it gradually spread to the south. The strength and rapidity of this movement could be seen as early as 1521 and as far south as Louvain when Erasmus left that university rather than to stay and enter into the kind of conflict which he felt would be inevitable with Lutheranism. 

Even though this was the strongest and fastest growing movement of any in the earlier stages of the Reformation, it was also the first to show signs of fading in the Low Countries.

We shall study other causes of this decline later on, but for the present it is sufficient to note that the primary reason for this was the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Luther met the Dutch humanists, Wessel Gansfort, Cornelius Hoen, and Hime Rode very early in the Reformation, but he never approved of their doctrine of the Lord's Supper, nor did they agree with his. These men were also in contact with Zwingli and they came to feel that they had much in common with him in regard to this doctrine.

There are even some authorities who believe that,

...the Swiss opinions regarding the communion seem to have originated more or less under Hoen's influence.

It was just this point that separated the Netherlands reformers from the Lutherans, and although the name 'Lutheran' remained the ordinary appellation given to the reformed congregations, they have been preferably called in our time 'Sacramentists' or 'Evangelicals'.

It was this aversion to Lutheran doctrine and the failure of Zwingli to have any lasting influence in the Low Countries that opened the door for the dissemination of Calvinism later. 

---

1. P.J. Blok, History of the People of the Netherlands (1899), II, 303-304.
2. Ibid., 305-306.
3. Ibid., 320-321.
Another disruptive force in this period was the combined political and religious factor of persecution. Protestants and Anabaptists had been persecuted even as early as the deaths of the two Lutherans mentioned above, but in the year of 1544 it became much more serious. At that time Charles V and Francis I signed a treaty at Crespy "...whereby it was stipulated that the two monarchs should assist each other in reestablishing the old religion." Only Spain was to experience a more severe administration of the Inquisition than that which came during the next twenty years in the Low Countries. This persecution was described above as both religious and political because it was jointly administered by the Roman Catholic Church and the state. The Emperor laid down the rule, Ecclesia non sitit sanguinea, so the state took the leadership in the thirsting for blood, but the church managed to retain some of the control of these purges. By the year 1555 a dozen very stringent placards against heretics had been issued; the worst of these was the famous blood placard of 1550, with its frightful penalties that "...the men shall be executed with the sword and the women buried," while the obstinate were burned alive." These were hard times not only for those who died, but also for those who managed to survive as well. "Some said that there could be no viler slavery than to lead a trembling life in the midst of spies and informers, who registered every word, action, look, and even every thought which they pretended to read from thence, and upon which they put the very worst construction."  

The Anabaptists bore the brunt of this persecution. Their zeal and radical convictions reached the greatest degree of intensity in the Münster rebellion of 1534-35. Menno Simons sought with great difficulty to induce the Anabaptists of the Netherlands to adopt a more moderate position, but this movement remained the most antagonistic of all at that time to the moderation of Dutch humanism.

The last and most decisive force that moved into the Netherlands during this period was Calvinism. It came to the Low Countries through France and England by way of Flanders and the Walloon country. Artois, the home of Saravia, became one of the earliest strongholds of Calvinism in this whole area, so he probably became familiar with some of the doctrines of Calvin as a child or as a very young man. Gradually the teachings of Calvin moved northwards and pushed aside those of Luther, Zwingli, Simons, and Joris. Calvinism was better suited to be a resistance movement than any of the others because it was active, aggressive, and its doctrines of Church and State were agreeable with the growing popularity of nationalism among the people. The Dutch knew it had proved its viability in France in the face of tyranny, and they felt the emphasis which it made upon the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth made the Calvinists seem to be the stronger group to drive "...the Spanish vermin from the land." Calvinism proved to be a powerful force in the development of national life as can be seen in the fact that the Dutch government is antedated by the organization of the Dutch Reformed Church. Not only was the pattern for this revolutionary plan found in Calvinist doctrine, but the leaders

to put it into action were found in the Calvinist camp.\textsuperscript{1} A Roman Catholic historian summed up this choice that the Dutch people were making in their theology and in the form of their civil government in these words:

\begin{quote}
It is significant...that not the teachings of Luther, who simply transferred the spiritual powers of the Pope to the temporal prince, thus strengthening the trend towards totalitarian despotism, but those of the Anabaptists and Calvinists with their revolutionary democratic and indeed republican implications were those that most appealed to the Dutch people.\textsuperscript{2}
\end{quote}

The appeal of these new movements proved to be stronger for the Dutch people than their response to them, for the majority never left the Roman Catholic Church although they deeply felt the need for reform. The tradition of humanistic moderation which kept Erasmus in the Roman Church also kept many of his countrymen in it. They felt as deeply about the freedom of their country as they did the need for reform in the Church, and the one was related to the other in their minds: as soon as some measure of freedom was attained, particularly in the southern provinces, the force of rebellion against the Roman Church began to subside. Another reason why some of the Dutch people refused to leave that church was their feeling that the church there had not reached the state of decadence that it had in some of the other countries. They came to the conclusion therefore that the best solution was to stay in the Roman Catholic Church and to reform it from within. It was this decision by the vast majority in the southern provinces which did so much to contribute to the eventual separation of the northern provinces from those of the south.

\textsuperscript{1} John T. McNeill, \textit{The History and Character of Calvinism} (1954), 262. This author records that on Oct. 2, 1565, Francis Junius, a Calvinist, instituted with prayer the campaign for national liberation in a meeting of twenty nobles at Brussels. William of Orange was not a member of the Reformed Church at that time, but it is significant that the more deeply involved he became the closer he moved towards Calvinism.

These religious and political currents which we have briefly surveyed in the preceding section are important for a proper understanding of a large part of Saravia's theology. He was born at the time when many of these movements were beginning to gain strength in his native land, so he grew up in the atmosphere of tension which resulted from their confrontation with the established civil and religious powers of the land, and also that which resulted from their conflict with one another. Saravia's birthplace was Hesdin in Artois, the southernmost province in the Netherlands, in the year 1530.¹ The influence of the chaos and change which characterized much of the earlier part of his life is very apparent in his writings and should be given full consideration in any study of his doctrines. Our earliest records of his life reveal that he was a participant in many of the controversies of his times, some of which brought him into physical danger and some of which must have had a profound effect upon his spiritual convictions. These controversies served as anvils on which he was forced to hammer out his beliefs and on which his spiritual life was forged and shaped.

There is little known of Saravia's family background except that his father was of Spanish origin and his mother was Flemish, and that both of them became Protestants at an undetermined time. Saravia seems to have been brought up a Roman Catholic for he eventually became a member of the Franciscan Convent at St. Omer. He was there for several years, but left

¹ Some authorities place the date at 1531, but this is probably due to the difference which existed then between the continental and the English calendars. The new year of the former began with Jan. 1, and the later with March 25. This confusion of dates will be found in other events of Saravia's life also.
in 1557 because of his changing beliefs. He is reputed to have gone over to the Reformation in 1558 because of the influence of Jacques Taffin, who was once the Receiving-General of Cassel of La Motte au Bois and who later became a student of Beza in Geneva. Taffin reported that Saravia fled to England that year, sometime between the death of Queen Mary and the coronation of Queen Elizabeth, because of the discovery of some German books of a heretical nature in his possession. These were extremely busy years for Saravia if he did all that was reported of him, for there is much comment on and confusion about his movements from the time he left the Roman faith until 1562. It is known, though, that in 1559, he, along with several other ministers, assisted Guido de Bres in writing the Belgic Confession of Faith. We shall turn now to a consideration of that document as the first concrete event in the Reformation in which Saravia had a part, and as one of the more important events of his whole life.

The Belgic Confession of Faith

This Confession, consisting of thirty-seven articles, is one of the best statements of moderate Calvinism in existence. It was first written in French and published in 1561 for the churches in Flanders and the Netherlands; afterwards it was translated into Dutch and Latin. Guido de Bres was the principal author of this Confession, but Saravia and several

---

2. P. C. Molhuysen, et al. (eds.), Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek (1933), IX, cols. 934-939, is the best authority for this period.
3. Ibid., col. 934. These books were received from a German captain, but nothing else is known about them or him. It was very likely, though, that Saravia had established some connections in Germany because his first treatise was published there not long after this time. Altogether, three of his books were published in Frankfurt.
other ministers were closely consulted by him. Saravia is usually mentioned as the most outstanding of these advisors who assisted de Bres in this work. The Confession was carried to Calvin to ask his opinion of it, and it has been rumored that Saravia was the one who was given this responsibility, but it seems unlikely that this was more than just a rumor. Calvin approved of the Belgic Confession, but opposed its publication on the grounds that it followed too soon after the publication of the Gallic Confession. He did not say so but it may have been that he thought it followed the theology of the Gallic Confession so closely that he did not feel that it was even necessary. The tendency of the time was to try to out-Calvin Calvin, but the authors of both of these documents resisted this temptation. The authors of the Belgic Confession wisely guarded against making it appear to be the work of one man or even of a group of men. To do this they sent it to as many of the ministers of the Low Countries as possible with the request that they correct that which they felt to be erroneous, and that they supply anything which they thought to have been omitted. Saravia stated rather strongly that no one who had anything to do with the writing of this Confession thought that he was producing a "canon of faith," but they considered it to be only a statement of their own beliefs supported by Scriptural proofs. In 1566 the Antwerp Synod revised the Confession and had it reprinted. At that time they sent it to Philip II of Spain with a


2. Christianus Hartscecker, and Philippus a Limborch (eds.), *Praestantium ac Eruditorum Virorum Epistolae Ecclesiasticae et Theologicae* (1660), 362. This is found in a letter from Saravia to Johannes Uytenbogaert written on April 13, 1612. The text of the letter is found on pages 360-363.
covering letter in which they stated that the Confession represented the beliefs of over 100,000 of his subjects in those provinces.¹ In this letter they were careful not to call themselves "Calvinists"; instead they described themselves as "Lutherans" for this was the more acceptable term at Philip's court. This is indicative of the apologetic intent and tone not only of the letter, but of the Confession as well. It avoided all provocative reference to Roman Catholicism and it disassociated itself from the traditional heresies of Marcion, Manes, Praxeas, Sabellius, Samosataenus, Arius, etc.² The authors also took a great deal of care to show that there was no connection between the Anabaptists and themselves. Following these apologetic motives as guidelines they gave the Confession a positive, concise, and thoroughly developed Christo-centric basis, which is, according to Philip Schaff, "...upon the whole, the best symbolical statement of the Calvinistic system of doctrine with the exception of the Westminster Confession."³

Saravia's letter to his friend Uytenbogaert is the last of his writings which has been found, for it was written less than a year before his death. In this epistle he shed some very helpful and interesting light on his feelings about the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism; the latter had been adopted at the Antwerp Synod along with the

¹. Brandt, ibid., 159; v. 158-60 for the text of the letter.
Confession. He revealed in that letter that he had been minister of the French Church in Antwerp at the time of the Synod. Also, he said that he took the responsibility of carrying copies of the revised Confession to several noblemen with whom he seemed to have been on good terms. The most important thing he said in the letter, though, was that he was still in agreement with the Confession and that he did not wish anything in it to be changed. The occasion of this comment, and of the whole letter for that matter, was to write Uytenbogaert his feelings about the treatise "De summi imperii in rebus Ecclesiasticis authoritate," which the latter had sent him. Uytenbogaert had been one of the chief framers of the Remonstrance in 1610 and was the leader of the "Arminian" party after the death of Arminius in 1609. We should expect, Saravia, therefore, to have said something about the doctrines of Election and Predestination in this letter, but he didn't mention them. He did mention the troubles that Uytenbogaert and others were having in Leyden at that time, but probably preferred to stay out of that controversy.

It is significant that the Belgic Confession followed the Gallic rather than the Augsburg Confession. Brandt attributed this first of all to the affinity of languages between the two countries, and, secondly, to the fact that the authors of the Confession had already supported the doctrines of Calvin in their previous writings. Both of these are fundamental

1. Hartsoecker, ibid., 361: "Ego tunc temporis Minister eram Ecclesiae Gallicanae, Antverpiae, et exemplaria illius Confessionis Principi Auriaco et Comiti Egmondano offerenda curavi. Frater uxoris meae erat Comiti Ludovico a cubiculis, qui me ad Dominum suum adduxit, ut illi innotescerem, et exemplaria recens editae confessionis darem, ulterius principibus distribuenda."

2. Ibid., 362: "Nihil tamen meo judicio in illa est quod reprehended aut mutare velim."


4. Brandt, ibid., 142. This author would have been correct if he had given these reasons in this order as the explanation of why Calvinism moved from France into the Netherlands for language had much to do with that development.
reasons, but the latter is certainly of greater importance than the former. However, the fact that the authors chose to call themselves "Lutherans" indicates that they did not think their Confession differed very much from the Augsburg Confession, for they knew that Philip would think of the latter when he saw the appellation, "Lutheran". Actually the two documents differ significantly only in the doctrines of the Lord's Supper and of Predestination.

As noted previously, the Belgic Confession closely followed the Gallic Confession but it also expanded and developed the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, and the Sacraments. The Calvinistic character of the Confession is particularly strong in the way it rejects free-will in Article XIV, in the approval of the doctrine of Total Depravity in Article XV, and in the discussion of the doctrine of Predestination in the XVIth Article.

Saravia's part in the writing of the Belgic Confession and his subsequent work to get support for it is important for two reasons:
(1) he made a lasting contribution to the Dutch Reformed Church. The adoption of this document in 1566 meant that all the Calvinist congregations of the Low Countries were bound together by one confession of faith within two years after the death of Calvin.⁷ The continuing value of the Confession can be seen in the way that it (along with the Heidelberg Catechism and the Canons of the Synod of Dort [1618-1619] ) has been the accepted theological standard of the Reformed Churches of Belgium, Holland, and their kindred colonial churches. (2) it provides us with an invaluable standard of reference to evaluate Saravia's theology in his early years.

and since he professed to be in agreement with this Confession just prior to his death then it also gives us helpful insight in regard to the interpretation of some of the doctrines which he wrote about in his later years.

The three main theological movements which were discussed in the preceding section had changed considerably by the time the Belgic Confession was adopted. Lutherans and Zwinglians had gradually merged into one party. This was partially caused by the reduction of their numbers through persecution, and partially by the preference of the magistrates and learned people who controlled Lutheranism for the moderation of Erasmian humanism. The Anabaptists had also been weakened by severe persecution and by internal dissensions, so they too became more moderate. Calvinism was the fastest growing Protestant group primarily because its doctrines appealed widely to the lower classes. There was by this time, though, a split coming in their ranks because some of its adherents were also moving towards a more moderate type of theology, while others wished to adopt a much more rigid type of Calvinism. However, all of the activity was not in the Protestant camps, for by this time the Roman Church was vigorously engaged in the Counter-Reformation. There was great fear in the Netherlands that Cardinal Granvelle was going to bring the Spanish Inquisition to that country. These fears were soon realized because the Duke of Alva began a purge in the southern provinces which almost wiped out Protestantism. Those provinces had once been strongholds of Calvinism but Alva's work was so thorough that they were lost not only to the Protestant cause, but also to the free Dutch nation soon to emerge. Alva's work in places like Artois, where Saravia had grown up, meant that all the Protestants there were either martyred or were forced to flee to the northern provinces or neighboring countries.
The First Period of Exile

Although it would be difficult to prove, one authority, A.A. van Schelven, has stated that Saravia spent most, if not all, the period of 1559-1562 in England. It seems much more likely that he made several trips back and forth during these years and divided his time fairly equally between both countries. We know he was in the Low Countries long enough to give valuable help in writing the Belgic Confession, and that it probably was sometime during that period that he became involved in a situation in the Netherlands which was to change much of his thought on church polity. A controversy arose over the views of a Dr. Pierre L'Quselaur Dit de Villiers concerning the government of the Church by bishops. Those who opposed Villiers' teachings about bishops came to Saravia and asked his opinion about them. Thirty years later he said this about that experience:

What was I to do? although I agreed with him, I did not dare defend him, lest I should incur the same charge of ambitious views. The result was, that, from that time forth, I set about more diligently examining the subject, and I doubt not but the same thing will happen to many of my brethren, who see and feel that this authority of Bishops is a desideratum in our Churches.

This, then, was the beginning of the change which took place in his doctrine of the Ministry, and we know that it happened either before or during the year of 1561 for that may have been the year Saravia's first treatise was published—"De diversis gradibus Ministrorum Evangelii." This work, which contained his basic thoughts about the imparity of ministers will be

---

1. Molhuysen, ibid., 934. Van Schelven is the author of the article on Saravia.
2. Peter de Villiers was once a student under Beza and he spent some-time in England. He is best known as a chaplain to the Prince of Orange. For more about him see P.J. Blok's article in Molhuysen, ibid., V, cols. 412-414.
discussed later in the section on the controversy with Beza. Saravia's activity in England during these three years will be mentioned in the section on the Austin-Friars Church (v. infra).

Saravia returned from England in June, 1562, to Brussels where he was instrumental in beginning a Walloon church. He told Uytenbogare that he had gathered a few noblemen and a few French-speaking citizens together and started the church with the help of Lord de Tolossa. However, he was not there for very long because he returned to England within a few months. The following year we find him on the Isle of Guernsey, where he was made a lecturer at a new university founded on Sept. 23, 1563, by Queen Elizabeth. He also became assistant minister of St. Peter's Church on the island on Sept. 1, 1564. This double function of preaching and teaching seems to have given him very little satisfaction, but he stayed there for sometime. There were only two churches on the island which followed the French churches in modeling their polity along Genevan lines, while the others were episcopally governed by the Bishop of Winchester.

Many years later he wrote a letter to the ministers of that island in which he said that he had been one of the first Protestant ministers to serve there. He was writing, he said, to urge them not to turn from the form of episcopal government which had been followed from the very first by the

---

1. This edition was published in Frankfurt and as far as is known there are no extant copies of it; the only traces of it are the mention made in Molhuysen, ibid., IX, col. 937, and in K.J.R. van Hardenwijk and G.D.J. Schotel (eds.), A.J. van der AA Biographisch Woordenboek (1874) XVII, 120. The date of 1561 given by both of these authors may be an error, for G. Kawerau says that he worked from a 1591 edition of this treatise (v. G. Kawerau, "Adrian Saravia und seine Gedanken über Mission," Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift, XXVI (1899), 336.

2. Hartsoecker, ibid.
churches of Guernsey; however, Saravia failed to mention to them that the church in which he had worked, St. Peter's, was one of the two which had adopted a Genevan type of ecclesiastical polity. This, too, may have been one of the reasons why he gained little satisfaction from his work in Guernsey. Even so, when he was asked by friends in the Netherlands to return and serve a church there, he said that he did not feel that he should take his family back since there was danger involved. Also, at that time, Governor Chamberlayne sought to persuade him to stay on the island and continue his work for he thought he was needed where he was. We do not know how long Saravia stayed in the Low Countries on this trip, but we do know that he spent some time there during that year, because he himself said that he was serving a church in Antwerp when the Synod met in 1566.

Saravia left Guernsey in 1568, when he became field chaplain to William of Orange. He accompanied the Dutch army in the campaign over the Meuse and it was during this time with Prince William that one authority believes Saravia wrote the Dutch National Anthem, "Het Wilhelmus." Van Schelven has disagreed with this conclusion of Blok, because he felt that Blok attributed it to Saravia solely on the basis that there are many similar phrases in that song and in Saravia's treatise, "Ken hertgrondighe

1. Molhuysen, ibid. In several places in his article, van Schelven has given the impression that Saravia was overly concerned about the safety of either his family or himself. This he said caused Saravia to equivocate about his reasons for not returning to his homeland to serve when opportunities were given him to do so. However, it must not be forgotten that these really were dangerous times—just a year after this his friend, Guido de Bres, was martyred at Valenciennes.


3. Molhuysen, ibid., cited Blok, but no ref. given.
The campaign by the Prince failed and again Saravia crossed the Channel, but this time he went to Southampton where he taught in the Free Grammar School. His work there is remembered because two of his students, Nicholas Fuller (the Orientalist) and Sir Thomas Lake (Secretary of State to James I), became famous men in later years. Saravia moved from Southampton in 1572, when he was engaged in some kind of work by the Austin-Friars Church in London, which was to keep him employed for the next six years.

**Return to the Low Countries**

In 1578 Saravia returned to the Netherlands after having spent almost all of the preceding decade in England. He went back in answer to a plea for help from churches in Ghent and Kortrijk. He did not accept the call of the latter, though, because there was no Walloon-speaking church in that town, and he said his wife, mother, and son did not understand Dutch. He became pastor of a Walloon church in Ghent and remained in that post for three and a half years: his standing in that area was apparently very high for he was elected president of the provincial synod held in Ghent in 1581.

There had been many changes in the Netherlands while Saravia was living in England. "The Pacification of Ghent" in 1576 had united all of

---

1. Ibid., col. 937, cited Meulman pamphlet No. 190.
2. Ibid., col. 936.
the provinces in an agreement that they would work for the traditional liberties, the expulsion of the Spanish, and the abolition of the Inquisition, without prejudice to Roman Catholics. Soon, however, Philip regained the southern provinces for the Spanish — this caused the seven northern provinces to declare themselves an independent republic in 1581, when they signed the Union of Utrecht. Calvinism was the dominating religion of the new country, although it did not account for more than one-fourth of the population. The aggressive and vigorous manner in which they sought to win the people and the leaders of the government is the best explanation of this disproportionate influence. They were in the majority only in Zeeland, but Roman Catholics had this distinction in the other six provinces. The precariousness of this balance of power was not helped by the intolerance of the Calvinists towards the Romanists and their fellow Protestants.

As far as we know, Saravia approved of the political changes which had made the northern provinces an independent nation, but he did not approve of some of the developments taking place in the national church. He disliked the principles of equality in the ministry and the Genevan-type church polity which had been adopted at the Synods of Baden in 1571 and Dort in 1578. In the main this meant, "'no church may pretend to domination or preeminence over the other churches, nor minister over other ministers, elders over elders, deacons over deacons,' "2 The decision had been made that the Dutch Reformed National Church would be organised so that there would be local consistories meeting weekly, and groups of

---

2. McNeill, History...of Calvinism, 261, quotation from Synod of Baden.
these consistories would form classes (corresponding to the French colloquia and the Scottish presbyteries), which would meet quarterly. Synod meetings were to be held annually in the three areas of the country and these would then come together for biennial national synods. The first such national synod to be held on Dutch soil was in Dort in 1572, and it was this as much as anything else which brought Saravia home during that year. He undoubtedly had secret hopes that he would be able to help reverse this trend towards what he often called "a Genevan type of church government," and that he would be of some aid in healing the growing rift which was developing in the ranks of the Calvinists. He spent the next ten years attempting to accomplish these two aims, but he was utterly frustrated in his efforts. He wisely realized that discretion was the better part of valor for later he was to say of this decade and the preceding sixteen year period, "in the six and twenty years last past, I have over and over again declared my opinion concerning the Episcopate in familiar discourse with my friends, although not everywhere, nor to all."1

It was Saravia's conviction all through the rest of his life that most of the problems which he saw in the Dutch Reformed Church were the sequel of the rejection of episcopacy by his countrymen. He had an intense hatred of the violence and damage which anti-clerical mobs had caused during and after the Reformation: he was sure that the cause of these outrages could be traced directly to a lack of proper authority in the churches necessary to prevent them. Closely akin to these feelings about mob violence was his antipathy towards those civil authorities who had taken

1. A Treatise...etc., 33-34.
advantage of the Reformation to rob the churches of their wealth and property; this he also felt to be a concomitant of inadequate ecclesiastical authority. He was convinced that the synods in the Netherlands were neither sufficiently organized nor properly authorized to prevent this kind of erosion of the honor and glory of the Church.

When Saravia began his work in Ghent he became active in the orthodox part of Calvinism known as the "precisians", or the "streng-gereformeerde" party: the other part of Calvinism were known as the "liberals" or the "libertines". The precisians were in favor of a rigid Calvinistic theology and church polity based on the Genevan system, which would issue in a theocracy. Saravia did not agree with some of the doctrines held by this group, but he was closer to them than to any other party in the Netherlands. The majority of the Reformed ministers were on the side of the precisians, but the liberals seemed to have greater support from the people of the country because of their more moderate views: for this reason the States-General and most of the magistrates of the cities favored the latter as well. The liberals were keenly interested in establishing religious freedom and the toleration of all beliefs, whether Roman Catholic, Protestant, or Anabaptist. They were against the establishment of a national church and the adoption of a confession of faith to which all ministers would have to subscribe. Generally, they were in favor of what might be called a moderate or reasonable approach to religion; it can clearly be seen from these brief comments that at least a part of the strong tradition of humanism in the Low Countries was reasserting itself in and through the views of this group. In retrospect, it is also apparent that the Arminian-Calvinist split at the Synod of Dort in 1618-1619 really
took root in this liberal-precisian split in the last half of the sixteenth century. It might even be said of Arminius, as it was earlier of Erasmus, that the Dutch were Arminian before Arminius and he was Arminian because he was Dutch.

**The Leyden Years**

In 1582 Saravia moved to Leyden where he was given the responsibility of looking after the Wallonian theological students studying at the University and of conducting services for French-speaking citizens residing there. Almost as soon as he arrived Saravia was drawn into a controversy with Richard Coornhert, a liberal, who had just published a treatise entitled, "The Tryal." In this Coornhert attacked the Heidelberg Catechism, which, he said, denied freedom of belief to people because it had been adopted to the exclusion of other confessions of faith. This was sent to the States-General for study and they decided that Saravia and Coornhert should debate the points in question. The disputation was held in the Hague in 1583 in the presence of William of Nassau, a tribunal of fifteen judges, and the general public. Both parties agreed to a total of fifty articles which were to be covered in the debate. Saravia and Coornhert argued with one another for four weeks, but at the end of that time they were still debating the first article. The tribunal lost patience with both of them and ordered the affair stopped, "...that it might not produce more discord." Later in that same year Saravia published his arguments against Coornhert in a treatise entitled, "Disputatie over den

---

1. Louis D. Petit (comp.), *Bibliographische Lijst der Werken van de Leidsche Hoogleraren van de Opritiching der Hoogeschool tot Op Onze dagen* (1894), 36.
An interesting aspect of this situation was that Saravia stoutly defended the whole Catechism, but later he strongly attacked the concept of "Christ's descent into hell" which is a unique part of it. It is "unique" only in the sense that it was not included in the other catechisms of that time, but it was an interpretation of Calvin's doctrine of the Death of Christ.²

Saravia became well-known for his violent manner of expressing himself in controversies; an unfortunate characteristic which often detracted from the strength of his reasoning and the depth of his scholarship. This trait was manifested again in another dispute in which he became involved. This time it was with Jasper Coolhaes, who had denied the doctrine of Predestination, and again Saravia was on the defensive. He stated his position on this doctrine to be the same as that of the Belgic Confession; this put Saravia on strong ground but the argument between the disputants became so heated that they were silenced by the authorities.³

Although Saravia did not seem to come off too well in these theological disputes he was nevertheless recognized as an able and distinguished scholar. On May 12, 1584, he was nominated and confirmed as a professor of theology in the University with the stipulation that he would preach a Latin sermon on Sundays for the benefit of the students.⁴

The young Dutch government desperately needed protection against the threat of external enemies, so Queen Elizabeth was asked to be their defender. She complied with this request by sending Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester,

---

2. V. infra, "The Bete Controversy, etc."
with a small force in 1585. This action served to guarantee the freedom of the country, but it had an unexpected effect upon the theological differences of the Calvinists as well. Leicester was an ultra-Calvinist so the precisions sought to gain his support for their views, while the liberals tended to side with Prince Maurice of Orange (son of William) and with the States-General. Because they were so grateful for the aid which they were receiving from the English the States-General had unfortunately given Leicester almost sovereign powers when he arrived in their country. This greatly pleased Saravia for he had hoped that the Queen would permanently occupy the Netherlands as an English possession, and in 1585 he wrote to the Lord Treasurer asking that his feelings be made known to her Majesty.

Leicester was a bad choice to carry out this assignment, for his authoritarian ways repeatedly antagonized the Dutch, but the States-General also made a mistake in assigning too much power to him. In deference to the wishes of the precisions Leicester called a national synod at the Hague the very year he arrived in that country, so that they could change some of the rules and principles of ecclesiastical government which had been adopted in previous synods. In this synod the minister of Gouda was called in question about his doctrine of Predestination and Saravia was the one chosen to examine him. These two really differed very little about the nature of predestination, but they expressed themselves in different ways and words; the result was that their argument "...raised a new storm which raged so furiously that seven years were spent in calming it."

1. Brandt, *ibid.*, 403-408.
The new plans for church government adopted by the synod were very much to the liking of the ultra-Calvinists and were ratified by Leicester, who left the country for a visit to England without even consulting the States-General about his action. This act amounted to a military governor trying to force an ecclesiastical constitution and polity upon a nation with the consent of only a small part of its citizenry.\(^1\) The following year another synod was called and Saravia was appointed the representative of the ministers of Leyden. However, the magistrates of Leyden prevented him from going because they feared the growing power of what might now be called the Leicesterian party. It was probably this decision as much as anything else which later caused Saravia to join a group seeking to overthrow the Leyden government. Brandt observed that the States of Holland were greatly concerned about the ill-will and hard feeling which some ministers were promoting towards their own government through their teaching and preaching. It was noted by the authorities that:

\[
...\text{some who had been born out of Holland were warmer than all the rest... so they found it expedient to summon Adrian Saravia, Professor of Divinity at Leyden, together with twelve of the principal Ministers of Holland, to the Hague, and to appoint some of their deputies to confer with them about the state of the Church and Nation.}\(^2\)
\]

This conference held on the 14th of May, 1587, consisted of an appeal to these ministers by Heer vander Mijle to support their government, and, a recital of their grievances by the ministers to the effect that the States of Holland was not giving sufficient support to the Reformed faith and was

\[\text{1. Ibid., 411, qtd. Heer vander Mijle, President of the Court of Holland to Saravia and some other ministers, "that instead of discountenancing or suppressing the Reformed religion, there was no other publicly tolerated, though scarce the tenth part of the people of the land [italics mine] were of the said religion."}
\]
\[\text{2. Ibid., 410.}\]
being too tolerant of Romanists, Anabaptists, etc.\textsuperscript{1} These incidents give some idea of how deeply involved in political matters Saravia had become, and perhaps a presentiment of the trouble which would soon cause him to be exiled from the Netherlands.

Saravia's difficulties with the civil authorities and with other theologians did not prevent him from being respected for his work as a scholar. His teaching responsibilities at the University were in the subjects of Divinity, Old Testament, and New Testament. To these tasks he brought a knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Chaldean, Syriac, Arabic, French, English, and the dialects of Dutch and French which were indigenous to Walloon areas.\textsuperscript{2} He was also noted for his knowledge of the Scriptures, the Church fathers, and the classics. His reputation at the University is reflected in the choice which they made in selecting him as Rector-Magnificus in 1585 and in 1586.\textsuperscript{3}

The last two years which Saravia spent at the University were marred to some extent by criticism from the Curators and Burgemeisters. Attendance dropped during these years -- the cause of which was said by the Curators to be a lack of industry by the Professors and the repeated absences of the Rector.\textsuperscript{4} This accusation was aimed at Saravia because of his frequent trips to the Hague to see the Earl of Leicester. Saravia's answer to this was that the Earl ordered him to make many trips to his

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., 411-412.
\textsuperscript{2} P.C. Molhuysen (ed.), Bronnen Tot de Geschiedenis der Leidsche Universiteit (1913), I, 124\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{3} Blok, ibid., III, 88.
\textsuperscript{4} Ibid.
headquarters and to deliver reports about the activities of the University. Later the Curators found that there was another reason for some of these trips, for Saravia had been seeing the Earl in the hope that he could persuade him to move the University to Utrecht. The authorities do not seem to have taken this very seriously, but there was a growing distrust of Saravia. In that same year (1586) Leicester decided to visit the University and since Saravia was the man most closely identified with him the faculty asked him to greet the Earl "in his own name."

The split in the Calvinist ranks was becoming more and more pronounced with the passing of each year. Leyden was a crucial city in the struggle because the liberals were strong enough to resist the "...subjecting of the new commonwealth to a masked theocracy." The precisians were not as strong in numbers there but they could rely heavily on leaders like Saravia who had enough influence and determination to make up for any numerical deficiencies. Even the faculty of the University was split, for Saravia and Holmanus lectured side by side and were members of opposite factions. The dénouement of this situation came in 1587, when the precisians decided on a plan to take the city for their side by revolution.

...Dr. Saravia...with other deacons, preachers, and captains went at different times from Leyden to Utrecht and had secret

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid. : "Hij was een invloedrijk man, die ook met den Engelschen landvoogd in nauwe betrekking stond maar dien de Leidsche regering wegens zijn bekende rechtzinnigheid en heftige geaardheid maar half vertrouwde."
3. Holhuysen, Ibid., 42 : "Decretum ut Saravia privato suo nomine ei Hagae gratularetur."
4. V. John Lothrop Motley, History of the United Netherlands (1875), II, 316-18, for a discussion of this plot; cf., Geyl, Ibid., 214.
interviews with Leicester. A plan was at last agreed upon, according to which about the middle of October a revolution should be effected in Leyden...a list of the burghers who were to be executed was likewise agreed upon, at a final meeting of the conspirators.

Unfortunately for the scheme a day or two before the stroke was to be hazarded, Cosmo de Pescarengis had been accidentally arrested for a debt. A subordinate accomplice taking alarm, had then gone to the magistrates and revealed the plot...President de Meetkerke, Professor Saravia...and others compromised effected their escape.

All, however, did not escape for three conspirators were caught and beheaded. Saravia's escape was made possible because his son came from the Hague to warn him that the plot was known to the magistrates.

Saravia may be due the benefit of the doubt as to just how guilty he actually was of all that the conspirators had planned. He certainly was party to the plot, but he may have been opposed to some of the methods of carrying it out, such as the execution of some of the burghers. This would explain why just a month before the coup was planned Saravia wrote to Dr. John James, Leicester's personal physician, that he did not think peace could be concluded with the papists and if he knew that the Earl would not be offended he would ask his discharge from the Curators of the University and would spend the winter in England. This sounds very much like a man who is trying to back out of the plot without admitting that is what he is doing.

Until he settled in England in the winter of 1587, Saravia was a man out of step with most of those around him. He was Flemish and felt out of place in Dutch speaking territory, and to compound his troubles, he worked...

1. Ibid., 317-18. President de Meetkerke was the former President of Holland and Cosmo de Pescarengis was the officer who was to lead the soldiers into the city for the conspirators.
2. Hessels, Ecclesiae...etc., II, 828-29.
to establish a type of ecclesiastical government which never had much chance for adoption in the Low Countries. It might even be said therefore that Saravia was like a man without a country until he became an English citizen, and that he was a man virtually without a church until he joined the Church of England. It seemed inevitable that he would eventually reach some crisis point which would be either personally disastrous to himself or would force him to move to a place with a more agreeable theological climate. Therefore, it must have been with some sense of relief that he fled to England, for this was a place where he could feel "at home" theologically even though he would be a foreigner in most respects. He deeply regretted the manner in which his exile was forced upon him for he repeatedly tried to clear his name in the Netherlands.

Saravia was dismissed by the University on November 2, 1587, and The States-General declared him an exile who would be punished by death if he returned to the Low Countries. In the next three years he spent much time trying to wipe this stigma from his name by writing Dutch Reformed classes to protest his innocence. Likewise he often urged his "...friends ...of theological integrity...." to continue making appeals to the authorities on his behalf. All these efforts were unsuccessful for Saravia was neither acquitted by the Dutch authorities, nor has he been found blameless by the historians of succeeding generations of the charges made against him. The main reason for this was that Saravia

---

1. Molhuysen, ibid., 159a.
2. Pieter C. Bor, Oorsprong, Begin, en Vervolgh der Nederlandsche Corlogen, Beroerten, en Burgerlyke Oneenigheden (1624) IV, 105 : "Dus Saravia heeft over gesonden een lange Missive geschreven aen de classen in Walcheren, Dort, Rotterdam, Delft, in den Hage, Rijnland, Utrecht...."
3. One of those whom Saravia wrote was Justius Lipsius, one-time Rector and Professor of History at the University. It was thought by Burmannus that Lipsius was also involved in the Leyden plot, but this was not known to the authorities. Lipsius stayed on at the University until 1591, when he reentered the Roman Catholic Church; v. Petrus Burmannus, Sylloges Epistolarum (1724), I, 363-65.
himself was never able to offer any proof of his innocence, whereas there was ample evidence of his involvement in the conspiracy. The rest of his life, though, he continued to sound the same note of protest as that made to Lipsius just a week after his flight:

Sed meam innocentiam in dubium vocari vehementer doleo, propter vitae meae conditionem, quae non tantum a seclere, sed ab omni suspicione sceleris integra esse debet. Hoc tamen me consolatur, quod sum extra culpam, ut pote qui semper callida, et turbulenta consilia sum aversatus. Cuius red Deus, meam conscientiam hominesque testes citare possam. Quotquot me norunt, et familiariter mecum de rebus nostris temporis locuti sunt, sciant quae sit mea sententia, et quis animus.

Saravia was not the only one to suffer in this attempted coup d'etat for the Leicesterian party throughout the Netherlands was seriously damaged, as was the cause of the ultra-Calvinists who had allied themselves closely with the Earl.

**Foreign Influence on the English Reformation**

The influence which foreigners had on the English Reformation, or were thought to have had on it, is relevant to this study, because it explains why Saravia was careful to avoid directly participating in the Puritan controversy of his time. This influence was exerted in two ways: first, by those who went there either for visits or permanent residence; secondly, by those whose doctrines had made some impression on the English, when they were refugees on the continent, or through the reading of foreign

---

1. V. J.J. van Toorenenbergen (ed.), *Werken der Marnix-Vereeniging: Brieven uit onderscheidene Kerelijke Archieven*, (1884), IV, 299-302, for text of letter Saravia wrote to the authorities of Holland, entitled, "Rekwest van ad Saravia, aan den Provinciaal Raad van Holland na zijne verbanning."

2. Hunnema, *ibid.*, 363: cf., "A Letter of Hadrian Saravia to the Pastors of the Churches of Christ in the Netherlands," in *A Treatise...etc.*, 15: "...although I might, with good reason, complain of having been deserted by you who ought to have been the assertors of my innocence......"

works being circulated in England. In the reign of Edward VI an invitation was sent to some of the reformers across the channel asking them to come and to take part in the English Reformation. The most important of those who came were Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr, who, according to Strype, were asked to come because it was thought that they held correct views of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and would be able to correct corrupt opinions about the Eucharist in the Universities.\(^1\) In Chapter IV we shall see that Saravia followed Bucer's doctrine very closely, so his thought will be compared with the latter's and that of Martyr's, there, and in several places in other chapters.

Bucer and Martyr are representative of the many foreign reformers who came during the reign of Edward and found "...a receptive mood..." and encouragement for their services in the English Reformation. They also found that the English had "...little respect for the old theology and little confidence in themselves. It may be said that till Hooker arose, they made no contribution to the guidance of their own church."\(^2\) However, when the persecution began under Queen Mary, many of these foreigners went back to the continent and carried with them some of the English leaders to centers like Geneva, Zürich, and Strassburg. When the latter returned at the end of the Marian reign they came back without their continental friends but with some of their doctrinal influence: therefore, the weight of foreign opinions was more or less indirect from this time on. This made for an important difference in England, for now at least "...the public
government of the national church was in English hands."\(^3\) This was the

---

3. Ibid., 93.
beginning of a change which was to take place in the attitude of the English towards theologians on the continent, but it was not until after Saravia's death that the change was complete. Only then would sentiments be generally accepted such as those which Archbishop Laud expressed in regard to Bucer's Censura:

'...this hath been the common error...of the English nation, to entertain and value strangers in all professions of learning beyond their desert, and to the contempt or passing by at least of men of equal worth of their own nation.'  

Some even came to think of a reformer of the stature of Martyr as "...a Puritan pioneer and therefore an unfortunate accident in the history of the Reformation in England."  

The feeling of distrust of the doctrines developed in sixteenth century Anglicanism has continued, for some theologians and historians at least, to the present century. As late as 1901 some authorities were saying substantially the same thing Laud had said two hundred and fifty years earlier:

'It is to the divines of the seventeenth century, therefore, rather than to those of the sixteenth, that we must look as the representative exponents of the doctrinal position of the Church of England. The returned exiles in Queen Elizabeth's reign have, in fact, left us no theology — and cannot be regarded at all as representatives of the Reformation settlement.'  

This tendency to play down or even to discount the contribution of theologians like Bucer, Martyr, John a Lasco, and others, as well as to

---

disregard the doctrinal accomplishments of the whole sixteenth century Anglican Church, has been a serious mistake.\(^1\) Woodhouse has provided a very strong case in his book to show that this kind of attitude has seriously weakened and impoverished the understanding of the doctrine of the Church by Anglicans.\(^2\) Since this was the pivotal doctrine of that century, then naturally this notion had some effect on Saravia’s life and the evaluation of his theology by subsequent generations. He seems to have been well received in England by those who were in agreement with his doctrines, but he was always careful to avoid directly attacking the Puritans in the Anglican Church lest it be said that he, a foreigner, was seeking to instruct those who had grown up in this Church.\(^3\) It may well have been that Saravia was overly sensitive to such a charge of being an outsider, but it is nonetheless true that he left Puritanism at home alone and engaged in polemics only with controversialists abroad, like Besa.

Saravia was for all intents and purposes an Anglican long before he became a member of the Church of England. When he arrived in that country he moved almost immediately into the main stream of the Anglicanism of his times and he seemed to be as much at home in those waters as any of his contemporaries were. The term "main stream" should not be

---

2. Woodhouse, ibid., Chapter II.
3. Saravia, Of the Diverse Degrees of the Ministers of the Gospel; Of the Honor which Is Due unto the Priests and Prelates of the Church; Of Sacrilege, and the Punishment Thereof, trans. anon. (1592), Dedieatory Epistle, 2nd p. (this Dedieatory Epis. was not included in the 1840 Street translation of the first of these treatises, nor in the 1610 edition of the Tractatus/ "...because I am but new made of Flemish sterling, that is, of outlandish English, it may be happily, that they which are home-bred, will think I deal not well with them, to deal with them, and that I meddle too farre, when I come so neare."
interpreted to mean those views of the Church of England which later came into usage, e.g., High, Broad, or Low Churchmen, rather it should be understood as referring to that uniqueness which differentiates Anglicanism from all other Christian groups. Saravia developed a Church polity and theology which showed Lutheran as well as Calvinistic influence, however, although he opposed the Puritan tradition of Calvinism, he remained more indebted to that part of Reformed theology than to any other kind of sixteenth century Protestant thought. In agreement with Anglicans he stood for catholicism, and for a harmony of faith and reason which was based on sound learning. Like his contemporaries he revealed a great appreciation of the Apostolic foundations of the Church witnessed to by the Scriptures and the early fathers.1

A very important reason for putting Saravia into the proper historical background is the unique nature of the English Reformation itself. Although many continental reformers tended to regard it as inferior to their own Reformation because it was not as complete as theirs, the Anglicans themselves thought the sui generis character of their Reformation an asset and not a liability. Some have termed this a via media Anglicana, but as we shall see in a later chapter this designation is misleading if one understands it to mean that the sixteenth century theologians like Saravia deliberately tried to choose "a middle way" between the Roman Church and Protestantism.2 However, it is significant that Saravia has often been remembered by historians and theologians of later generations as an example of the way Anglicanism attracted men from all theological groups.3

1. A Treatise...etc., Preface, 41.
2. V. infra, Chapter IV, "Saravia's Evaluation of the Reformation"
The Austin-Friars Church

A large number of refugees came to England during the reign of Edward VI from the Low Countries, Germany, and France. These joined together in London to form the Netherlands Fugitives Church, which is now called the Austin-Friars Church. This church was made up of several congregations which were divided into their various language groups, each having its own pastor. John a Lasco, who had studied under Bucer in Strassburg, and Utenhove, who, in 1551 had written the first confession of faith in the Dutch language, were the founders of this church.

It was formed with a polity which consisted of a type of episcopacy which was more a superintendence than it was a bishopric; John a Lasco being the first to serve in this capacity. Another interesting feature of this church besides its modified type of episcopacy was the manner in which it was also governed by presbyteries made up of ministers and elders. When this church was reconstituted at the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign she brought it more into the Anglican organization by putting it under the Bishop of London. No longer were these Dutch Reformed able to say, as Utenhove had earlier said in a letter to Calvin, "it is no small thing that we are free from the yoke of the bishops and for that may the Lord be praised." 

1. This section should come in Saravia's Life chronologically when it was first mentioned on p. 19, but it logically fits better here.
2. In "A Letter of...Saravia to the Pastors...in the Netherlands" in A Treatise...etc., 22, mentions these "...first churches of foreigners..." as examples of why the Dutch churches should accept episcopacy. He apparently considered a Lasco a full bishop for he spoke of him as "...the Lord Bishop a Lasco." This is indicative of the way Saravia was willing to give a broad interpretation to this office.
The personal contact which Saravia had with the Netherlands Fugitives Church extended over a longer period of time than that which he had with any other church in his life. This began early in his life for the records of the church indicate that on May 29, 1561, he was listed on the church roll as a "'iuvenis studiosus'"1, which confirms the statement of another authority who says that it was thought Saravia was attending Oxford at that time.2 In 1562 there was some talk that Saravia would take the Walloon Fugitives congregation in London as the successor of Nicholas Gallusius, but this did not materialize. In connection with this, van Schelven recorded a rather vague statement taken from the church records about Saravia's knowledge of this language:

...hij sprak immers ook 'lingua Belgica et Flandrica' met welke niet heel duidelijke uitdrukking vel bedoeld zal zijn, dat hij vlaamsch en fransch kende.3

As we have previously noted, it was in June of that year that Saravia went to Antwerp and Brussels and helped found Walloon churches there. Soon he returned to English soil when he took the position at the university on the Isle of Guernsey. From there he went to Southampton, and then on to London from 1572-1578, during which time he was listed as a preacher connected with the Netherlands Fugitives Church.

In 1573 a church in Dordrecht asked the Austin-Friars Church to send a suitable person to serve as their preacher. Saravia was asked, but he

---

1. Molhuysen, Nieuw Nederlandsch...Woordenboek, IX, col. 934, cited Kerkeraadsprotocolen der nederduitsche vluchtelingskerk te Londen.
3. Molhuysen, ibid. This was not the only time that Saravia claimed a loss of memory in the languages of the Netherlands as a reason (or excuse) not to go back to his homeland: fifteen years after the above date the classis of Walcheren asked him to take a church, but the Netherlands Fugitives Church wrote from London that he had forgotten his Dutch, although they said they thought he could relearn it in just a few months in Walcheren.
declined the invitation, and this time the consistory of the Austin-Friars Church did not accept his excuse as a valid one. This, however, apparently did not jeopardize his standing with the church, for he remained in good standing with the congregation through all of his association with them.

Saravia's association with this church was renewed ten years later when he fled from Leyden and took up permanent residence in England. At that time he had no formal connection with these congregations except as a friend, and in that capacity he was often called upon to serve as a moderator of disputes which developed in one of the congregations in London, or in one of the other cities where the church then had other congregations, e.g., Maidstone, Sandwich, and Norwich. Many years later, in 1609, a dispute arose about the rights of the Dutch Congregation in London to its churchyard. Saravia was called to testify in a court about this matter because "...the old members were asked what they remembered of the earlier situation..." In his testimony Saravia was shown to be one of the members of the church who had received the deed of land from Queen Elizabeth.

1. Ibid. col. 955. Van Schelven again gives the impression that he has real doubts about the validity of Saravia's motives when he refused these invitations to go back and serve churches in the Low Countries. In connection with an appeal from Antwerp and Ghent for his help in 1577, van Schelven listed four reasons which Saravia gave the London church for not going: (1) He said he did not feel suited for service there because he had been away for the better part of seventeen years and had forgotten much of the language; (2) he now had a large family and the responsibilities of tutoring the children of several nobles; (3) he had incurred a lot of expense and trouble from the service of the church in the past three or four years, and was just now beginning to get in better circumstances; (4) nevertheless he considered himself at their disposal. It so happened that Saravia did not have to go because many ministers were having to flee the Palts at that time and some of them went to serve these churches, thus relieving him of having to make a final decision about their invitation.

Saravia's Reception in England

When Saravia arrived in England he was welcomed by friends in the highest theological and political circles. Archbishop Whitgift extended the hospitality of Canterbury to him, and it is not without significance that he started off this period of his life in England at the very center of Anglicanism. Sir Francis Walsingham, advisor to Queen Elizabeth, also befriended him, as did the Lord Chancellor, Christopher Hatton, who took him into his own family circle and kept him for sometime after he arrived. Sir William Cecil (Lord Burleigh), the Lord Treasurer, was considered his patron and Saravia said it was he who "...brought to passe that by her Majesties privilege and preference I might be made...a citizen." It is also very likely that the Earl of Leicester assisted Saravia during this period since they had been closely related in their work in the Low Countries. A newcomer could hardly have wished for friends of greater authority or influence than these, but it was rather ironic that some of these men were not at all in agreement with him about church polity. It is not certain whether Cecil and Walsingham actually wanted to change Anglican polity to that of the Church of Scotland, but they were inclined in that direction and occasionally supported the Puritan cause.

What is even more significant is that Leicester was considered by some to be the head of the Puritan party in England.

---

1. Saravia, Of the Diverse Degrees...etc., Dedicatory Epistle, 1st p. He received citizenship in 1590, but he had desired it as early as 1566, "...naar een al in 1566 bij hem bestaanden wensch, tegen 1590 engelsch burger werd," (Molhuysen, ibid., col. 957); cf., Edward Hasted, The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent (1799), IV, 612.

2. Cf., McNeill, History...of Calviniaa, 316.
During his first few years in this country Saravia "exercised himself in some petty or pedagogical employments for a time."\(^1\) This was probably done in connection with his work as rector of Tattenhill in Staffordshire (or Tattenhall in Cheshire), which he began in 1588. On July 9th, 1590, he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity from Oxford University, in recognition of the recent publication of his first book in England.\(^2\) At least one authority thought Saravia was a fellow of Christ’s College, Cambridge, but this is unsupported elsewhere.\(^3\)

On October 22, 1591, Saravia was installed as a prebendary of Gloucester, but his name was misspelled, "Adrian Savaria" and he was treated in the Index as a different person from the man who was made a prebendary of Canterbury on Dec. 6, 1595.\(^4\) In 1601 he was chosen to serve in that same capacity in Worcester. All of these assignments were probably made possible by the high esteem which Whitgift had for Saravia.\(^5\) This is not shown in the records available, but it is known that he made Saravia

---

2. Ibid. Saravia had previously received this degree from the University of Leyden.
4. In his introduction Denison gave the correct dates for both of these offices, correcting the mistake of LeNeve in Fasti, Hardy ed., I, 445, who said Saravia resigned from Canterbury in 1602, and Hasted, Kent, IV, 612, who said he took office at Canterbury in 1597.
5. Some of the difficulty in ascertaining the correct records of Saravia’s life can be seen in the various ways his name has been spelled: Sexavia, Sorvia, Saravius, Saravius, Saravia, Savaria, Saravia, Sarafia, Zaraphya, Zaravia, and even Moravia.
Vicar of Lewisham in the Diocese of Rochester in the same year he was chosen as a prebendary of Canterbury. In 1601 he was also made a prebendary of Westminster, taking the eleventh stall vacated by Lancelot Andrewes who had just become Dean of the Cathedral. Saravia is often spoken of as having himself once been Dean of Westminster, but this is obviously a mistake, for there is no evidence to support such a conclusion. In 1609-1610 he became rector of Great Chart in Canterbury, and this was to be the place where he spent the three remaining years of his life. It was during this time that he became a friend of Isaac Casaubon, who revealed his high regard for Saravia when he said, "this man is of no mean reputation at this time in England. He is a man of great learning, most anxious and earnest in seeking for general peace and concord in the Church of God."2

The Bega Controversy

and

the Publication of Saravia's Works for the Period, 1590-1610

The book which Saravia published in 1590, and for which he was honored by Oxford, consisted of three treatises, one of which we have mentioned previously.3 If he published a treatise in 1561 in Frankfurt, then it was probably an abbreviated form of the first of these treatises. The evidence certainly points towards an earlier publication, for, as Denison said of the 1590 edition, it "...is an answer to the criticisms of Bega upon the

2. *Saravia...Eucharist*, Denison's Intro., xxii-xxiv, contains a memorandum by Casaubon on a conversation with Saravia in 1610.
3. *V. supra*, p. 17, no. 1 for information on the 1561 edition, and p. 34 for the English titles to these treatises given by the anonymous translator of 1592.
treatise of Saravia on the same subject, which was, it would appear, written, if not published, as early as 1566...\(^1\) Additional evidence about this earlier work is given by Strype, who said Saravia brought to England in 1587 what amounted to several chapters of a work which he had previously prepared in the Bessa controversy.\(^2\) Saravia had once thought of giving this material to the States of Holland but decided against it. Later, when he came to England he saw that there was some doubt in the minds of some about his beliefs concerning the validity of the episcopal government, and it alarmed him that the churches in the Low Countries were encouraging the "...seditious and schismatic party of the Church of England,..."\(^3\) Therefore he wrote this tripartite work to prove that episcopacy was the ancient form of ecclesiastical government taught in the Scriptures and by the Church fathers, and to appeal for a proper respect for ministers and Church property. Saravia published this work in Latin when he came to England, but it was so well received that it was anonymously translated and published again in 1592 and 1640. In 1640 Street came out with a translation of only the first of these treatises and just at the time his book was going to press he learned of this earlier translation; without having seen the copy at the Bodleian library of which he had heard, he mistakenly concluded that it must have been the work of

---
\(^1\) Strype, \textit{ibid.}, 202-203; "this book was in vindication of a former, which he composed when he was abroad." Strype was referring to "De diversis gradibus...etc." published in 1594, so the "former" book of which he spoke would be "De diversis gradibus...etc." (published in England in 1590), which he believed to be an amplified version of the continental edition. This would also explain why neither Bessa nor Saravia ever referred to the earliest work, but only to those published in England.

\(^2\) Strype, \textit{ibid.}, 204.
Saravia, for had he seen either the translation or the translator's preface
he would have known that it could not have been the work of the author.  
In 1629 James Martin translated the third treatise, "De Sacrilegis et
Sacrilégiorum poenis," but for some strange reason he entitled it, 
Hippociae
Saravia: a Treatise of the Honor and Maintenance Due to Ecclesiastical
Persons, as if it were about the second treatise, "De honore Praesulibus
et Presbyteris debito." What is even more strange he included the last
chapter of the latter, but all the rest came from "De Sacrilegis...etc."

Besa was offended when he saw the continental edition of Saravia's
treatise because he thought it was an attack by "...an ordinary, private
minister..." on the tract which he had written to friends in Scotland
seeking to dissuade them from adopting an episcopal polity.  
Saravia also
took offence at the way Besa dealt with him so roughly in his reply.
Besa, or possibly Damaeus who may have written this reply for Besa, he
said, had spoken disdainfully of him by saying "Saravia nescio quis." 
The reply which Saravia referred to was Ad Tractationem de Ministerorum
Evangelici ordinationem ab Hadriano Saravia, which was such a heavy-handed and
harsh treatment of Saravia's ideas that it hurt Besa's cause in England.
It seems very likely that this was really not Besa's work, though, but
that of his assistant, Damaeus, for Hook said that Besa was very busy at the
time and left the undertaking to his colleague.  

1. A Treatise...etc., Preface, ix; cf., Mason, Church of England... 
etc., 32.
this was written to Lord Clavis, the Scottish chancellor, as a letter in
answer to a request in 1576 about the correct order of ecclesiastical
polity. Besa's letter was later published under the title De triplici
episcopatu.
3. Saravia, Of the Diverse Degrees...etc. Translator's Preface, 1st p.
swift work in securing this treatise by Beza and/or Danasus and because of
his encouragement of Saravia to answer it as soon as possible, the latter
published a long reply in 1594, entitled, Defensio Tractatus de diversis
Ministrorum syndibus, and in that same year, or possibly even a year
earlier, he published Emanem Tractatus D. Bssae de triangulo Bisepcoporum
genera. The latter work was the result of reading a treatise by
Bishop John Bridges in which he refuted Beza's De Triungle...etc.
Saravia apparently had not seen this before being introduced to it in
Bridges' work and he said he could not really believe that it was by
Beza because it was in English. Later when he saw the Latin copy he
recognised Beza's style. He said he thought even less of this than he did
of Ad Tractationem...etc. and that he was replying to it only because Beza
was known as a great authority. In both of these works published in
1594 Saravia simply amplified what he had already written in De diversis...
etc. for he did not alter a single part of his doctrine in either of these
writings. It seems that Saravia got the best of Beza in these arguments
and proved at several points that he and Danasus had taken up a position
different from that of Calvin; at any rate Beza evidently had had enough
of this controversy for he dropped the matter except for an occasional
reference to Saravia in his correspondence. In one such letter he
virtually admitted he had come off second-best in these arguments, for in
1595 he wrote a friend:

1. "Defensio...etc." was published in Frankfurt in 1601 by Adam
Hertinge, who had also been roughly treated by Beza for having ideas about
episcopacy very similar to those of Saravia (v. Strype, Whitgift, II, 209).
2. "Emanem...etc." Prologus, 1st p. In these works which were written
to controvert opinions of others he used the same style of dissecting his
opponents' writings and answering them paragraph by paragraph that Jewel used
in The Defence of the Apology; this made for a very broken and disconnected
development of his thought.
I hardly doubt that Saravia and others are pleased with themselves to have as they mistakenly believe, silenced me. Not that I am personally bothered but as the saying goes there is always a time of silence while the powers of darkness reign. And if, by chance, you imagine that my silence is more pitiable than profitable I warn you (and this without malice) my reply is almost ready, strengthened mostly by the very arguments of those people.†

Previously, a comment was made about Saravia's friendship with Isaac Casaubon, the great classical scholar. In the memorandum which Casaubon wrote about a conversation with him, he said Saravia differed in the following ways with Beza:‡ (1) because the Genevan form of ecclesiastical government was creating anarchy in the Church and was opposed to the ancient polity which the Anglican Church followed; (2) he thought Calvinists like Beza were introducing novelty in religion by systematizing Calvin's teachings, which in turn caused them to despise the early fathers; (3) he did not approve of Beza's actions at the Colloquy of Poissy in 1561 because he had refused to sign the Augsburg Confession and because Beza said that he and his followers believed in an "extraordinary call" for Christians. In this same conversation with Casaubon Saravia mentioned two things about which he also differed with Calvin. The first of these was one he felt more deeply about than the other for he mentioned it several times in his works — i.e., Calvin's doctrine of Christ's Death. He disliked this because the Genevan theologian had interpreted the statement in the creed that Christ had descended into hell as simply an image of the sufferings endured by Christ on the Cross and not as a literal statement of fact. Casaubon said "Saravia hath this portion of Calvin's

† Schickler, Les Églises...Angleterre, I, 270-71, trans. by W. Bauermeister. This reply promised by Beza was never published.
‡ V. Saravia...Bucharist, Casaubon's memo, in Denison's Intro., xxii-xxiv. The original of this is in the Bodleian library, MSS xxvii, fol. 6.
teachings in such utter detestation, that he can find no words wherein sufficiently to condemn it..." He also said Saravia had told him that he had written a book about this matter in refutation of the opinions of Calvin, Beza, and Nicholas Cusanus. However, this book was probably never published for no trace of it has been found. The other thing about which he said Saravia differed with Calvin was the latter's lack of appreciation of the fathers. This is the only time Saravia made such a comment as far as is known, and indeed, in several places in his works he quoted Calvin against Beza to show that the former was in agreement with patristic opinion.

This controversy with Beza led to a similar argument with Jacob Gretzer, a German Jesuit. Cardinal Bellarmine had written a work sometime prior to this in which he had denied Anglican episcopacy to be the same as that of the One, Holy, Catholic Church. This naturally drew many replies from English theologians, and Gretzer undertook to defend the Cardinal by answering them. He probably had read some of Saravia's writings against Beza and subsequently had mentioned the name abusively in his work. We do not know the date of Saravia's reply, but it is likely that it was around 1595. In this treatise he used quotations from ancient canons and the comments of Jean Gerson and Nicholas Cusanus to refute Gretzer's position.

2. Hartsoecker, Praestantium...Virorum Epistolae...etc., 362, reveals that Saravia told his friend Uytenbogaert that he had two books written on this subject which had never seen the light of day; since that letter was written in 1612, there is almost no chance that they were published or even remain in manuscript form.
3. E.g., "Examen...etc." Prologus, 2nd & 3rd pp.; "Defensio...etc.," 158, 160.
4. "Responsio ad convitia quaedam Gretseri Jesuitae, in quibus Hadriani Saraviae nomine abutitur."
Early in the reign of James I, Saravia presented him with a treatise entitled, "De Sacra Eucharistia." The King deposited this in his library and it was then given to the British Museum when that institution was founded. In 1855 Archdeacon George A. Denison made a good translation of it and it was published that same year under the title Saravia on the Holy Eucharist. This was Saravia's finest theological work for it reveals a much better development of his thought and a terseness of style which would have greatly improved some of his other works. This may very well be explained by the fact that it was also one of the few non-polemical things he ever wrote.  

Probably the next to the last thing which Saravia wrote for publication was "N. fratri et Amico." This nameless friend was apparently someone who had come to England from the Low Countries and had engaged in an argument with Saravia about certain canons which had been adopted in Anglican convocations. Saravia comments very briefly upon such doctrines as Baptism, Excommunication, ceremonies and rites, and the functions and orders of the ministry, in an effort to correct his friend's theology.

The last of Saravia's published works was "De imperandi authoritye et Christiana obedientia," in 1610. In it he developed the principle of order and authority which he felt to be so important in every aspect of human society. In every doctrine about which he had written he had shown these to be of paramount importance for his theology, but just a few years before his death he made this ambitious attempt to

1. This exposition of the doctrine of the Real Presence will be discussed in Chapter I in "The Nature and Order of the Ministry," and in Chapter IV in "Ecclesiastical Unity in the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper."

2. Saravia often used what is now considered a corrupted form of Latin spelling — e.g., "authoritas" instead of "auctoritas."
summarize his philosophy and to show how it related to the family, Church, and state. Unfortunately, he finished only four of the seven books which he had planned, and the three which he failed to complete would have been far more important than the ones he did finish. In the four books in Tractatus he began with the family and showed how all order must proceed from that institution. It is significant that he felt the father and husband to have almost absolute powers and that he traced the need of a similar authoritarianism in his subsequent discussions of the Church and the state. To do this he gave examples from the organization of crafts, unions, religious societies, military organizations, and the sovereignty of monarchs in their kingdoms. The books which he failed to complete were to deal with the rule of nobles, the status of the people, and the government of the Church.  

Most, if not all, of these treatises were published separately, but in 1611 all of them except "De Sacra Eucharistia" were published in a tome entitled, Diversi Tractatus Theologici. The individual title pages show that they were all published in 1610, but many of them were published at least once before then. "Defensio Tractatus...etc." was in its third edition by that time and Saravia revised it to bring it up to date for the publication of Tractatus.

Saravia's Relationship to Archbishop Whitgift, Richard Hooker, and Bishop Andrewes

Saravia had a close relationship to Whitgift which began when he entered England in 1587. He spent several months at Canterbury at that time, and afterwards he was often with the Archbishop either at Canterbury

---

1. "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," Prologus.
or Lambeth Palace, in the role of an advisor and a research scholar. This was evident in the Beza controversy which Whitgift did not participate in directly, but which he encouraged Saravia to continue. Probably the most important theological problem he was called upon to give advice about was the Barret controversy which arose in 1595, and which led to the drafting of the Lambeth Articles. This affair developed out of the differences of Dr. Whitaker and Dr. Baro at Cambridge about free-will, hypothetical election, universal grace, etc. William Barret, following the views put forward by Baro, preached a sermon at St. Mary's Church ad clericum just after Easter, 1595, in which he spoke against the absolute decree of reprobation without regard to sin, against the certainty of faith; and in which he said that persons might fall from grace, that there was no distinction in faith except in the measure and degree by which people believe, that the remission of sins mentioned in the creed referred to sins in general and not those of particular persons, and in which he spoke abusively of Calvin, Peter Martyr, and several other reformers. The Puritans at the University were so disturbed by this sermon that they forced Barret to make a public recantation, but when he did so, his manner so angered them that they sought to have him expelled. Barret appealed to Whitgift and the Archbishop consulted Saravia about the doctrines involved, and asked him to prepare a statement about these. The latter submitted a work entitled, "A Censure of Barret's Retraction" in answer

2. Ibid., 229-230.
3. Ibid., III, 317-20. Whitgift himself outlined the chronology of these events (v. The Works of John Whitgift, ed. for P.S. by John Ayre [1853], III, 614-15)
to Whitgift's request, but not agreeing with the position the Archbishop later took in the preparation of the Lambeth Articles. There is no evidence that Saravia took part in the preparation of these Articles, but it seems likely that he must have been in the meeting in which they were prepared, because of the advice which he had already given Whitgift about this matter. However, it is apparent that he could not have agreed with more than half of the Articles which were drawn up.

Saravia became more irenic in spirit in his later years for instead of displaying the contentiousness for which he was noted in the Netherlands, he became deeply concerned about peace and harmony in the Church. This change of attitude was manifested in his ability to get along with a militant Puritan like Hugh Broughton. This difficult but brilliant scholar had preached a sermon on Acts 13:18-22, which he interpreted as an abridgement of all the Bible, but Whitgift had objected to such an interpretation. Saravia interceded for the Puritan with some success on this occasion, and at another time when Whitgift had condemned Broughton's commentary on Daniel. Later, when the list of scholars who were to serve as translators of the Authorized Version of the Bible was drawn up, Broughton, who was considered one of the best Hebraists in all of England was not included.

1. V. Strype, ibid., 321-37, for the text of Saravia's treatise. For an examination of this doctrine, v. infra, Chapter IV, "The Doctrine of Election." For the Lambeth Articles, v. Schaff (ed.), Creeds...of Protestant Churches, 523-525.
2. Ibid., II, 118; v. also III, 367-74, for a letter from Broughton to the Lord Treasurer giving his complaints against Whitgift. In this letter he speaks of Saravia's intercessions on his behalf, and in the context of a statement comparing his own learning with that of the Archbishop, he said: "'Dr. Seravia [sic] told Mr. David Roberts, that he could not beat into my Lord Grace's head so much as the conceit of my studies: but he would lerne of me, and so bring my Lord Grace to be gracious to my studies.'"
Saravia, who was chosen, may have been used by the committee of translators to consult with Broughton about difficult points because of his rapport with him.

At the time Saravia was made a prebendary of Canterbury, Richard Hooker was living at Bishopsbourne, only a few miles from the Cathedral. During the next five years, and until Hooker's death in 1600, these two became the closest of friends. In 1594, Hooker had published the first four books of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, which have been called "...the most outstanding literary product of the Anglican Reformation." We shall see later that some have thought Hooker influenced Saravia's thinking about episcopacy, but this was most unlikely, for Saravia had already published his major works on this doctrine before he and Hooker became friends. This was the area in which both men showed their greatest interest and about which they did much of their writing, but they did not always express themselves in exactly the same way. They both lived in a time when there was a pressing need to understand the nature of the Church in respect to its government, discipline, and polity, and both made his own contribution towards meeting that need. Walton described their agreement in this way:

---

1. Isaac Walton's "Life of Hooker" gives much of the information about this relationship. This biography can be found in *Richard Hooker, The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine. Mr. Richard Hooker, arr. and intro. by John Keble, 3rd ed. (1845) 1-37*. This friendship was so striking that it led Walton to suggest that much more study should be given to the sentiments of the less celebrated of the two on the subject of church polity.


3. Woodhouse, *Doctrine of the Church...etc.*, Chap. VIII for a discussion of these terms.
these two excellent persons began a holy friendship, increasing daily to so high and mutual affections, that their two wills seemed to be but one and the same; and their designs both for the glory of God and peace of the Church still assisting and improving each other's virtues, and the desired comforts of a peaceable piety.¹

It is from Walton that we learn Hooker and Saravia were confessors to each other, and that the latter administered the sacrament and absolution to his friend the day before Hooker died.² This poses a very interesting problem about what happened to Books VI-VIII of the Ecclesiastical Polity, for there has long been a mystery about their disposition after Hooker's death.³ It is thought by Sisson that these are authentic works of Hooker, although many have doubted this, but he does say that there was some "...possible contamination of the manuscripts by their clerical trustees between 1600 and 1648 with respect to Books VI and VIII, and 1662 with respect to Book VII."⁴ Hooker was very concerned about what would happen to them after his death, so it would seem reasonable that he would have entrusted them to Saravia. Samuel Taylor Coleridge questioned the authenticity of these posthumous publications, and asked this very relevant question:

If honest Isaac's account of that tender, confidential, even confessional, friendship of Hooker and Saravia be accurate, how chance it that Hooker did not entrust the manuscripts to his friend who stood beside him in his last moments? At all events, Saravia must have known whether they had or had not received the author's last hand.⁵

---

¹. Hooker, ibid., Walton's "Life...etc..." 77.
². Ibid., 85.
³. V. C.J. Sisson, The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker and the Birth of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity (1940), Chap. III, for a discussion of these books.
⁴. Ibid., 107.
His question truly poses a great mystery about this matter, but, unfortunately, Saravía's works shed no light at all on it. One would have expected him to have provided the key to this problem, but there has not been found even one reference to Hooker, or to these posthumous publications.

Another person with whom Saravía had opportunity to have close contact was Lancelot Andrews. Both served Archbishop Whitgift in varying capacities, and, as we have seen above, Saravía occupied the stall at Westminster which Andrews vacated when he became Dean of the Cathedral. We shall also see that Saravía served with Andrews on the Westminster committee for the translation of the Authorized Version of the Bible. Undoubtedly Saravía had a great respect for Andrews and was influenced by him, but we do not know how much. Denison mistakenly assumed that Saravía had given the credit to Andrews for leading him to change his ideas about Calvin's doctrine of the Death of Christ. He got this idea from Saravía's letter to Uyteribogaert, when he said:

*Ab illis tamen dissentio in expositions descensus Christi ad inferos, postquam a vestris ejectus, hunc sum reversus mutavi sententiam, melius hinc in Anglia edoctus Concionibus et scriptis tum doctissimi viri Reverendi Episcopi Vintoniensis, tum aliorum doctorum hominum, qui nulla in parte aut Calvinio aut Bezae cedunt.*

However, Andrews did not become Bishop of Winchester until 1619, and Saravía's letter was written in 1612. Generally, it should be said that most of Saravía's doctrines were already formed before he came to England to live, so there was little chance for any of his colleagues to change

---

1. Saravía...Eucharist. Denison's Intro., xxiv. Saravía was referring either to Thomas Cooper, Bishop of Winchester from 1584-1594, or to Thomas Bilson, who became Bishop there in 1597 and continued until his death in 1616.

2. Hartsoecker, Praestantium...Virorum Epistolae...etc., 362. The phrase "...postquam a vestris ejectus..." may refer to a formal expulsion from the Dutch Reformed Church.
his ideas. The interesting thing about this is that he was almost completely in agreement with them anyway, so there was really no need for him to alter or modify his doctrines.

The Authorized Version of the Bible

In 1607 Saravia was chosen by King James as one of translators of the new version of the Bible. His name came third on the Westminster committee, after that of Andrewes and Overall, both of whom were known to be brilliant linguists. There were nine men on this group and the judgement of Greenslade was that they were unquestionably a strong team. Their particular responsibility was the translation of Genesis — II Kings. Daiches and Greenslade both mention that Saravia had acquired a reputation of being a scholar of modern languages, and the latter said this knowledge was thought to be a considerable asset to that committee. The former also observed that it was not possible to evaluate his knowledge of Hebrew from his theological works, but he should have been competent in that field as well. Saravia also had the honor to serve on the committee of revisers, so he rendered double service in this respect. Isaac Walton observed that it was probably Saravia's ability as a Hebrew scholar, as well as his great discretion which led Whitgift to use him in his communications with "...the 'learned though morose' High Broughton." Saravia revealed a little of his erudition and the sources on which he

1. Greenslade, ibid.
2. David Daiches, The King James Version of the English Bible (1941) 161; Greenslade, ibid.
4. Booker, ibid., Walton's "Life...etc.," 77, qtd. Strype, ibid. II, 118; III, 370.
relied in one of his works when he cited Santes Paginus, Jean Hercvier, Barthezus, and Antoine Chevalier, all of whom were outstanding linguists who had made substantial contributions to scholarship through their teaching and the publication of word lists and dictionaries in Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, etc.¹

The Mission of the Church to the Heathen

Saravia is often remembered today as one of the first in his time who taught the responsibility of the Church to carry the Gospel into all the world. In Part II we shall be examining this doctrine and trying to determine why he saw this need so clearly when so few of his contemporaries were even aware of it. We shall have already seen in the study of Saravia's doctrine of the Ministry that he put great emphasis on the Apostolic foundations of the Church. In our study of his concept of missions we shall see that it was precisely this which caused him to come to these convictions. We shall also see that it was his interpretation of Matthew 28:16-20, which led him to believe Christ's great commission was still meant for all the Church and not just for the Apostles. Until Saravia's time this passage had not been used extensively as a missionary text, so he may be thought of as one of the first to interpret and to apply it in this way.

Saravia's understanding of missions was remarkably farsighted, because he linked it closely with his ecclesiology. The magnitude of his vision looms even larger when one compares his thoughts with those of most other sixteenth century theologians, and when one sees that in some

¹ "Defensio...etc.," 101.
ways the Church in the twentieth century has only begun to grasp the importance of ecclesiology to missions. This was undoubtedly Saravia's most unique contribution to the Church, but unfortunately it is one which he failed to write very much about. Only a few chapters in "De diversis gradibus...etc.," and "Defensio...etc.," contain the bulk of his thought about this subject. Yet, when one reads these pages, the impression one receives is that he had not exhausted his thoughts on missions by any means for Saravia seems to have only begun to say what he believed about the mission of Church to the heathen. Maybe he said no more because he was so far ahead of his times and no one had seemed to give any attention to that which he had already shared in his writings. These two treatises went through several editions, so they were apparently read by many people, but there has not been found a single reference in the writings of his English contemporaries either for or against his ideas about missions. Only Beza seems to have taken notice of them, and he strongly opposed the idea that the Church was under any obligation to continue carrying the Gospel to the rest of the world in every age.

The Question of Saravia's Ordination

One of the most controversial aspects of Saravia's life is the matter of whether he at any time received episcopal ordination. Quite a good case can be made for either side of this argument, for there are some mystifying considerations involved which make it impossible to answer this question categorically one way or the other. First, we shall list those arguments against his having been re-ordained when he became a minister in the Anglican Church, and then we shall list those which could
be made for such a re-ordination.

The reasons why it seems likely Saravia was not re-ordained are as follows: (1) Diocesan registers have been examined by several authorities in the past, and more recently inquiries have been made again in all of the dioceses in which he had held any office in the Church of England, but none of these investigations have yielded any evidence of it;¹ (2) Saravia's avowed purpose in taking office in the Church of England and in writing his works on the doctrine of the Ministry was to free the churches of the Low Countries from suspicion of episcopal government and to show the inherent unity of Reformed churches with Anglicanism;² such a high purpose would have been meaningless to his brethren in the Low Countries if he himself had felt it necessary to be ordained episcopally when he had become an Anglican; (3) Saravia expressly stated that in times of necessity the whole episcopal office could devolve upon presbyters giving them the full right of ordination;³ (4) if Saravia had been re-ordained it would not have escaped the notice of his friends or his foes, yet there is no mention of it in any correspondence, or in any of the controversial writings of opponents like Bessière;⁴ (5) Saravia himself gave remarkably little attention to ordination per se, and what he did have to say about it showed that his concern was more about the examination of candidates than about the rite itself. (6) It is questionable whether the

¹. These include Canterbury, Gloucester, Lichfield, London, Rochester, and Worcester.
². "Defensio...etc.", Candido Lectori, 2nd p.: "Qua suspicione ut nostras liberarem Ecclesiam, et ministerium Pastorale in Ecclesia Anglicana suscepil, et tractatum de diversis Ministeriorum gradibus edidi, quo coniunctiones animorum in una eademque fide testatae mundo facerem."
³. Ibid., 32: "...ad pios Presbyteros...tota Episcopalis gubernationis Ecclesiasticae authoritates devolviatur: ut Presbyter liquido possit ordinare Presbyteros." Also, v. infra Chap. II, "The Power of the Keys of the Kingdom."
Anglican Church itself required re-ordination at that time.\(^1\)

The arguments which indicate that Saravia might have been ordained are: (1) this would have been consistent with his deep feelings about the importance of the episcopate; (2) the controversies in which he engaged give us reason to believe that this was done, for it seems impossible to suppose that Beza, Damascus, or Gretzer would have failed to comment on this had he not been episcopally ordained.\(^2\) (3) It would have been unlikely that Hooker would have chosen Saravia as his confesser and received absolution and the sacrament from him on his death bed if Saravia had not had such ordination; (4) Whitgift would have hardly chosen Saravia as his own theological advisor and admitted him to a prebend without proper credentials, when he had already told Travers "I know of no such" in referring to those serving in the Church of England with only presbyterian ordination;\(^3\) (5) the question of ordination would not have come up if Saravia had held his prebends beneficiæ simplicia, as Casaubon was to do later, but it is very doubtful that he himself would have agreed to do this, and besides he eventually held three cures of souls as well. (6) the final piece of evidence which can be offered for this view is a statement by Saravia to the ministers on the Isle of Guernsey:

I must add one word more, which will be hard of digestion; this is it, that you may be upbraided, that as many Ministers, that are natural of the country, being not made Ministers of the Church by your Bishop, nor by his Diumissories, nor by any

\(^1\) Ibid. In this article Sprott gave several arguments from history to support this contention.

\(^2\) Saravia…Eucharist, Denison’s Intro., xx.


Of., Mason, Church of England…etc., 507, who showed that James Owen, a presbyterian controversialist at the end of the 17th cent., inveighed against Saravia’s concept of divine right, but when he drew up a list of those whom he knew to be holding English benefices on the strength of presbyterian orders he did not include Saravia’s name, although it would have greatly strengthened his case if he could have done so.
other according to the Order of the English Church, you are not true and lawful Ministers.¹

We have seen from these arguments that both sides of this question have many strong points to be given for or against the matter of Saravia's re-ordination. However, it really seems that neither presents a completely satisfactory answer vis-à-vis the strength of the other. Therefore, the most logical conclusion and the one which affords more answers to the questions which have been raised than any other is that Saravia had received Roman orders before he went over to the Reformation. This was the conclusion to which Bishop Wordsworth came when he studied this problem, but he offered no concrete reason for having done so.² It may be that he was not aware Saravia had once been a member of the Franciscan Convent at St. Omer, but this would lend added weight to this theory.³ The fact that he served several years in that order would indicate that he had been there long enough to receive orders and it would explain the absence of any statement by his friends or by himself about the nature of his ordination. The Act of 1571 had recognized the Roman orders of those coming into the Anglican Church, so this would have been no problem for him when he came to England. Additional proof for this view may be seen in the way Saravia argued that Protestant churches should accept the orders of those who came over to the Reformation.⁴ He did not say he had been ordained in the Roman Church, but the whole tenor of his discussion of this matter would certainly be congruous with this theory.

¹. "Letter...to the Ministers...of Guernsey," in A Treatise...etc., xx. It should be noted that Saravia spoke here of those "...natural of the country..." so this might also be used as an argument for the opposite view.
³. V. supra, "Saravia's Early Years."
⁴. "Defensio...etc.," 30-39, et Passim.
The Closing Years of His Life

Saravia spent the last three years of his life as rector of Great Chart.

On January 25, 1612, he died at the age of eighty-two and was buried at Canterbury. A tablet has been placed in his memory at the west end of the north aisle.¹

The facts of Saravia's life have more than a passing meaning for a study of the doctrines about which he wrote, for many of these events directly influenced his theology, and, as we shall see, cannot be ignored in our efforts to determine the nature of the contribution which he made to those doctrines giving expression to the nature of the Church.

¹. Hasted, History ... of Kent, IV, 613, records that Saravia's first wife (whom he married in 1561) died in 1585. Her name was Catherine d'Allis. Later he married Margaret Witts. The only known children were Thomas A. and Adrian T., both of whom attended the University of Leyden. The epitaphs on his gravestone and the Canterbury tablet can be found in Saravia ... Eucharist, Denison's Intro., xxviii.
PART I

THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH.
CHAPTER I

SARAVIA’S DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY

Introduction

The sixteenth century was both a formative and a formulative period in the Church of England, and, therefore, it is of particular importance for an understanding of Anglican doctrine. In his thorough study of the doctrine of the Church held by those divines living in the latter half of that century, H.F. Woodhouse aptly described it as a time when, "... new ideas were common, much of what was old was being questioned and new patterns were being woven." He also observed that even though this was an epoch of unusual significance for Anglicans it is one in which very few writers are more than names to us today. One of those who is hardly known at all is Saravia, yet he certainly should be considered a key figure in the last decade of that century and in the first decade of the seventeenth. It will be the purpose of this and the following chapters to show why such a statement is justified. This will be done by an examination of his doctrines and a comparison of them with the doctrine of his Anglican contemporaries where such juxtaposing is warranted.

Most authorities consider Puritanism to have been the most serious threat to the Anglican establishment during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. This controversy within the Church of England began in a minor way almost as soon as she began her reign, for many of the exiles returning to England from the continent were convicted that the reformation in their Church should be carried as far as

---

1. Woodhouse, Doctrine of the Church ... etc., 13.
3. The critical judgments exercised in Parts I and II will be those which determine the extent to which it might be said that Saravia agreed or disagreed with his Anglican compatriots. The Critical Assessment in the Conclusion to the thesis will be a summary of those judgments plus personal evaluations and criticisms.
they had seen it carried in Geneva, Strassburg, and many of the other major Reformation centers. However, the Puritan movement as such did not become a major attack upon Anglicanism, as it then existed, until the publication of Admonition to Parliament in 1572 by an unknown author. This treatise censured the Church of England in respect to its clergy, liturgy, and polity. Among the demands made in it were those seeking the abolition of vestments, the Book of Common Prayer, diocesan episcopacy, and those seeking the institution of a doctrine of the Parity of Ministers. This treatise was really the beginning of a pamphlet war in which outstanding men on both sides of this issue took part. Some of the Anglicans who answered these rather strong Puritan desiderations were capable men like John Whitgift, John Bridges, and Thomas Cooper, but it is noteworthy that their counter-claims were very mild in comparison with those which would later be put forward by Saravia, Bilson, Sutcliffe and others. For example, when the Puritans charged that episcopacy was "... unscriptural, unnecessary and ungodly ..." they were answered by those early Anglican apologists with a defense which was based on merely practical and historical grounds.¹

Another noticeable feature of the Anglican apologetic between 1572-1588 was the way these men refrained from attacking those in foreign churches, like Beza, who were giving strong support to the Puritan movement. The primary reason for this seems to have been the influence of the crown, for Queen Elizabeth wished to moderate these differences at home as much as possible so as to avoid making enemies of Protestants on the continent. She had excellent political reasons for this for the threat of Roman Catholic recusancy in England was a serious menace to the country as long as Spain remained a potential invader of English soil. The whole political climate changed rather dramatically with the

¹. Woodhouse, ibid., 84.
defeat of the Armada in July, 1588, and as an almost immediate consequence of this there can be seen a very decided change in the Anglican defense. No longer did they feel it necessary to devote most of their attention to their Roman Catholic opponents and there was a very noticeable stiffening of opposition to English Puritanism and to those abroad who were encouraging them.

Evidence of this new phase in Anglican polemics is quite noticeable in the tenor and number of writings produced within a few years after the defeat of the Armada. It has been thought likely that that event caused Richard Hooker to begin work immediately on *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Either just before or just after that battle Richard Bancroft became the first to give public evidence of a new approach in the defense of the Anglican establishment when he preached his famous sermon at St. Paul's Cross, for he is generally credited as being the first to attack both Puritanism at home and Presbyterianism in Scotland and on the continent. In his introduction to *The Works of...

Hooker*, John Keble said that Puritans had often complained that Bancroft's sermon was, "... the first express development of high church principles here." However, Keble said that Saravia probably should be considered the first to hold such views for he believed that he may have held them as early as 1564.

The substance therefore of his work was long anterior to Bancroft's sermon, although it did not appear till more than a twelvemonth after. Its publication at that particular time in England may be regarded as another symptom of the alteration in tone concerning such matters occasioned by the destruction of the Armada.

---

1. Sisson, *Judicious Marriage of...
2. It is uncertain whether the date of the sermon was Feb. 9, 1588, or 1589. The sermon as it was printed in 1636 and published in Bancroft's Tracts (1663) gives the date as 1588, but some scholars think it was in 1589 (v. F.L. Cross (ed), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (1963), 123).
5. Ibid.
Saravia's importance as a theologian during that period is attributable not only to the fact that his views were symptomatic "of the alteration in tone" at that point of time, but also to the fact that "De diversis gradibus Ministerum Evangelii" was the first formal treatise published in England during the Elizabethan era on the orders of the ministry. The early publication of this work was due (as Keble recognized) to the fact that he had held some, if not all, of the views expressed in it for a very long time. We have already seen that Saravia's purpose in writing this treatise was to show his Dutch brethren that they were wrong to support English Puritanism, without making it look as if a foreigner was making an attack on Puritanism per se. He had good reason to be careful for even an influential man like Bancroft had recently been forced to retract that portion of his sermon at St. Paul's Cross in which he had said James VI would restore episcopacy in Scotland when he came to the throne of England. Coupled with this reason was the fact that some of Saravia's benefactors in England, like the Earl of Leicester, were either Puritans or sympathetic with their aims, so Saravia was careful to state his convictions as if he were speaking only to the Dutch Reformed Church. Of course, this did not mean that he was indifferent to the outcome of these matters in England but it was the way which he chose to state how he felt about this situation without arousing undue hostility. Later the controversy with Beza served his purposes even better for he then had a chance to expand the views he had presented in a rather brief form in "De diversis ...," although again without seeming to engage directly in the dispute in England.

The two most important purposes of the study of Saravia's doctrines in

1. Mason, Church of England ... etc., 37.
2. A Treatise ... etc., 260 /"De diversis ... etc.," 357.
this first section are: (1) to determine what Saravia's total understanding of each doctrine was; (2) to compare these doctrines with those of his Anglican contemporaries and predecessors and to see if he actually departed to any major degree from the positions they held. The former aim is warranted because some of those who have made references to his doctrines have made the mistake of failing to consider the context of all that he had to say about a subject. In his polemical works he developed his thought by contrast to that of his opponent rather than logically or systematically unfolding it. Therefore he sometimes made statements in some passages which are almost in direct contradiction to what he said in other passages. This necessitates taking a balanced view of each doctrine so that we may be able to understand it the way Saravia understood it. The latter aim is warranted because of the present disagreement in Anglican circles as to whether, in their attempts to stiffen the opposition to Puritan claims, these later Elizabethans did, or did not, actually alter some of the doctrines established by the reformers.

The Importance of Order and Authority in Saravia's Doctrine of the Ministry.

There is an underlying motif about the necessity of order and authority in all of the treatises which Saravia wrote. It is like a recurrent theme in his doctrines, so none of them can really be understood properly apart from this relationship of order to authority. At the very heart of his theology there was this idea which is best described in his own words, "God is never the author of confusion, but of order." This principle held true in nature, in the home,

1. *A Treatise ... etc.*, 272 ["De diversis ... etc.", "57"].
in manufacture and art, in governments, in religion, and in every area of human society.\textsuperscript{1} We shall see how important this concept was to Saravia not only in his doctrine of the Ministry, but in all the other doctrines with which he dealt as well.

To have this state of orderliness Saravia said there must be the right kind of authority operative. This meant that there must be some in positions of authority and others who must obey them.\textsuperscript{2} He meticulously developed this idea in his last treatise, "De imperandi authori\textsuperscript{t}ate ... etc.," by beginning with the parent-child relationship and moving finally to the relation of kings and bishops to their people. His adherence to the principle of an authoritarian structure in every area of society is clearly seen in the way he stressed the need of authority in the home, in any kind of gathering or meeting, as well as in every conceivable kind of organization or institution.\textsuperscript{3} In all the history of the world, no civil, or ecclesiastical, or domestic society has been able to survive without some kind of head.\textsuperscript{4}

This had been a principle which Saravia's predecessors and contemporaries in the Church of England had also highly valued. Archbishop Jewel and the reformers had often commented on the necessity of order and authority for proper ecclesiastical organization.\textsuperscript{5} Hooker had also emphasized the importance of this in ecclesiastical polity,\textsuperscript{6} but neither he nor the majority of the rest of the Elizabethans attached as much importance to this principle as Saravia did.

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., 36-37 /Candido Lectori, 3rd p./, 122 /12/; "Defensio ... etc." 97; "De imperandi authori\textsuperscript{t}ate ... etc.," 122; et passim.

\textsuperscript{2} "Defensio ... etc.," ibid.

\textsuperscript{3} Cf., "De imperandi authori\textsuperscript{t}ate ... etc.," Index Capitum; "Defensio ... etc.," 53.

\textsuperscript{4} "Examen ... etc.," 16.

\textsuperscript{5} A.M. Watts, "The Doctrine of the Church in the Caroline Divines" (Thesis University of Edinburgh, 1960), 142.

\textsuperscript{6} Hooker, Works, Vol I, pp. 441-444 /E.P. III, xi, 18-20/.
This may be largely explained by the deep impressions which he had received from his experiences in the Netherlands. The anarchy and chaos there in Church and State made a lasting imprint on his mind. It was very likely that it was this aspect of the controversy in which Peter de Villiers had been involved which caused Saravia first to start thinking of the value of episcopal authority. His conviction that there was need for some kind of authoritarianism is also shown clearly in the two treatises which he published in 1590 with "De diversis ... etc."

Very little attention has been given to these by those who have studied Saravia's works, but they have an important bearing on his doctrine of the Ministry, for they explain much about the influences which affected it.

Saravia was greatly concerned about the sacrilege of ecclesiastical property which had taken place during and after the Reformation. He was concerned not simply that the churches were being robbed, but also that this had so impoverished them that many churches could no longer properly support their ministers. This was causing several things to happen which he felt could only bring greater trouble and tragedy to these churches. Firstly, it was depleting the Church of the resources necessary for the proper training and preparation of new ministers. Secondly, those who were pastoring churches were being forced to supplement their incomes by doing manual labour or other kinds of secular tasks; this prevented these ministers from giving their full time to the study of the Scriptures and the work of the Church.

References:
1. V. supra, Introduction. 16.
2. V. "De homonre ... etc.," and "De Sacrilegis ... etc.," in Tractatus 39-92; cf. "Letter ... to the Pastors ... in the Netherlands," in A Treatise ... etc., 6-28.
3. Of the honor ... etc., 97 /"De homonre ... etc.," 39/; Of Sacrilege ... etc., 219 /"De Sacrilegis ... etc.," 83/; et passim.
4. Of the honor ... etc., 124-28 /Abid, 48-57/; cf. 204-17 /77-82/, for his objections to the support of ministers by the magistrates.
section that Saravia was very zealous that all ministers have the best possible education and the greatest amount of time possible for study. The two trends mentioned above, he felt, could only lead into two disastrous courses. One would be schism because the Church had been improperly led by its ministers, and the other would be heresy because the ministers themselves would not be able to discern false teachings from the Truth. All of this he saw as partially the result of the theft of ecclesiastical resources, and, that in turn he believed could only have happened because there had not been sufficient authority in the Church to prevent it. It was this whole series of events which undoubtedly played a very large part in convincing him that episcopacy was the only way to prevent this. If one man had the authority and responsibility to oversee all the churches in a province, or even in a country, then he could have prevented much of this from happening. In this way the resources of the Church could have been protected, and the soundness of doctrine and the unity of the brethren could have been insured.

This very strong emphasis on authority, which oftentimes was given in the context of personal experiences relating the troubles which had arisen because of a lack of it, gives very good reason for stressing the part which pragmatic necessity had in the development of Saravia's doctrine of the Ministry. However, he was not the kind of man to let his convictions rest on so narrow a base for he also searched both the Bible and the patristic literature for support of his doctrine. In the Scriptures he believed that he found an authoritarian structure of ecclesiastical government in the Mosaic laws and the levi-

1. Cf. Stephen Neill, Anglicanism (1958), 126. Bishop Neill has shown that the lack of education in the Elizabethan ministry was a very serious matter.
2. Of the Honor ... etc., 125-25 /"De honore ... etc.," 127/.
3. "Letter ... to the Pastors ... in the Netherlands," in A Treatise ... etc., 3-10.
4. E.g., A Treatise ..., 260 /"De diversis ... etc.," 35/.
tical priesthood and later in the Apostolic form of government instituted by Christ. There can be no doubt that Saravia considered the Scriptures of paramount importance for he said we would only go astray if we followed the teachings of men rather than the authority of the Word of God. He likewise placed great importance on the Holy Spirit as the ruler over the churches and the interpreter of Scriptures. He said that since the Holy Spirit had ruled over the early Church in the formation of the Bible and continued to rule over it in the interpretation of the Scriptures, then it was to the Spirit that we should look for an elucidation of them. However, this principle of interpretation might appear at face value to be only a confusion of the authority of the Scriptures with that of tradition. It is true that there are times when he seems to be reading the history of the Church back into the Bible, as if it were evidence of the will of the Holy Spirit in the interpretation of some biblical passages. Of course, Saravia did not mean that any custom should be followed as sacred law if it is against the authority of the Scriptures, but it is sometimes difficult to see how he felt the former would ever be in contradiction with the latter. The reason he seems to have created this particular possibility for misunderstanding was his desire to stress that the universality of a custom proves its rightfulness. He believed any custom which had been practiced by the churches throughout the world in all ages was, "... a kind of inviolable law. It was not likely that an universal consent of all the churches in all times can have come to pass without the sanction of the Word of God or Apostolical tradition." This will be considered in greater detail in a later chapter.

1. "Examen ... etc.," Prologus, 4th p.
2. "Defensio ... etc.," 3.
3. A Treatise ... etc., 42 /"De diversis ... etc.," Prologus, 1st p.,/. 4. V infra, Chapter IV, "The Nature of Catholicity and Its Relation to the Various Sources of Authority."
The Nature and Order of the Ministry

Saravia said that the ministry of the Gospel could be defined in different ways in the Scripture, but he preferred to think of it in terms of the words of the Apostle Paul who spoke of it as a, "... dispensation of the mysteries of God... which have been made manifest to the whole world by the coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." When he spoke of these "mysteries" Saravia understood "... both the doctrine of the wonderful counsel of God in the redemption of mankind, and whatever things God has connected with that doctrine." He divided these "mysteries" into three parts, viz., the preaching of the gospel, the administration of the sacraments, and the authority for governing the Church. Sometimes he spoke of these as the "essence" of the Apostolate, or as the "essence" of the ministry of the Gospel. By this he meant to show two things: firstly, that the Word of God and the ministry of the Word were bound closely together, and, secondly, that these marks were essential to the nature of the Church and should therefore be perpetual in the Church militant. He concluded from this that wherever the ministry is properly constituted according to the Word of God it will be distinguished by these three marks. This general definition of the ministry was in accord with that of his contemporaries, but we shall see later that not all of them would have agreed with Saravia about the great importance which he attached to the third point.

The first and most important thing to be said about Saravia's treatment of the nature of the ministry is the way he showed it to be completely dependent on the primary or foundational ministry of Jesus Christ. The institution, authorization, and commissioning of all true ministers of the Lord was rooted in...
Christ's great act of redemption and reconciliation. This determined the purpose of the minister's calling, the content of his message, and the nature of his mission in the Church. He interpreted all of the ministerial offices as gifts of the Holy Spirit and "... as it were, talents lent on interest, of which an account must one day be rendered to the Lord". There is, therefore, in Saravia's doctrine of the Ministry a keen sense of urgency and expectation because all of the power has come from the Lord and is under the direct control of the Holy Spirit. This is apparent in the way he spoke of the work of the ministry in edifying the Church and of the whole Church being itself "... built up together into the one mystical body of Christ." This shows not only the urgency, but also the necessity of the ministry, for the work of edifying the Church is essential if the body is to continue to be built up into Him who is the Head. This kind of ministry would not be possible if Christ Himself were not the foundation of the minister's calling. In this sense he said that ministers were Christ's representatives and whatever honor is given to them, is, as it were, given to God, for they are His servants, and His envoys, who have been sent to dispense His mysteries and to carry out this heavenly mission for God on behalf of the Lord Himself.

We have already mentioned the way Saravia saw the unity of the Church and the ordering of the ministry to be related, but it would be worthwhile here to underscore this by showing that he thought this possible only if the ministry remained true both to the Body and to the Head of the Church. In whatever way the ministry is called upon to edify and build up the Church through the preaching of the Word and by the administration of the sacraments it is thereby a wit-

1. A Treatise ... etc., 125-26 /"De diversis ... etc.," 137.
2. Ibid., 240-41 /327/.
3. "De honore ... etc.," 58 /Of the honor ... etc., 1237: "Servui Dei sunt, et Oeconomi mysteriorum Dei, missi a Deo, ut pro Christo legationes fungantur: quos qui contentit, Dominum Iesum, et Deum patrem contentit." Cited Matt.10:40-42
ness to the unity and wholeness which is in, and always will be in, the Body of Christ. Congruent with this, he said that ministers are not ordained to a local church but into the ministry of the universal Church. This, he felt was important not only in witnessing to the unity of the whole Body of Christ, but even more so in witnessing to the unity of the mystical Body of Christ with its Head, the Lord Jesus Christ. Whenever the ministry has failed to serve Him in these functions then it has thereby led the Church into heresy and has made schism inevitable; e.g., the heresy and schism caused by the Roman papacy.  

In regard to preaching it is noticeable that Saravia said less about this function than we should have expected from one who emphasized the supremacy of the Word of God. When he did mention it he seems to have preferred using other terms, such as, "teaching the Gospel", or "feeding the flock", but even then he did not give comprehensive explanations of the meanings of these terms. It is very likely that Saravia was reacting, like many of his colleagues, to the Puritans' heavy emphasis upon the act of preaching. It certainly must have been this reaction which caused him to say, "... /some/ men are inclined to reduce the whole ministry of the Church to the mere preaching of the Gospel". Queen Elizabeth had similar feelings about sermons to the laity by inexperienced and untrained ministers for she found such preaching objectionable.  

Since Saravia made the administration of the sacraments, along with preaching, one of the marks of the true ministry we can gain some understanding of his doctrine of the Ministry from his doctrines of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. He had much more to say about the latter than he did the former because of his

---

1. "Responsio ... Gretseri ... etc." 364-65.  
2. A Treatise ... etc., 47 /"De diversis ... etc.," Prologus, 2nd p/.  
treatise on the Eucharist. His thoughts about Baptism are found either in the
context of that treatise or in his treatise to his unnamed friend on the conti-
nent, "N. fratri et amico." The fact that Saravia did not say more about
Baptism would not necessarily mean that he subordinated it to the other sacrament.
However, he did make one statement which sounded as if he believed Baptism to be
of less significance than the Lord's Supper. In answer to the objection made
by "N" that the Church of England allowed deacons to baptize, but not to preside
at the sacrament of the Supper, Saravia said that this was right and proper be-
cause more was signified in the latter than in the former. Here we might note
that Saravia was in agreement with his contemporaries about the right of deacons
to baptize, but it is doubtful that very many of them would have explained the
reason in such a way as to imply that one sacrament was more important than
another.

Saravia indicated that he, like other Anglicans, held that all infants were
reborn in baptism and were thereby adopted as children of God. Then he quali-
fied this to show that he did not necessarily mean that in some cases the bap-
tized could not be "reborn before rebirth" /"nempe ante regenerationem esse
renatos"/. Examples which he cited of this were the Eunuch mentioned in Acts
By this Saravia was saying that justification actually came through faith and
not through Baptism alone, just as Abraham was justified through faith before he
received circumcision, which thing he received as a sign of the steadfastness of
his faith. In Baptism, as in the Lord's Supper, he contended that both the be-
liever and the unbeliever received a sacrament; for the former it was a means

1. "N. fratri ... etc.," 12: "Cur baptizandi potestas potius diacono
concedatur, quam communio? Respondo: quia sic veteris ecclesiae usus
obtinit, et necessitas illic maior, quam hic visa est."
2. Ibid. 5.
of grace, but for the latter it was a source of condemnation. In another place he said that this should apply for catechumens and adults who spoke for themselves, or for infants because the godparents spoke for the child. His basis for this was that a child born in a Christian nation is in a way a member of the body of believers in God just as he is English because he is born in England. He also likened the covenant made in this sacrament to the obligation imposed upon an infant who has succeeded to the crown. Just as a prince might be considered to answer through his guardians and is held responsible for their pledges, so an infant in Baptism would be obligated by the pledges of his godparents.

Saravia's view of the Lord's Supper was that of the doctrine of the Real Presence. The real heart of his interpretation of this doctrine was its Christology. This strong Christological predilection can be seen in several of his doctrines, but nowhere is it any more strongly stated than in his treatise on the Lord's Supper. He began with the well-known quotation from Irenaeus that the "... Eucharist consisteth of two things, an earthly and a heavenly." This statement, said Saravia, seemed also to be the origin of the most common definition of a sacrament, i.e., "a visible sign of a sacred thing — a visible form of an invisible Grace." This he said was in agreement with the Chalcedonian formula which had defined the relation of the two natures of Christ, so that the "earthly" and the "heavenly" could be neither separated nor confused in the sacrament. He took this a step further in a quotation from Augustine in which he showed how this analogical relation was to be posited: "... the

1. Saravia ... Eucharist, 169; cf. 99.
2. "N. fratrum ... etc.," 5.
3. Ibid.
4. This doctrine will also be discussed in Chapter IV, "Ecclesiastical Unity in the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.
5. Saravia ... Eucharist, 20-33, et passim.
6. Ibid., 21.
visible form of the Elements, and the invisible Flesh and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; that is, of the "Sacramentum", and of the "Res Sacramenti", that is, the Body of Christ.¹ He maintained that the sacramentum and the res sacramenti were analogically a mystery, but he believed that in partaking of the elements there was a real participation in the body and blood of Christ.

In adopting this Christological analogy Saravia showed on the one hand that he did not accept that the Supper was only a memorial feast and on the other hand that there was no sacerdotalism in the administration of the sacrament. He was particularly insistent in showing the difference between this position and that of transubstantiation where the priest virtually attempts a re-immolation of Christ in the Mass and consequently tries to become mediator between God and man.² As over against this he said that there was only a "eucharistic offering", or a "thank offering" given in the Lord's Supper. The reason that there could be no sacrifice offered by the presbyter other than that of thanksgiving was,³ he said, because "in the blood of Christ we have The Eternal Covenant and The Eternal Sacrifice. He is Himself The Temple, Himself The Altar, Himself The Victim, Himself The Priest forever after the Order of Melchisedec."⁴ The duty of the minister is to ask a blessing upon the elements that grace might be given to the faithful and damnation to those who partake impiously, and, in

¹. Ibid., 25, qtd ibid. Sent. Prosp. in Mag. Sent. lib iv, dist. 10.
². Although the priesthood of believers is everywhere assumed in this treatise it is strange that he did not mention this doctrine a single time.
³. Presbyter has simply been transliterated into "presbyter" because it is easier to understand exactly which type of minister is meant in some of the discussions. "Elder" was the choice of the 1592 translator, but this becomes very confusing in certain sections when Beza's two kinds of elders are considered. When Saravia meant a lay-elder he used senior and he used sacerdos to designate the Old Testament priesthood. Cf., Norman Sykes, Old Priest and New Presbyter (1956), 43, who said Hooker and Whitgift both preferred "presbyter" to "priest" in their translations of this word.
⁴. Saravia ... Eucharist, 179.
distributing the sacrament. In a sense then Saravia meant that the minister proclaimed Christ through these visible words.

Saravia wished to show not only the unity of the Church as inherent in the sacraments, but also the unity and equality of the ministry as evidenced in the administration of them. He often asserted that it did not make any difference whether the Gospel was preached, or the sacraments administered, by an Apostle, Evangelist, bishop, or presbyter, for the ministry of one was equally valid and efficacious as that of any other. All were commissioned alike to teach the Gospel, to reprehend evil, to exhort virtue and to console the afflicted, publicly and privately, in word and in doctrine. All were, according to him, equal in worth and in honor and the only imparity which existed between them was in ecclesiastical government. The one thing which was necessary to all of them was that they should be lawfully called and authorized by the Holy Spirit and by the Church before they undertook any ecclesiastical responsibility. We can see from this that he regarded the task of building up the Church into the one Body of Christ as primarily that of the whole ministry; since this task was the primary purpose of all ministers then we can logically conclude that Saravia did not believe that the unity and continuity of the Church was dependent on any particular order of the ministry. We shall consider his understanding of the ordering of the ministry in the next section and in the following chapter when we examine the difference which he saw between bishops and presbyters.

Saravia thought of the diaconate as one kind of the three-fold ordering of the ministry, but he said that the deacon was a minister of the Church and not of the Gospel. By this he meant that the deacon could teach the Gospel and

1. "Defensio ... etc.," 178.
2. Ibid., 95.
3. For the kinds of callings which he believed God could give ministers, v. infra, Chapter II, "The Apostolic Foundation of the Church."
4. v., A Treatise ... etc., Chapter VII, for his views on the office of the deacon.
baptize, but that he could only assist in the administration of the Supper. This he said was the established custom of the ancient Church and the continuing practice of the Church of England. One other responsibility which he felt the deacon had was one which he believed all other ministers to have as well. He deplored the custom of some churches when they turned over to the deacons all of the care of the poor, for this was not their sole responsibility. Saravia also said that this was a form of service which should not be given to the magistrates as some in the Reformation had suggested. The ministry to the needy was a sacred duty of every minister, for it was a part of his service to God. The true spirit of the kind of service which should be rendered by a minister is shown when he said: "to have compassion on the needy, to defend the fatherless children and widows, was formerly the glory of the Church, and the highest praise of her pastors."¹

Saravia’s Doctrine of the Importance of Ministers

The ministers which the Apostle Paul mentioned in Ephesians 4:11 were believed by Saravia to have been those created by the Lord to serve in His Church.² In that verse we read: "... and he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers". (K.J.V.). It is not possible to determine whether Saravia believed all of these to have been created as permanent officers in the Church, yet it is to be expected that he thought of the Apostolate in some way as permanent in the Church for he spoke of the bishops as successors to the Apostles.³ He also thought of the pastorate as a permanently instituted ministry which included superiores presbyteri et inferiores presbyteri.

¹. Ibid., 100.
². Ibid., 47-49, 57-58 /"De diversis ... etc.,” Prologus, 2nd p., 27.
³. ib., 1-19, Chapter II, "The Apostolic Foundation of the Church."
These "superior presbyters" were also known as bishops, and as we shall see later he actually thought of these bishops as successors to certain Apostolic functions, but not to the Apostolic office itself.\footnote{A Treatise ... etc., 57-58: "There is no question but that the Apostles held the first rank, Evangelists the second, Prophets the third, Pastors and Presbyters the fourth, Teachers the last. But Pastors and Presbyters were distinguished by the Apostles into two Orders ..."} Saravia likewise dealt with the ministry of the Evangelists rather extensively, but, significantly, it was always in the context of their relation to the Apostles so that a kind of imparity might be seen between them. He said that the Evangelists were not temporary officers in the Church, but strangely enough he made no attempt to show how their role was continued after the Seventy died. He seems to have implied that the Prophet was likewise intended to be a permanent kind of minister, but, here too, he did not refer to them in post-Apostolic times.\footnote{V., "De diversis ... etc.," and "Defensio ... etc.," Chap. V.} The teachers were definitely believed and shown to have a continuing type of ministry in the Church, but Beza and Saravia did not differ much about these doctores, so Saravia gave them only summary attention.\footnote{Ibid., Chap. XXVI.}

Saravia's main reason for selecting this verse as the basis of his doctrine of the Ministry was to seek to show an imparity which existed among these five kinds of ministers and then to give extensive attention to the ones which he considered to be of the greatest importance for his doctrine, i.e., the Apostles and the two kinds of pastors, or presbyters. It has already been noted that Saravia believed any imparity which existed in the ministry could be found only in the authority for governing the Church - we shall now be considering what manner of imparity he believed to exist between these ministers and in the next chapter this will be related to the kind of government he taught in the Church.
Saravia said that the Church during the Reformation had departed from the authority of the Word of God and the earliest antiquity in three ways. "The first way was in the abolition of bishops, the second was in the invention of temporary presbyters and deacons, and the third way was in the office and function of both of these." 1 Most of these changes he blamed on Geneva for he felt that if Geneva had not approved of the abolition of bishops and had not created this new kind of presbyter and deacon, then others, like the Puritans, would themselves have never sought Scriptural proof for them. In another treatise he assigned some of the blame to the magistrates for he said that their authority had become so great that even a simple statement from one of them had become more persuasive and influential than all the reasonings and proofs of all of the writers of all the centuries. 2 These changes, he said, were not only against the witness of the Scriptures and the testimony of the fathers, but even against common sense itself. The importance which Saravia attached to human reason is very interestingly shown in a de facto argument which he says he once made to his brethren in a meeting of a synod in the Netherlands. 3 A canon was proposed at that time which said that no minister should give commands to another minister. Saravia said that he indicated to those present that he did not disagree with this but that he would not approve of it until the rule proposed to achieve equality in all respects between ministers. By this he said that nature itself had always taught that the younger brethren should respect their seniors and that experience has shown men of advanced scholarship to be more respected and of greater authority than those who were not so learned. In these differences of age, learning, experience, etc., he told his brethren that an imparity already existed, so how was this canon to deal with that which was

1. "Defensio ..., etc.," 3, trans. by J. Russell.
2. "Examen ..., etc.," Prologus, 1st p.
3. "Defensio ..., etc.," 53.
established by reason and by nature? When he related this experience to Beza he reminded him that both Beza and Calvin had had considerable influence over their colleagues, so how could he argue for a parity of ministers? Saravia even said that Calvin had possessed more authority over his fellow ministers than the Archbishop of England exercised over his fellow bishops. The real point of this whole line of reasoning was that Saravia did not believe that it mattered in what manner a colleague might snatch away equality of authority, whether by age, reputation, learning, or influence, for if these counted more than reason itself, then of necessity freedom of action is thereby limited. It is apparent from this line of reasoning which Saravia took that he favored a system of ecclesiastical government which took little account of individual differences and gifts, but which operated more by the principle of order and authority itself. Naturally, he was assuming in this that in the kind of imparity of church government for which he was arguing, those who were most distinguished by virtue of their age, learning, and experience would be those chosen for the positions of authority.

The substance of Saravia's doctrine of an Imparity of Ministers corresponded with contemporary Anglican doctrine, although there was some difference in the way various divines expressed it. The main point of divergence between Saravia and most of his colleagues in 1590 was the character of their arguments for episcopacy. He was much closer to them in regard to the nature of episcopacy itself than he was in the arguments which he adduced for it. For example, neither Hooker nor Whitgift believed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity to be prescribed exclusively in Scripture, but Saravia believed that episcopacy was the form of government taught in the Scriptures although he himself refused to say

1. Ibid., 52: "Johannes Calvinius dum vixit, plus authoritatis in suos collegas habuit, quam hodie Angliae Primas in episcopos exercet."
2. Ibid.; Cf., 195: "In ordinis aequalitate, personarum inaequalitas non potest non perturbare aequalitatem."
that it was the exclusive form of the government of the Church. Two centuries later Keble was to lament that none of those who had had the responsibility for the debate with the Puritans had actually sought for Scriptural proof for episcopal government but had merely tried to show that it was "... ancient and allowable." Yet, all of these men did hold a doctrine of an Imparity of Ministers, for even Archbishop Jewel, who was one of the most Protestant of the sixteenth century Anglicans, held that there was an imparity in regard to ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The view which best seems to have expressed the sentiments of the age was that of Archbishop Whitgift who said that there was an equality of ministers "quoad ministerium ... for they have all like power to preach the word, to minister the sacraments ..., but quoad ordinem et politicam ... there always hath been and must be degrees and superiority among them". This inequality he felt was necessitated by human pride and sins, but, as we have seen, Saravia felt it was in the very nature of the way things were created.

We can rightfully conclude that Saravia really differed little, if any, with his contemporaries, if we accept that he himself believed his own conception of the bishop to be essentially the same as theirs. There is no doubt that he used Scriptural arguments for this office whereas his predecessors did not, and, as we shall see later in this chapter, he presented the argument for the divine institution of bishops which they had refrained from using. 

Prima facie this would seem to have altered the very nature of his conception of the episcopate, and it probably would have if he had drawn the conclusions which logically follow from these arguments. However, Saravia did not draw such con-

2. Ibid., 17-18.
clusions but evidently thought that he was only constructing a stronger case for episcopacy than his predecessors had given, and he did not think that he was arguing for a new kind of bishop inherently different from that of Jewel, Hooker, or Whitgift. There would seem to be proof of this judgment in the four men to whom he dedicated "Defensio Tractatus ... etc.,"¹. Not one of these men made an argument for episcopacy on spiritual grounds or said that it was divinely instituted. Of the four, Whitgift probably made the strongest case for episcopacy and he himself said that since no one type of ecclesiastical government was taught in the Scriptures then every Church in every nation had the right to choose its own order of government.² Also we can see that Bishop Cooper's, Admonition, might be evaluated as one of the mildest answers to the Puritan charges during this whole period.³ However, we do not have to rest this conclusion merely on the assumption that Saravia believed his conception was in harmony with the views of these and other contemporary Anglicans, for it will be shown again in several ways later on.

It would be easier to determine how much difference Saravia saw between bishops and presbyters if he had been more precise in his description of the nature of the three-fold ordering of the ministry. However, his decision to use gradus and ordo interchangeably may be an indication that he preferred not to be precise about these two offices. An example of this may be seen in the title of his first treatise, "De diversis gradibus Ministrorum Evangelii", but in discussing these "different degrees of ministers" he entitled chapter X of that treatise "De duplici Pastorum ordine".⁴ It is true that most Anglicans

¹. Archbishop Whitgift, Bishops John Aylmer, Thomas Cooper, and Richard Fletcher.
². Whitgift, Works ... etc., III, 214.
⁴. A.W. Street usually translated both of these words as "order", but the anonymous translator in 1592 preferred "degree".
during this time saw little need to differentiate between the idea of separate orders in the ministry and various degrees of ministers. Almost a century later Joseph Bingham said that "order" should mean one and the same thing as "degree, office, power and jurisdiction ..."; therefore, this was the multiple meaning which he gave ordem, gradus, and officium.\(^1\) This kind of definition would suit Saravia's use of these words very well, and, indeed, it would suit the usage of these words by many Elizabethans, for many felt that an imparity of ministers meant a difference "... in degree or dignity and rank \(^2\) all did not hold that bishops and presbyters were different orders." The point in this discussion of gradus and ordem is more than one of semantics, for the difference between these words has doctrinal overtones. Since Saravia felt the imparity of ministers existed only in the third point of his three "essences" of the ministry, then the nature of that imparity is important for an understanding of his doctrine of the Ministry.

As far as is known, all Elizabethans said that ecclesiastical polity was a part of the external make-up of the Church and not on a level with the preaching of the Word or the administration of the sacraments. This would apply to Saravia as well as to any of the others of that period, but he took a slightly different ground on which to argue his case because he made the "authority" for governing the Church one of the essential notes of the ministry.\(^4\) If he had said that this authority resided in the hands of individuals, or belonged to the episcopal order, then his whole conception of the ministry would have differed from theirs. He would have been saying then what some in later centuries were to say,

\(^1\) Joseph Bingham, Antiquities of the Christian Church (1843) I, 51-53.
\(^3\) Ibid., 109-111.
\(^4\) "Defensio ... etc.," 170; "habet enim Apostolica Ecclesia Apostolicam
authoritatem et potestatem"; "Examen ... etc.," 27; cf., Arts. XX - XX, in "The Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, "in Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth (1757)."
that the form of ecclesiastical government /i.e., episcopal/ also was a part of the internal structure of the Church. This is precisely what he did not do, though, for he said this authority was given to the Church and the Church chose those who were to govern or to oversee it. Therefore, what Saravia really did was to make the authority for governing the Church a part of the internal structure of the Church and the form of that government a part of the external structure. Since bishops were the ones who ordinarily exercised this authority, it appears at some points as if he has identified them with the authority, but this would be a serious misunderstanding of what he actually meant by "the authority for governing the Church". Here again we see that Saravia took slightly different grounds from which to argue his doctrine of the Ministry, but this did not prevent him from holding essentially the same doctrine as his contemporaries held.

At this point we should recapitulate the major ideas which have been covered thus far and try to see from them in what sense Saravia believed this imparity to be hierarchical. We have established that he believed that there was only one ministry, so any kind of hierarchy which he desired must have existed within the confines of that united ministry. We have seen also that he taught an equality in those who preached the Word and administered the sacraments and an imparity in the form of ecclesiastical government. Therefore, we might say that whatever hierarchy he conceived of was in a functional sense, for this was precisely what he was saying when he described the nature of this imparity; but, this was not a hierarchy which had a mediatorial function. Actually the kind of hierarchy which he desired to see in the Church was, he said, congruent with that of Calvin and Farel.¹ He observed that Calvin had said he was prepared

to subject himself to an ecclesiastical hierarchy so long as it did not categorically refuse to be subjected to Christ the Lord. In concluding this reference to Calvin's views Saravia said that if Beza had not withdrawn from this judgment of Calvin there would be no need of this argument between them. This is a very significant statement because it revealed that Saravia was aware to some extent that Beza had deviated from Calvin's doctrine.2

There is a difference between the way Saravia and Calvin looked at a hierarchy in the ministry. Calvin had said that he was willing to accept such an ordering of authority as long as the complete and total Lordship of Christ was maintained. Saravia likewise agreed that the sovereignty of Christ was the sine qua non of any ordering of the ministry of the Church, but he did not look on a hierarchy as only permissible, as Calvin had done, for Saravia stressed that it was an absolute necessity for the ministry to be so structured. This is perhaps most clearly seen in a quotation from Gulielmus Altisiodorensis who said that if there were only three ministers in the whole world, it would be necessary that one should consecrate another as bishop and another as archbishop.3 This clearly reveals his basic idea that Christ is the only monarch, for He alone properly and truly governs His Church, but in the ministry subservient to Christ, who is Head of the Church, there must nevertheless be some command, which of necessity involved some kind of authority.4 Since this was an imperium which was subordinate to Christ and to conciliar authority we can conclude that Saravia did not advocate a doctrine of Episcopacy which was either prelatical or monarchical. In answer to Beza's statement that episcop-

1. Ibid., qted. Calvin's "De necessitate reformandae Ecclesiae" no page given. This passage was also quoted on p. 160 of "Defensio ... etc.," and p. 352 of "Responsio ... Gretseri ... etc."  
2. Donaldson, Scottish Reformation, 187-91, for a discussion of the way Beza altered his views on episcopacy.  
3. "Defensio ... etc.," 32, qted. G. Alti., Summa, Bk. IV.  
4. Ibid. 195.
pacy created tyranny he said that it was not even oligarchical. ¹

Saravia believed a hierarchical structuring of the ministry could be shown from both of the Testaments. In the Old Dispensation God had so ordered the nation and the temple that some were put in charge of others. At that time he said it was divinely instituted for priest to be over priest and Levite over Levite. All of this had been necessary to conduct the various ceremonies properly and to maintain the best possible system of worship for the large crowds of people coming to the temple.² This was not to say that Saravia believed the priesthood to be brought over into the New Covenant, for he stated clearly that he felt it had been abrogated. Everything in the Levitical priesthood that foreshadowed the office of Christ had been utterly abolished by His blood.³ No part of that redemptive office may be usurped by any human being, so for this reason the ceremonies and rites had been abolished, but the essence of the ministry remained under the new as under the Old Covenant.⁴ When Saravia spoke of the "genera earum" he meant the functions of teaching the people, disciplining the Church, guiding public worship, and administering the sacraments of the New Covenant.⁵ He also said that the Lord himself wholly discharged all parts of the priesthood but He so improved some of them that they might be left in common to others in the New Israel without any disagreement to Himself. Those parts which He did leave to the ministers under the New Covenant in no way involved his work as Mediator for no sinner was able to be made a sufficient mediator between God and

¹. Ibid. "Patriarcharum, Archiepiscoporum, et Episcoporum regimin non esse potest, nec dici oligarchicum."

². "Examen ... etc.," 7-8; cf., "Defensio ... etc.," 97.

³. Of the Honor ... etc., 135 /"De honore ... etc.," 527.

⁴. "Examen ... etc.," 8: "Si quis dicat ordines gradusque /sic/ istos, simul cum sacerdotio temploque acceptissimae finem. Respondeo, me illas easdem formas in illis rebus non urge: sed genera earum in illis sacerdotii partibus, quae Christiano populo remansere."

⁵. Ibid.
One of the most vital of the "genera" which Saravia saw transferred from the Old to the New Covenant was a pattern of authority. This, he said, could be seen in the manner in which the Lord chose the twelve Apostles and the seventy Evangelists to represent the twelve Patriarchs and the seventy Elders who assisted Moses. This was an idea which was shared by all the Elizabethan and Caroline divines; examples can be shown in the writings of Bilson, Andrewes, and Overall, who said in effect that "the principles of hierarchical government were laid down in the Old Testament". Yet none of them thought of a hierarchy in the ministry as being of the esse of the Church, for all believed that the entire nature of the ordering of the Church would pass away when the earth was removed. Saravia spoke of these things as being necessary "... sub Domino nostro Iesu Christo, ab Evangelii promulgatione, usque ad finem seculi, quando Dominus venturus est iudicatum vivos et mortuos".

Saravia's Dislike of Temporary Elders

The dispute between Saravia and Beza involved several subjects concerning which they differed considerably, but none about which Saravia felt any more strongly than their controversy related to annui presbyteri. There was good

1. Ibid.
2. A Treatise ... etc., 59, 236-38 /"De diversis ... etc.," 2, 317. This was an important part of his argument that bishops were created de jure divino.
4. "De imperandi authoritate ... etc.," Prologus.
5. V., "De diversis ... etc.," and "Defensio ... etc.," Chapters XI-XIII, et passim.
reason for both this depth of feeling and the proximity of the debate for the subject of "temporary elders" was one of the main focal points of the difference between a doctrine of the Parity of Ministers and a doctrine of the Imparity of Ministers. Saravia's objections were three-fold: (1) he said there was no Scriptural or patristic authority for this "new kind of presbyter"; (2) he contended that the annual presbyters would be confused with the ministers of the Word because of their ordinations and because Beza was saying that these ruling elders were teaching the Word of God through their oversight of the Church; (3) he objected to them being given the authority of the censura morum of the Church. The first of these objections was primarily a difference of opinion as to the interpretation of certain passages of Scripture, and secondarily a differing about the meaning of some statements by the fathers. The second objection was the result of Beza's having adopted an argument about ruling elders also being teachers of the Word, which he seems to have been forced to do because Saravia compelled him to admit that doctrine and the censura morum could not be separated. The last objection was closely related to the one before it and is self-explanatory.

The heart of the disagreement between these two men on this subject is really found in their differences of interpretation of two statements by Ambrose. The first of these was his well-known and oft-quoted comment that the ordination of a bishop and a presbyter were one and the same thing. Beza

1. "Defensio ... etc.," 110.
2. Ibid., 131; cf., A Treatise ... etc., 126-27 /"De diversis ... etc., 13/. 3. Ibid., 94.
4. This may be illustrated with the way each man interpreted several New Testament passages in the context of his own doctrinal milieu; e.g., Heb. 13:24; I Cor. 13:8; I Tim. 5:17; Rom. 12:8, v. "Defensio ... etc.," 8, 95, 115, 131, 133; "Examens ... etc.," 19-30, et passim.
5. "Defensio ... etc.," 226; "Una eademque est" (inquit Ambrosius) "Episcopi et Presbyteri ordinatio."
said this meant that teaching elders and ruling elders should receive the same ordination. Saravia disputed this view and countered with the assertion that Ambrose was actually speaking of bishops and presbyters as the two degrees of ministers of the Word, or, to put it another way, he meant that "each of the two is a presbyter". The second of Ambrose's statements concerned a comment which he had made about I Tim. 5:1, to the effect that it was greatly to be regretted that elders were no longer used in the councils of the Church. Beza believed this to be direct evidence of the use of ruling elders in the Church, but Saravia countered that this was a reference to those seniores in respect to their age, character, and wisdom, but that they were not presbyteri of the Word of God.

Saravia said that there were two kinds of seniores to be found in the Old Testament. The first type were those seventy elders chosen by Moses and therefore "of divine institution" who had served as magistrates and judges of Israel. These magistrates had a right to participate in ecclesiastical councils, but their primary function was to serve in civil courts. The other kind of seniores were those who were chosen by the people to assist in the synagogues and in ecclesiastical councils because of their venerability and wisdom. Saravia believed Ambrose to be referring to the latter type and he said that he himself had no objections to this kind of senior serving in an advisory capacity in coun-

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid., 124: "... unde et synagoga, et postea Ecclesia seniores habuit, quorum sine consilio nihil agebatur in Ecclesia: quod qua negligentia obsoleverit, nescio ...." This was actually a pseudo-Ambrose statement, but it was believed to be genuine by Saravia and Beza and actually comes from the fourth century, or very near to it.
3. Ibid., 125, 226.
4. Ibid., 125-26.
5. Ibid., 213: "Sed D. Beza in toto veteri aut novo testamento musquam inventit, Presbyterium, aut seniores populi, accipi pro semita Ecclesiastico, sed civili", In the next chapter we shall see that Saravia also understood "Presbyterium" to mean the office of a bishop.
He said that he had even used this kind of elder in helping to govern the church of which he was pastor in the Netherlands. He emphasized that these men were not to be confused with ministers of the Word, for they were lay-elders who only had some share in the governing of these churches. It is noteworthy that it was this experience in the Netherlands which caused him to be so much against this custom. This is seen in the way he placed the responsibility on this "... novum genus Presbyterorum temporarium ..." for much of the sacrilege of church property there. This charge was made to his former colleagues because he said these elders who were elected for only a year or two to rule or govern the churches had done great harm by giving only casual attention to their duties, due to the fact that they were so preoccupied with their secular affairs. In another place he said he had lived 46 years in reformed Churches in England and in Belgium and during that time he had had good and bad colleagues, and elders as helpers whom it would have been better not to have had at all for they were more like enemies in that they were hindrances to sound doctrine and to judgment of character. The elders with whom he had been associated in England were those of the Austin-Friars Church in London, who, he said, were different in no respect from those in Geneva. Later he observed that he was quite satisfied with the foreigners' churches in England because "... ex prima earum institutions, habuerint Episcopum D. Alasco; et nunc habent dioecesann loci ubi habitant".

---

1. A Treatise ... etc., 131. "De diversis ... etc.," 13 (sic) should be 14.
2. Ibid., 133-34. 1 /2.
3. "Venerabilibus et piis viris ... Germaniis, "in Tractatus, 2nd p; cf. "Eramen ... etc." 11.
4. "Defensio ..." 113. "Ego 46 annos in Ecclesiis reformatis vixi, tam in Anglia, quam in Belgio; collegas habui bonos et malos; et seniores quisquilibet praetore praestaret, quam pro adiutoribus, si non apertum hostes, resorun tam sale doctrinae tam morum censurae habere:"
5. V. supra, Introductory Chapter, "The Austin-Friars Church".
6. "Defensio ... etc.," 114.
The impression might be given from Saravia's continual reference to the annual or biennial period of service of these elders that it was really this short length of service to which he was objecting. This kind of understanding would seriously distort his main dissension to these elders for it was not the length of service so much as the kind of service to which he objected. He rejected any idea of laymen having some part in the censura morum other than in some kind of advisory capacity. He contended that all presbyters should be ministers of the Word for they were charged with the responsibility of disciplining the Church just as they were charged with the responsibility of preaching and administering the sacraments. He cited as Scriptural proof of this, the statements by Paul found in I Tim. 3: 2; 5: 17; Titus 1: 9; Acts 20: 28. He contended that all of these verses referred to the mandate given to ministers of the Word to feed their flocks through teaching and preaching and not to the duties of lay-elders as such. In other words, Saravia was saying that doctrine must be reflected in government or discipline of the Church in the same way as it was revealed in preaching the Word and the observance of the sacraments. He did not see how this could be possible unless the same one who loosed the Word through preaching, etc., should be the one who bound the Word in the censura morum. To put this still another way, he was contending that the authority for absolution and excommunication was not to be divided. 

Saravia's frequent usage of the title "annui presbyteri" does show us another very important thing and that is that he did not have the Church of Scotland specifically in mind when he wrote his treatises. Donaldson has shown that

1. Ibid., 94-95.
2. Ibid., 112.
3. It was much more likely that he was thinking of the French Church than the Church of Scotland, for the former followed Beza much more closely than the latter.
the Church of Scotland had begun changing from the annual election of presbyters to a permanent election and ordination probably as early as 1568, when Erastus and Withers had their famous argument about the relation of the Church to the State.\(^1\) Therefore, both the length of service and the nature of the eldership had changed long before Saravia and Beza argued these matters.\(^2\) This does not mean, though, that the situation in Scotland and this part of the Beza-Saravia disputation had no points of mutual relevance. On the contrary, there actually are two ways in which we can see at least an indirect connection between the events which had transpired in Scotland and the subject-matter of Saravia’s argument. The first way is seen in Donaldson’s description of the alteration of the elder’s term of service from an annual to a permanent basis. This meant that "... he ceased to be a layman as generally understood, that he received indelible \(\text{italics, sic}\) character \(\text{italics, sic}\), and that his office could be mistaken for an order in the ministry -- "\(^2\). When this process was carried to its logical conclusion it meant that the ordinations of the ruling elders and those of the teaching elders were almost the same.\(^3\) This was exactly what Saravia feared would happen and about which he had so much to say in rebuttal of Beza’s arguments. The second relevant feature was one which accompanied the first, for Donaldson also has shown that the eldership, when it became permanent, was elevated in authority at the expense of the superintendents of the Church of Scotland, \textit{ergo}, the presbytery gradually assumed the episcopate which these superintendents had originally been given.\(^4\) This also was thoroughly discussed by

---

2. \textit{Ibid.}, Donaldson went too far in attributing the character of a minister to ruling elders in the Church of Scotland, for they have never been understood to be ministers of the Word and sacraments. V., H.J. Wotherspoon and J.M. Kirkpatrick, \textit{A Manual of Church Doctrine}. Rev. ed. (1960), 101.
3. In addition to the provisos of the preceding footnote, they have never had hands laid upon them in ordination services.
Beza and Saravia for both realised that the basic matter in question was whether
the authority for governing the Church resided in the presbyters themselves or
in a bishop.

In Chapter III we shall see that Saravia evidenced only a very weak form
of Erastianism before the reign of James I, but during the early years of the
Stuart era he moved very rapidly towards a view in which he thought of the State
as being pre-eminent to the Church. Prior to this, and during the time he was
writing on the doctrine of the Ministry, he contended that when the ruler was a
Christian, then the nation and the Church were a commonwealth, or a unified
Christian society: thus the Church would be "established" and, apart from the
censura morum, the magistrates could administer any correction which would be
necessary. In such circumstances he did not see any need of elders save these
magistrates and those "Seniores aetate, rerum experiencia, et gravitate spectatos,
ab Ecclesiarum Presbyteris in consilium quondam adhibitos ..." such as Ambrose
had mentioned. This part of the discussion he made quite clear, but for some
reason he seems to have avoided the question about whether this kind of elder¬
ship was justified when the Church and the State were in opposition to one an¬
other. Most Elizabethans had agreed that elders were instituted in the early
Church because of such persecution and they themselves had appointed elders when
they were refugees from the Marian persecutions. When Whitgift replied to
Cartwright he spoke of those times when elders had been appointed under such
circumstances, but he said that when there was "a godly prince" there was no
need of seniores, for their functions were performed by the magistrates.

---
1. A Treatise .... etc., 125 "De diversis .... etc.," 137.
2. "Defensio .... etc.," 114.
3. Donaldson, ibid., 80.
4. Ibid., 185-86, cited Whitgift, Works, I, 389-90; III, 166, 175-76,
209, 217-19.
This was basically the view which Saravia held, but he would have insisted that they be only the kind of seniores mentioned in the Old Testament and not any kind of minister of the Word. He would have granted under those circumstances that they might assist in all ways of governing the churches except in those related to spiritual discipline.

The Meaning of "Divine Institution" and "Dominical Appointment" for Saravia

The first Anglican after the Reformation to claim that bishops had been created by divine institution and not by human authority was Archbishop Cramer. Davies said that this was the most explicit claim for the divine origin of episcopacy after the Reformation, but it also was a claim which seems to have been disregarded largely by most Elizabethan theologians. As far as it can be determined, none of them either referred to Cramer's claim, or even made a similar defense for episcopacy de jure divino for almost forty years after he wrote this treatise. The fact that the later Elizabethans returned to this idea first put forward by Cramer can be explained in two ways. The first and foremost reason was to counteract the Puritan assertion which had been made almost since the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign that their doctrines of the Church and of the Ministry were "divinely authorized." At first the Anglican counter-claims for episcopacy rested only on the will of the monarch, or royal supremacy, and we have already seen why this gave way when they realized the

1. Thomas Cranmer, Works of Archbishop Cranmer, ed. for P.S. by John Edmund Cox (1846), 484. This is found in a treatise entitled, "De Ordine et Ministerio Sacerdotum et Episcoporum". Cf., Davies, Episcopacy ... in the Church of England ... etc., 17.
2. Ainslie, Doctrines ... in the Reformed Churches ... etc., 23.
3. Sykes, Old Priest ... etc., 60.
the need also to claim Scriptural and divine authority for episcopacy. The second reason they changed their defense was the growing concern among churchmen about the increasing encroachment of civil authority on ecclesiastical rights and property. To prevent this process from going further it seemed necessary to make the argument for episcopacy *de jure divino* as it was beginning to be made for the monarch. These were the two factors which led Elizabethans back to the point which Cramer had made decades earlier.

Some have thought Bancroft was the first Elizabethan to broach the *jus divinum* theory of episcopacy when he delivered his sermon at St. Paul's Cross in 1588-89, but a reading of that sermon has shown that he did no more than hint at it in a quotation from Cyprian. The first man to make this claim was Matthew Sutcliffe, Dean of Exeter, in his *Treatise of Ecclesiastical Discipline*. This was published just three months before Saravia's "De diversis ... etc.," came out, but it was not really comparable to Saravia's work, either in spirit or in comprehension. These three men, plus Thomas Bilson, are usually thought of as the most definite exponents of "... the divine origin of episcopacy in this period."

Saravia dealt with this subject in two ways as we can see in two chapters of "De diversis ... etc." and "Defensio ... etc." We shall consider these

---

4. Of., Woodhouse, *Doctrine of the Church ... etc.,* 85, who said this of Bilson, Saravia, Bancroft, and Hooker, but not of Sutcliffe; Kirk (ed.), *Apostolic Ministry* 430.
two ways separately so that we can determine as nearly as possible what he meant by these terms. Chapter XV is mainly an argument for a divine authorization and continuation of the hierarchical paradigm we have noted earlier. The roots of this he traced back through the Old Testament to claim that it was first divinely instituted there. He concluded that no one would ever be able to find a better form of government, either ecclesiastical or civil, than that which God himself founded among the priests and the Levites: "... est enim divina, igitur retinenda." The context of this statement is found in a discussion of the diverse degrees of authority which God had set up under the Old Covenant. This corresponds to the idea already established in which we saw that Saravia did not believe in a continuation of the priesthood of the Old Dispensation, but he did believe that the principle of imparity in it was transferred to the New Dispensation. This was the foundation on which he built his doctrine of Episcopacy de jure divino so we can already see that his emphasis was not so much on episcopacy per se as on an imparity in the ministry. In other words we might say that the very heart of his thought about this subject was that it was false to say that authority had been brought into the Church by men and not by the Word and the law of God.

Saravia believed this was brought into the New Dispensation by the Lord Himself when He created the Apostles and the Evangelists. It would be well to note here that even though Saravia believed bishops to be the successors of the Apostles, he did not believe the presbyters to be the successors of the Evangelists, so he did not mean that Jesus instituted the two orders of the

2. "Examen ... etc.," 8; A Treatise ... etc., 145 [16].
3. V. supra, "Saravia's Doctrine of the Imparity of Ministers"; cf., A Treatise ... etc., 236-37 ["De diversis ... etc.," 31].
4. "Defensio ... etc.," 97.
5. A Treatise ... etc., 59 ["De diversis ... etc.," 27].
ministry when He called the Twelve and the Seventy. However, he did argue with Beza that episcopacy was Dominically instituted,¹ but Beza showed him that the logical conclusion of such a statement would of necessity be that the presbyters succeeded the Seventy and bishops the Twelve. Beza seems to have been right about this, so, de facto Saravia meant episcopacy to be of Dominical appointment only in the sense that he believed the Lord continued a pattern of imparity similar to that found in the Old Testament and in the Apostles and Evangelists.²

We can see all of this in a somewhat clearer perspective when we read that he told Beza that if a ministry were not of God then it must be of human invention,³ for if it did not descend from God it must be of the earth, of the animal and of Satan.⁴ In this way Saravia was careful to show that he realized there was a difference between the divine intention and the human institution for he was well aware of the abuses of episcopacy in the Roman Church.⁵ He admitted that it could become a human institution when the office was so perverted that it had become contrary to the will of God.⁶ With this as a background we can see that Saravia felt that it would have been the equivalent of saying episcopacy was of Satan, or at least a perversion of that which it was intended to be, if he had said that it was of human institution. Therefore, he claimed for all of the orders of the ministry that they were of divine institution and by Dominical appointment,⁷ and each was agreeable to the will of God in the same way the others were.⁸

¹. "Examen ... etc.," ²: "Hanc Episcopen /sig/ fuisset a Domino institutam, et mandata Apostolis, fixum et immotum est."
². A Treatise ... etc., 59-60 /"De diversis ... etc.," ²/.
³. Ibid., 214 /²7/.
⁴. "Examen ... etc.," ¹/.
⁵. Woodhouse, ibid., 84-85, cited A Treatise ... etc., ⁴⁴ ff., 197ff., ²²³, ²²⁹, ²³⁸.
⁶. A Treatise ... etc., ⁴⁴-⁴⁵ /De diversis ... etc.," Prologus, 2nd p./.
⁷. Ibid., ²¹⁻³, ²⁰⁸, ²¹⁰-²¹⁴ /Candida Lectori 1st p., ²⁶-²⁷/.
⁸. Ibid., ⁵⁹, ²¹⁶ /², ²⁷/.
The second way Saravia dealt with the subject of divine institution is seen in Chapter XXI where he sought to show all of the ministeries to be derivative from the Apostles. He concluded that the Apostles had ordained nothing which they had not received from the Lord, so everything they did could actually be considered as having been Dominically appointed. Therefore, Saravia believed that all of the churches on earth had received the three-fold ministry from the Apostles and had retained the orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons because they were divinely instituted. Saravia even felt that Jerome’s statement that episcopacy had arisen by human custom could be used to prove this point, for Jerome had also said that it could be called an Apostolic tradition. If Jerome believed this was so then it seemed logical to Saravia that he should have said the three-fold ministry was by “Dominical institution” rather than by human custom. It should be clear that the basic argument which Saravia used was, “quidquid igitur in hac re ab Apostolis fuit factitatum a Domino debet intelligi institutum.” He also said that even the admission that the first bishop had been appointed because of schism did not mean that it was any less a divinely and Dominically instituted order, for the Lord had known what the Church would have need of long before such crises had arisen. Several decades after these treatises were written by Saravia, the Bishop of Lincoln, Robert Sanderson, was asked by King Charles I to write a treatise about the relation of episcopal and royal power. In this work Sanderson did not

1. Ibid., 197 /24/; cf., “Examen ... etc.,” 35: “Ego nihil potuisse ab Apostolis constitutum firmiter credo, quod esset a divina institutio alienum”.  
2. “Examen ...,” 34.  
3. Ibid.; cf., “Hie mihi Hieronymus praevaricari videtur. Si quidem Episcopos et Presbyteros et Diaconos in Ecclesia sibi vendicare quod Aaron et filii eius atque Levitae fuerunt in veteri Testamento, ad traditiones referendum est Apostolicas, quomodo consuetudini id tribuatur, potius quam Domincalae institutioni?”  
4. Ibid.; cf., “De diversis ... etc.,” 25.
refer to Saravia, but he drew a conclusion which is relevant to this section of this thesis. He said that the Anglican arguments for a divine right for bishops meant that it was of Apostolical institution and not a positive divine precept. This seems to be precisely what Saravia meant, except that he actually saw no difference between the one and the other. We might also say that the whole tenor of his argument is such that it seems very likely he might have never gone beyond the claim of Apostolical institution if there had not been the polemical pressure of the times which he felt forced him to do so.

This examination has shown the need to be very careful about claiming Saravia as an advocate of a literal Dominical institution and as an unqualified adherent of episcopatus de jure divino. Those who do cite him as an authority ad rem should also show, in light of the way he developed this argument, that everything instituted in the civil or ecclesiastical affairs of the Old Covenant and everything which the Apostles did ex officio could likewise be shown to be of divine institution. Therefore, statements like that of A.J. Mason would seem to be more misleading than correct, when it is asserted, "nothing could be more clearly pronounced than Saravia's conviction that episcopacy was of divine origin ..." However, it may be that Saravia himself was the one most responsible for any incorrect impressions as to where he stood on this particular subject for several authorities have shown that they themselves were not precisely certain what Saravia did mean by this claim. For example, E.T. Davies said that Saravia "... may not claim in so many words that episcopacy is jure divino, but it is clear that episcopal authority can be so described according to his teaching". This is a mystifying statement for it is obvious in many places that Saravia did precisely the opposite of this - he did claim "in so many words"

3. Davies, *ibid.*, 32-33, 44.
that bishops are by divine institution, but it is the conclusion of this thesis that he meant no more by this than other Elizabethans who said only that it was de Apostolica traditions. It must have been this kind of indefiniteness which led H.P. Woodhouse to say of Saravia that he "... almost claimed divine institution, though he also held that government by bishops was human."  

Saravia's doctrine of Episcopacy by divine right has been seen in the preceding discussion to be only an adaptation of the more commonly accepted Anglican argument that it was by Apostolical institution. However, even at that, we can see that in this particular respect Saravia's position was very distant from that of earlier Elizabethans, e.g., Archbishop Parker who wrote to Queen Elizabeth's chief minister of state as follows:

'I refer the whole matter to her majesty and to your order .... I refer the standing or falling altogether to your own considerations, whether her majesty and you will have any archbishops or bishops, or how you will have them ordered.'  

Nevertheless, Saravia was not the only late Elizabethan to be taking up a position somewhat removed from that of his predecessors. We saw earlier that Whitgift made only the claim of Apostolical tradition to Cartwright, but in 1593, when he defended Saravia and Sutcliffe in a letter to Besa he said that episcopacy was both Apostolically and divinely instituted. Saravia may well have been the key person in influencing him to say this for it is not without significance that Whitgift's statement was made in the context of a quotation of Jerome writing to Eugrius which Saravia himself had already used in a treatise.  
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1. "De diversis ... etc." 24. A Treatise ... etc., 177.  
2. Woodhouse, ibid.  
3. Donaldson, ibid., 106, qted Parker, Correspondence, 454; cf., Cranmer, ibid., 116-17.  
5. Strype, Whitgift, II, 170-73; cf., "Examen ... etc.," 34.
Further evidence of the change which came late in this period is the statement by Hooker in Bk. VII that episcopacy was "ordained of God," but there is no reason to believe that this idea of Hooker's was influenced particularly by Saravia. Two authorities have assumed that there was special influence of the one upon the other. Miss Thompson in her essay in The Apostolic Ministry said that Hooker's "... influence on the later upholders of the Divine Right of Bishops was considerable, at any rate upon the early theological exponents of that view, like Saravia ..." We have already shown that the date of their meeting and the dates of their publications preclude this kind of conclusion. However, Keble, who did not specifically state that these two influenced each other's writings, said that he thought they were of one mind about their doctrines, so "... we may with reason use the recorded opinions of the one /i.e. Saravia/ for interpreting what might seem otherwise ambiguous in the other /i.e. Hooker/". It is true that these two men were very close friends and were in general doctrinal accord, but it seems to be a doubtful procedure to let either speak for the other one.

Sutcliffe and Bilson were the two men who were closest to Saravia in his arguments de jure divino. The former also attempted to trace a hierarchical principle from the Old Testament through the New and to prove thereby that episcopacy was divinely instituted as well as of Dominical appointment. Bilson followed the same course of argument but he drew more definite conclusions about jure divinum than either of the other two. He emphasized more strongly

---

3. Kirk, ibid., 428, v. supra, Introduction, "Saravia’s Relationship to ... Richard Hooker ... etc.".
than any of the others the authority and power held by the bishops so he may be rightly thought of as the most definite exponent of this doctrine in the Elizabethan period. Even though he has been shown to speak of "the office of the bishop as immediate from Christ" 1 Bilson seems to have rested his argument on the same basis as Saravia had, viz., that "apostolic" meant the same thing as "divine".

**Conclusion**

The Elizabethan period was one of the most important eras in the whole of Anglican history. During this time the Church of England was forced to restudy and even to reformulate some of the doctrines produced during the Reformation because of the changing circumstances and needs of the latter half of the sixteenth century. One of those doctrines which was given close scrutiny was the doctrine of the Ministry, for it was a target of attack both by the Romanists and the Puritans. It has not been the object of this thesis to attempt to determine whether this doctrine underwent any major degree of change during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, but we have had opportunity to give some attention to this as we have examined Saravia's own doctrine of the Ministry. From this study it seems reasonable to conclude that there was more homogeneity in the formulations of this doctrine during this controversial time than we would have expected to find.

Saravia himself is proof of the above conclusion for he certainly incorporated in his writings some arguments for the ministry in general, and episcopacy in particular, which were different from those of his predecessors like, Jewel,

---

Parker, or Cramer. Yet, it also seems to be justifiable to conclude that his use of Scriptural proofs and his arguments for Dominical and divine authority for bishops did not actually alter the structure of this doctrine, which they themselves had held without making such claims. It might be only fruitless conjecture to try to decide whether Saravia and the later Elizabethans would have ever made such claims if they had not felt that they were necessary in their defense against the Puritans, but it is logical to assume that inevitably Anglican theologians would have had to develop a stronger rationale for episcopacy than that based only on grounds of expediency, tradition, or reason. It was in this "inevitable" course of theological formulation of the Anglican doctrine of the Ministry that we see Saravia's prominence as a leader. However, it should be noted that his was a work of "formulation" and not of "reformulation". We might even say that Saravia examined the foundations of the structure of this doctrine and found them inadequate for the increased weight being exerted upon them, so he attempted to shore up this doctrine with theological beams, but he left its essential structure as it had been before. It may well be that some Anglican theologians could say in later centuries that Saravia, Bilson, Sutcliffe, and Bancroft were laying down principles which if carried to their ultimate conclusion would change the doctrine of Episcopacy itself, but that has also been beyond the scope and purpose of this thesis to decide. Although his arguments went beyond those of most other theologians of his time in their thoroughness and in the claims which were made through them we can say of him that which Bromiley has said in summary of these sixteenth century divines, "... /they/ did contend for an apostolic derivation of the ministry, and therefore, ultimately, for its dominical institution and authority".  

1. Bromiley, "Anglicanism ... etc.,” S.J.T., VII, 74.
these men had introduced and to put greater weight on the authority of the bishops de jure divino. ¹

The conclusion that Saravia was in agreement with his contemporaries can be shown in the following points: (1) the ministry of Christ was the primary or foundational ministry on which all Christian service rested; (2) he believed the essential ministry enjoyed a parity in the proclamation of the Word and in the administration of the sacraments; (3) all the ministry was derived from the Apostles, so there was no question of one minister having a spiritual preeminence over another minister; (4) the only imparity to be found in the ministry was in ecclesiastical government and this was a difference of degree, or of rank, but not of the ministry itself; (5) his concept of a hierarchy was actually an argument for an imparity of ministers in the authority for ecclesiastical government; (6) Saravia, like his fellow Anglicans, rejected the lay-eldership as being unnecessary in the Christian commonwealth; (7) he taught that all of the ministry must of necessity be duly called, qualified, and authorized; (8) his concept of the need of order and authority was particularly important in the development of his doctrine of Episcopacy.

The differences which we have noted in Saravia's doctrine from other Elizabethan views are not so easily differentiated for they were differences in emphases rather than in kind. Also, we should note here that these were differences which rapidly disappeared even before Saravia's death for they were quickly adopted as a standard part of the Anglican apologetic by nearly all Elizabethan and Jacobean theologians. These differences which changed so rapidly were: (1) the use of Scriptural proofs for episcopacy; (2) the claim of divine and Dominical authority for episcopacy - which basically meant no more for Saravia than others had meant when they used the word "Apostolical"; (3) the

¹ Sykes, ibid., 66.
elevation of the authority of ecclesiastical government to a level with the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments.

We have no way of knowing how much influence Saravia actually exerted on others in his church. His works went through several editions during his lifetime and were evidently widely read. Occasionally these were mentioned by a contemporary, but this tells us little for it was not the custom of Tudor divines to give much attention in their works to contemporaries with whom they were in agreement. It is likely that he was far more influential in respect to the doctrine of Episcopacy than has usually been realized and that he should be thought of as one of the theologians of that period who must be taken into account in any serious effort to understand the Church of England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The reason for this is that he should be reckoned as a precursor of changes which were to come in this doctrine in later periods because of the theological basis which he sought for episcopacy in the Scriptures and in reason.

---

1. E.g., Bancroft, A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline (1593), Bancroft's Tracts (1663), 106, 110; cf., Milson, Perpetual Gov't ... etc., 18, 23.
CHAPTER II

SARAVIA'S VIEW OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE EPISCOPATE

Introduction

In the last chapter we looked at Saravia's conception of the overall ministry of the Church. In the context of that study it was necessary to consider some of the major points related to his doctrine of Episcopacy, but now we must examine that doctrine in detail. It really would not be possible to understand properly any doctrine which he held without having some knowledge of this particular one, so this is a very important chapter for this thesis. Actually, this evaluation of the doctrinal centrality of episcopacy holds true for this whole period, for, as one authority commented in a work on the political thought of that century, "... the nature and righteousness of episcopacy bulked very large in the controversies of Elizabeth's reign ...."¹ These controversies revealed that not all of the doubts or misgivings about this office were on the Puritan side, for, many Anglicans were genuinely concerned about the tyranny and abuses which had grown up in the Roman episcopal system; therefore, there was remarkable unanimity of desire to reject these heretical notions while attempting to retain a reformed episcopate. An excellent example of this was Bancroft's comment on the Martin Marprelate accusation that bishops had been the cause of many schisms in the Church. In his sermon at St. Paul's Cross he said, "... I confess that I am myself in some part of his opinion,"² but, he said, this same reprehension

² Bancroft, A Sermon... at Paul's Cross, in Tracts, 71.
must be likewise shared by all the magistrates as well. He then went on to argue that all institutions which had been abused or evilly corrupted should be abolished, if people were going to do away with episcopacy solely on these grounds. This was the identical argument which Saravia himself was to use later, but for our purposes here, the important note sounded in these words was the doubt which even one of the strongest advocates of episcopacy had expressed publicly about what had happened to this office in the preceding centuries.

If the staunchest defenders of episcopacy could harbor these doubts then it is not surprising that many of the Protestants and Puritans felt that the Reformation would not be complete without the abolition of episcopal government. Sykes, who considered Saravia one of the most ardent supporters of episcopacy, thought it significant that, "even Saravia...confessed the truth of this /i.e., of the corruptions of the medieval doctrine/, whilst deploring the abandonment of episcopacy." This explains to some degree the reason why many of these Anglicans, like Saravia, were ready to accept the validity of the ordinations of continental Protestants who had rejected bishops for they were themselves understanding of the feelings of those brethren. Although there was no openly expressed dissatisfaction in England with Elizabethan bishops (other than by the Puritans) there may have been a feeling in the Church of England itself that this office also left something to be desired. The subsequent evaluations of these men have not been very high, for as Stephen Neill has commented "hardly anyone has a good word to say of the bishops of Elizabeth's time." However, he said that this may not have been a just appraisal of them and he personally endorsed the considered judgment of A.L.

1. Sykes, ibid., 107, cited Tractatus, Prologus.
Rouse who summed up their successes and failures in these words:

'I do not know a single Elizabethan bishop who was a bad man. Some were failures, some muddled... The great majority of them were conscientious hard-working men struggling in difficult circumstances with a heavy burden of administrative toil.'

With this evidence of at least some doubt about episcopacy during and after the Elizabethan period it is natural to ask why it was retained in the Church of England after the Reformation when many on the continent were rejecting it and when even those who were endorsing it were lamenting past apostasies. There are three basic reasons which can be given to explain its retention: (1) on the continent the bishops had been opposed to the Reformation, but in England the bishops, in cooperation with the civil authorities, were responsible for it; (2) most of the English reformers felt that episcopacy had proven itself to be the most effective way of preserving ecclesiastical order since the days of the early Church; (3) Queen Elizabeth preferred that this form of government be continued - this was the most decisive reason of all for the Royal Supremacy was the central feature of the Elizabethan establishment. Of course, there were other factors which had some part in this, but they were subordinate to these.

This was the kind of background which formed the context in which Saravia pressed his claims for episcopacy. These factors all had some influence on the way he developed his thoughts for his doctrine was deeply rooted in and influenced by his times. It was, as we shall see, partly formed by a straightforward dogmatic appeal from the Scriptures, the ancient Church, and from reason, to those who might still be won over to his side. In this examination we shall look first at the very heavy emphasis which Saravia made on the

---

2. Watts, "Doctrine of the Church...etc.," 145.
Apostolate as the foundation of the Church and of all its ministry; then we shall examine his conception of the episcopal office; finally we shall study his discussion of the power of the keys of the Kingdom.

The Apostolic Foundation of the Church

We must begin this chapter by considering the role of the Apostles as the founders of the Church because it would be impossible to understand precisely what Saravia believed about either the ministry or episcopacy without a thorough grounding in his conception of Apostolicity. It is obvious in all of his works that he placed great emphasis on the necessity of Apostolic authority in the founding of the Church and in its continuance and growth according to Apostolic principles. We shall see through this whole chapter that the explication of this is seen in the way he traced the ministry to its Apostolic bases and found there that neither the ministers nor the Church itself could understand either their nature or their mission apart from the Apostolate.

Saravia said that he found a full summary of the Apostolic office in Matthew 28:16-20. His interpretations of this passage are as follows:

1. the extraordinary calling of the Apostles which he believed to be reaffirmed in these verses;
2. their unlimited mission to go unto all nations;
3. the proclamation of the Gospel;
4. the administration of the sacraments;
5. the promise of divine assistance;
6. the gift of the Holy Spirit in such a way that He would act as an infallible guide for their ex officio utterances.

---

1. Saravia used "potestas" and "authoritas" interchangeably although their meanings are not identical. The former has been defined as "legal or legitimate authority or power," while the latter has been said to mean a "moral influence as distinct from authority in the sense of power." We can only conclude that Saravia had both meanings in mind when he used either word (v. J.F. Mountford (ed.), Bradley's Arnold Latin Prose Composition, 1961, 406, n. 1.
2. V. infra, Part II, Chapters I and II for a discussion of his missionary interpretations of these verses.
3. A Treatise... etc., 72-74. "De diversis... etc., " 4-5.
and activities and could be conferred by them through the laying on of their hands.

The last point in this list was of special significance to Saravia for he felt it was a very important part of the explanation of the uniqueness of the Apostolate. He believed all the other points (except number 2) were shared with either a few or with many other people, but this gift of the Holy Spirit was theirs alone. This promise that He would be their "inerrant director" meant that He would so govern their speech and the performance of all their duties that they would deliver only Christ's doctrine and not their own.

Saravia said everyone in the Church was promised divine assistance, but only the Apostles were given this particular kind of assurance about their work. This gave confidence not only to the Apostles but to all the Church that its foundation was firm and immovable and that the Apostolic doctrine, "... should be the canon and rule whereby the teaching of all others should be tested ...." Saravia also said that points number (1) and (2) were likewise necessary for the founding of the Church, so that they, along with (6), were temporary with the Apostles and would not therefore remain permanently in the Church. We have noticed in many places that he believed (3) and (4) to be of the "essence" of the Apostolate and the ministry and were therefore destined to remain permanently in the Church.

We can see from this description of the nature of the Apostolic office that Saravia's doctrine of the Ministry would be largely determined by what he considered to be temporary and what he considered to be permanent in the Apostolate. This explains why he and Besa argued at some length about the

---

1. Ibid., 142-44 "De diversis, etc.," 167. Why Saravia failed to comment on the third "essence"/a.e., the authority for governing the Church as not being in this list is a mystery since this was the point which concerned him even more than the others.
meaning of the *extraordinariae et ordinariae vocations*, for it was from their interpretations of these two kinds of calls that each decided what was meant therein to be either permanent or temporary.\(^1\) Saravia said that the *extraordinaria vocatio* was a direct call by God Himself, but it could come in one of three ways: (1) a call without any intermediary being used (e.g., Moses and the Twelve Apostles); (2) by means of an intermediary, such as a prophet, and before laws or rules had been laid down for that ministry (e.g., Aaron); (3) without any intermediary being used, but after certain laws had been received for that kind of ministry (e.g., Samuel, Paul, and Matthias). The *ordinaria vocatio* was that kind which all had received who had been indirectly called by God through the laws and institutions of the Church (e.g., the tribe of the Levites, the bishops and presbyters of his own time). He maintained that all in the sixteenth century were ordinarily called for there was no longer any need of the extraordinary call because through the many centuries of the growth of the Church, God had developed the rules for governing it so well that He need not go beyond the ordinary call anymore. This was said to rebut Beza's argument that the reformers had had an extraordinary call for their task, for Saravia felt that any Christian who was sufficiently instructed in doctrine could undertake to cleanse the Church of impiety.\(^2\)

Saravia warned Beza that it was a dangerous thing to talk of an extraordinary calling for it encouraged people to justify innovations in the Church by saying that they had been called directly by God and did not need the authorization of the Church for their ministries or for their doctrines. He illustrated this from his experience in the Netherlands where he had evidently reacted strongly

\(^1\) *V.*, "De diversis...etc.," and "Defensio....etc.," Chapters II and XVI, et passim.
\(^2\) "Defensio...etc.," 176; Ab adserenda veritate nemo prohiberi potest"; cf. A Treatise...etc., 68 ["De diversis...etc.,"] 47.
to the individualism of the Munsterites,¹ and from a more recent occurrence in England which was related to the publishing of the Martin Marprelate tracts.² He said that the ordinary calling of the minister should consist of two things. First of all, an internal call of the Holy Spirit, which might also be thought of as the "inner inspiration of the Holy Spirit."³ This could be called a "sine qua non" for the minister of the Gospel, but Saravia also felt the external call to be just as important. This he interpreted as the authentication which the Church should give a person who claimed the internal calling of the Spirit to show that it believed the experience to be valid. Without both kinds of calling he felt that a man should not be given responsibility for ministering in the Church.⁴

The disagreement which Saravia had with Besa about the extraordinariae et ordinariae vociones underscored the very great importance which he attached to the Apostolic potestas. It was this which he reiterated to be of paramount importance to the work of the Church in every age. It was this potestas which Besa understood to be a temporary gift which was attached to the particularity of the Apostolate, so that the Apostles were not able to pass it on to their successors.⁵ Saravia understood it to belong to the whole Church and said that it would destroy the bond of the Church with its Apostolic foundations if it did not remain permanently in the Church.⁶ He further maintained that it

---

¹ Ibid., 25: "Nota est Munsteriana insaniam, nihil opus est ut eas commemorem."
² Ibid., 27-29. He mentioned John Penry, who was thought to have been a writer and the director of the secret printing of the first Marprelate tracts (v. William Pierce (ed.), The Marprelate Tracts, 1588, 1589 /1917/, 3-4, 65-66). Later Penry was hanged on an "ill-grounded charge of Treason" (v. Cross (ed.), Dictionary of Christian Church, 1043).
³ Ibid., 20: "Afflatum autem Spiritus sancti intrinseca, ad vocaciones refero internas."
⁵ Ibid., 176.
⁶ Ibid., 181-82.
was incomprehensible to him how the Church could claim the right to preach the 
Gospel, and to administer the sacraments, without the form of government which 
existed under the Apostles. 1 In fact, Saravia went so far as to say that the 
need of Apostolic authority was even greater after the death of the Apostles 
than it was before, for the Church no longer had leaders who were so uniquely 
endowed and respected by all. 2

At this point it is necessary to try to determine whether Saravia thought 
of the Apostles only as men who were “uniquely endowed and respected by all,” 
or whether he thought of them as unique, and the Apostolate as *sui generis* and 
unrepeatable. In order to find out just what he did believe about this 
matter we must look carefully at the two ways he had of speaking of the 
Apostolate. In one way it would appear that he considered the Apostles to be 
unique only in the sense that they were the first of the Church’s long line of 
ministers and that they had some special gifts by virtue of their primacy in 
that lineage; for example: he spoke of the Apostolate and the episcopate as 
being the same office except for a wider range of gifts and powers in the 
former; 3 he believed the Apostles bequeathed their posts to the bishops who 
succeeded them; 4 he spoke of the bishops sitting on the thrones of the 
Apostles; 5 he sometimes spoke of the difference between the Apostles and the 
bishops as if it were a difference in degree only and not in kind. 6 These are

---

1. Ibid., 155-57. We shall see later in this section that Saravia under- 
stood "Apostolic authority" to be the same thing as these three points.
2. Ibid., 156.
3. "De diversis...etc.," 24: "Idem sumus Episcopi et Apostoli esse; nisi 
quod huius quem illius sit amplius, latiusque patet, communis Patrum sententia 
est." Of., "Defensio...etc.," 48, 308.
4. "Defensio...etc.," 182: "...suas vices mandasse Episcopos."
5. Ibid., 152: "...idem dici potest de Episcopis, quod in cathedra Petri 
et Pauli sedent, hoc est, quod successerunt in eodem regimine munere."
6. Ibid., 186: "Quod esti in circumstantiis aliquam varietatem accipiatis 
in re nullam admittit." Of., "De diversis...etc.," 32: "Discrimen hoc 
quantitatis et mensurae est, non ipsius rei."
representative statements of one side of Saravia's thought and if it had been the only way he expressed himself about the Apostolate it would have made a great difference in his doctrine of Episcopacy.

On the other side of Saravia's expressions about the Apostolate he spoke as if there were a disjunctive sense between the Apostles and all other ministers to the extent that no one would ever be like them or would ever fill their offices again. This was primarily shown in their work as founders of the Church, for in this way none would ever equal either the Apostles or the Prophets. Their "doctrina coelestis" had always been the normative teaching of the Church and as such the Apostles occupied a unique point in God's revelation to mankind. Saravia said that they held this particular point because they were eye-witnesses of the Lord's Life and Resurrection and they proclaimed only what they had seen, and heard, and touched; whereas all who came after them must faithfully hand on that which they had received from them. Even though Saravia did not speak of the founding of the Church as the "essence" of the Apostolate he has clearly shown in many places that he regarded it as of decisive importance for the Church for no one could repeat or renew that which they had already done.

1. Ibid., 174: "... nemo est ipsis nec eum conferendus."
2. Ibid., 153-54: "Tamen ipsi cum prophetis sunt soli et veri Ecclesiae fundatores."
4. Ibid., 168: "Nam horum nihil, Apostoli fuere authores, sed Deus: et in hoo Apostoli excellunt suis successores Episcopos, quod primi haece proxime a Deo acceperunt divinum mysterium, ut ea posteri tradarent. Quod demo fieri, nihil opus esse fatumur."
5. "Exam... etc.," 5. A concise account of many of the differences which he saw between Apostles and bishops may be found on this page.
6. "Defensio... etc.," 153-54. This is an account of an argument with Beza about an analogy in which Saravia spoke of the foundations of a building as representing the Apostles and the construction and maintenance of the rest of the building as representing the work of those who came after them.
This analysis of the two sides of Saravia’s thought about the relation of the Apostolate and the episcopate has revealed that this was not a subject which he had completely thought through. In fact, we cannot fully resolve all the tension in this doctrine because of the dualism which exists here between these two lines of thought, but we can with reasonable certainty draw some conclusions about where his major emphasis lay. We have seen that he blurred the line by which he sought to delineate the Apostolate, but at the same time he did maintain a kind of cleavage between them and all other ministers which preserved their uniqueness. The cause of this paradox may well be explained by his definition of that which was of the "Apostolatus essentia" as the three marks of the ministry meant to remain permanently in the Church.1 If one understands "essentia" to mean that which is "fundamental," or "of the intrinsic nature" of the Apostolate then Saravia confused the whole issue. However, it would seem far more likely that he had the idea that "essentia" should be translated as "that which was permanently of its nature." If we were to accept the first definition of this word then it would mean that he felt the foundations of the Church were only of secondary, or even of temporary, importance, and this would very clearly go against the whole of his thought. If we accept the second definition then he was simply saying that these three things were those parts of the Apostolic function which were meant to be permanent. It would then appear, me judice, that Saravia had actually used "essentia" wrongly for he did believe the Apostolate as the foundation of the Church to be sui generis. It would then be impossible to say that anyone had succeeded to their office per se. Therefore, when

1. Ibid., 308; "Nihil horum, neque haece omnia simul essentiam Apostolici munericis constituant; quae tota in Evangelii praedicatione, et sacramentorum administratione, atque gubernatione Ecclesiae consistit."
Saravia did speak of the bishops as succeeding the Apostles; he meant this in the limited sense that they succeeded to a part of their functions and consequently to a certain part of their office. Even then he actually was saying that all ministers succeeded the Apostolate for all were equals in the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments; and even in the authority for governing the Church he felt that both bishops and presbyters (to a limited extent) shared in this. The only "office" to which ministers succeeded was "...the same office of governing" and this led Saravia to admit that they received "...a similar commission with a similar authority..." This would mean that to a limited extent he believed the Apostles to have belonged to the succession of the ministry, but to a greater extent, by virtue of their foundational ministry, and without which there could not have been the three marks of the ministry, all ministers were dependent upon and distinguished from them.

The evidence for the above conclusions is much stronger than simply a weighing of counterpoised statements might seem to indicate, since this is also verified in the manner in which Saravia showed the Apostolic auctoritas to be posited in the Church. This he believed to be self-evident from the commission given by the Lord on the Mount of Ascension to the Apostles and to all the believers assembled there. Therefore, he said, this was given to the Church more than to individuals and this authority resided permanently in the Church.

1. *Ibid.*, 155: "...me dixisse Apostolorum et Evangelistarum functionem in circumstantiis non fuisse temporaria; sed gubernationis Ecclesiasticae formam, quae sub eis fuit, dixi et dico non fuisse temporaria." 2. "De diversis...etc.," 1: "Hac potestate Apostoli crearunt in Ecclesia Christi episcopos et presbyteros, quibus suas commiseris vices." 3. *A Treatise...etc.*, 159 "$De diversis...etc.," 187. 4. "Defensio...etc.," 173, 177, 181.
The realization that this had been given to all Christians rather than to a few was the thing which encouraged the Apostles to appoint men "... to be their partakers in the Apostolical office...." Davies interpreted this wrongly for he thought Saravía believed the commission was given to the Apostles and transmitted through them to the Church. However, most of the time Saravía spoke of the power as being that of the whole Church even in the Apostolic age. This is an important point, for as several authorities have observed, it is always of great significance whether the priority of authority be placed on the ministry, or on the Church. We can say, therefore, that Saravía undoubtedly put his major emphasis upon his ecclesiology for this is where he saw the Apostolic authority as residing. Otherwise he would have never quoted Cyprian to have said: "Ecclesiae ratio ita decurrît, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constitutur, et omnis actus Ecclesiae per eosdem praesitos gubernetur: cum hoc itaque divina legem fundamentum sit, etc." The rightful and proper conclusion which can be deduced from all of these statements by Saravía was that he saw the Apostles as unique in their work as founders of the Church, and for this task they possessed a unique and temporary authority, but Saravía never understood this kind of work as being involved in or a part of the "Apostolic authority" of which he spoke so often. Rather, he saw this latter authority as being made

1. A Treatise...etc., 162-63 /"De diversis...etc.," 12/.
2. Ibid.
3. Davies, Episcopacy...in the Church of England...etc., 32. He probably had a statement found in "Defensio...etc.," 181 in mind, where Saravía said this was given to the Church in the person of Peter and the other Apostles.
4. "Defensio...etc.," 173: "Quicquid potestatis Ecclesiasticae Dominus Apostolis dedisse legitur, non personas sed Ecclesiae datum ab Orthodoxis intelligitur."
6. "Defensio...etc.," 216, qted Cyprian, no ref. given.
up of the three essential notes of the ministry which remained permanently in the Church and were held by all the ministers of the Gospel.  

The Way Saravia Viewed Apostolic Succession

The Rev. B.D. Till has observed in his essay in The Historic Episcopate, that the "the idea of succession... appears surprisingly little in the thought of the sixteenth and seventeenth century divines." This statement certainly would hold true for Saravia for he seemed to be little concerned about this matter. The fact that he dwelt so much on the nature of the auctoritas Apostolica as being necessary in all ages and on the bishops as being the successores Apostolorum would naturally lead us to expect that he would want to show how this auctoritas was given to these successores. However, there are two points which we have established earlier which do throw some light on his attitude about the successio Apostolica potestatis. In the preceding chapter his concept of a hierarchy was shown to be a very important part of his doctrine of the Ministry. We saw there that he believed the authoritarian structure found in the Old Dispensation should apply also to the Church in the New Dispensation and should remain in it in all ages. Saravia held that Moses was given his authority directly by God and that he handed this on to Aaron and the latter in turn handed it on to the priests and the Levites and to their successors. Therefore, said Saravia, just as the Jewish priests sat in the

1. Ibid., 186: "Successionem Apostolicae potestatis perpetuum, in ordinaria Episcoporum et Presbyterorum, vel Ministrorum Evangelii et Pastorum constituo vocazione."
2. Carey, ibid., 75.
3. One of the men to whom Saravia dedicated "Defensio...etc.," Bishop Thomas Cooper, even repudiated the concept of Apostolic succession (V. Ainslie, Doctrines...in the Reformed Churches...etc., 212, cited Cooper, Admonition, 153).
4. "Defensio...etc.," 186.
5. V. supra, Chapter I, "Saravia's Doctrine of the Imparity of Ministers."
seat of Moses and Aaron, "... so may it be said of Bishops, that they sit in St. Peter's seat and St. Paul's, because they succeeded them in the same office of governing."¹

The other point which we have established and which will help in understanding Saravia's doctrine of Apostolic Succession was the way he posited all authority in the Church and not in individuals.² He believed the Lord made provision for the Apostles before He departed from the earth, and in the same manner the Apostles felt it incumbent upon themselves to make provision for their successors before they died.³ But, he said, this was an authority which they did not themselves have to give or to retain for it resided in the Church and after the Apostles died Saravia spoke only of the Church as being able to call others "... ad Apostolicam functionem."⁴ Those who received such a call from the Church were thought of as "successors of the Apostles, "who were in turn succeeded by others, "... to whom if they did not themselves commit the trust they had received from the Apostles, the Church inheriting the Apostles' authority, committed it."⁵ This ecclesiological idea of the succession of power stands in notable contrast to that of Bilson who said, "'they can have no part of the apostolic commission, that have no show of apostolic succession.'"⁶ Saravia never attempted to prove the authority from the succession of it; in fact, he thought the succession could only be shown by the authority abiding in the Church.

¹. A Treatise...etc., 158-59 /"De diversis...etc., 18/; of., "Defensio... etc.," 168-69.
². V. supra. Of., A Treatise...etc., 162-63 /197.
³. Ibid. 160 /22/.
⁴. "Defensio...etc.," 170.
⁵. A Treatise...etc., 170 /207.
There actually seem to have been two kinds of succession which Saravia had in mind. The first was a doctrinal succession which involved all of the ministers of the Gospel. This was the kind he was thinking of when he said the perpetual succession of Apostolic power existed "... in ordinaria Episcoporum et Presbyterorum vel Ministrorum Evangeli et Pastorum ... vocations."1 This passage related not only to a succession of the ministry, but it also shows that he thought of it as a true succession of the ministry because it was related to the doctrine of the Apostles in that the Church must always be faithful to its Apostolic foundations by adherence to a correct preaching of the Word, the proper administration of the sacraments, and the continuance of the Apostolic form of government in the Church. The conclusion has been justifiably reached by one authority that all the Anglican divines of this period generally believed in a theory of succession which involved holding the same doctrine as that of the primitive Church.2 G.W. Bromiley has also shown that this was the most commonly accepted view of the divines of this period for they wanted to show that the whole ministry was of Apostolic derivation and not that succession was vested only in episcopally ordained bishops.3 Saravia's position in this respect also seems to have been very close to that of many Reformed ministers. Ainslie spoke of them as viewing it as a succession of doctrine which was related to a line of men commissioned by the true Church, for "the continuous Church will produce the continuous ministry."4 This underlines again the conclusion that Saravia put his primary emphasis on the Church and not on the ministry, for it was not the ministry which made the true Church, but the ministry was so bound up in the

1. "Defensio...etc.,” 186.
3. Bromiley, "Anglicanism...etc.," S.J.T., VII, 75.
Church that it has its succession because of the continuity or "succession" of the Church. It also can be noted here that this was the point which Woodhouse has shown Hooker was making when he spoke of ministerial succession as meaning power and authority given in a lawful manner, either directly from God, or in any way the Church "... acting in His Name, thought fitting."¹

The other way which Saravia thought of a succession was in the Apostolic form of government.² He believed the auctoritas, as far as it related to the forma regimina, was as great in the bishops as it was in the Apostles, therefore, he contended that Timothy, Titus, and others who were thought to be successors, were able to accomplish as much "...by virtue of their embassy, or office..." as the Apostles would have been able to have done themselves.³ This might justifiably be called then a "functional succession," but in at least one place he also related it to a series succession in place.⁴ So far as is known, this is the only place he mentioned this kind of a series theory, but he did devote much space to the idea of "de uno Episcopo in una dioecesi."⁵ Even in the combined total of these forty pages he made only passing references in a very vague manner to succession as such.⁶ Even though we cannot be precise about the nature of the "successentium series" which he had in mind we do know that it was not the Roman "Series" theory, for he said that it did not matter whether the bishops knew from which Apostle their diocese was descended.

He said that the bishops were actually successors of all of the Apostles and

¹ Woodhouse, Doctrine of the Church...etc., 95, cited Hooker, Eccl. Pol. VIII, vi, 3,5,8; VII, xlv, 11; and Saravia, A Treatise...etc., 130.
² "Defensio...etc.," 175; "...cum Apostolico tantum regimina Ecclesiasticorum formam requiram."
³ Ibid., 181, trans. by R. Richards.
⁴ "Examen...etc.," 18: "Perpetua Episcoporum sibi sucedentium series, nobis ipsores posteris incola lex esse debetur."
⁵ V., "De diversis...etc.," and "Defensio...etc.," Chapter XXIV.
⁶ E.g., "Defensio...etc.," 260. He certainly had ample opportunity to go into any aspect of this matter very thoroughly which he wished to, yet we can find nothing even resembling the Eusebian tables quoted in Bilson, Perpetual Gov't, 333-34.
not just a particular one.¹

We also can be certain that Saravia did not advocate a "Transmission" theory of succession in which there was a "power" or charisima transmitted from the consecrator to the consecrated.² Woodhouse said he found only one instance of this kind of theory in the whole Elizabethan period,³ and he also showed that even Keble could find no evidence at all of this particular idea of a succession in his study of the Elizabethans.⁴ In that study Keble concluded of Saravia that he was primarily interested in only two things, and that was to show that bishops were not instituted by human custom and that they alone had been divinely appointed to govern the Church. This was an oversimplification by Keble, but it does show that he too saw no evidence in Saravia of a transmission of power, of a tactual continuity, or even that succession was a guarantee of valid ministrations.

Additional light is thrown upon the way Saravia understood the nature of the transmission of this authority from the Apostles to their successors in the manner he dealt with the Jewish concept of the Shaliach. This is mentioned only in the context of what he wrote about missions so it will be discussed in Part II.⁵ However, for the purposes of this section we should note that Saravia used the idea of the Shaliach in a two-fold manner and that this corresponded to the two kinds of succession we have concluded that he held. In one way Saravia posited a personal representation between the Apostles and their successors which seemed to suggest a "series" type of succession; in the other

---

¹ "Examen... etc.," 40-41.
² Cf., "Defensio... etc.," 287-88.
³ Woodhouse, "... Succession," Theology, IV, 377-78. The exception was The Catechism of Justus Jonas, called Cranmer's Catechism, which was published under Cranmer's authority, but probably did not completely reflect his beliefs.
⁴ Ibid., cited Hooker, Works, Keble's Intro., lxvi if, passim.
⁵ V. infra, Part II, Chapter II, "Apostolicity and the Ministry in the World-wide Expansion of the Church."
way he posited an identity of function, or a proxy in function, which indicated that there was a doctrinal relation between the one and the other. This functional emphasis put the stress on the relation of the successors, not so much to the Apostles, as to the Lord, for all that they did, they did in His Name and not in the name of the Apostles. He also said in the context of his doctrine of Missions that he was not so much concerned with the delegation of a person as with the transference of Apostolic power and the succession of that power. 1 This is extremely important for any understanding of what he thought about a succession of power from the Apostles for it rules out any idea of a legal or mechanical means by which this may always be preserved in, and even become the possession of, the Church. In other words he was maintaining that the Church of England did not have the Apos
tolorum potestas simply because it had retained the episcopal form of government. There is no doubt but that he felt this to be of great importance, but of even greater importance than the kind of government which the Church had, was the retention of the true faith and the doctrine of the Apostles and the obedience to Christ who is the Head of the Church, His Body.

Saravia blamed the Roman papacy for the corruption of episcopacy with a legalistic and mechanical concept of a transmission of authority. 2 This explains to a great degree why he felt so deeply about the papal claims, although he also believed them to be contrary to the teachings of Scripture and those of all of the ancient councils. 3 Jewel in his controversy with Harding was probably the most significant Elizabethan to show how the papacy gained power at the expense of the episcopal office. 4 This was seen to be one of the

1. "Defensio...etc., 180: "...ita hoc loco non tam de delegations ago; quam de transmissions potestatis Apostolicae, at successiones."
2. Væ infra. "The Episcopal Office" for his attitude towards the Roman episcopate.
3. "De Imperandi authoritate...etc.," 279-80.
strongest forces at work in the Council of Trent where doctrines were promulgated to encourage the Roman Catholic not to think so much of his bishop as the successor of the Apostles as to think of the pope as the successor of St. Peter. Episcopal succession had given way to papal succession in fact if not in theory. These conclusions of Davies about the Jewel-Harding disputation aptly describe Saravia’s conception of what had gone wrong in episcopal succession.

He apparently felt that this legalistic element which had crept into the claims of the Bishops of Rome had been the primary reason for the corruption of episcopal authority. He made many references to this, but the earliest bishop to whom he traced this trouble was Leo I and to a statement in the Pontifical rubric which apparently could be dated sometime in the fifth century. The latter spoke of the provisions and elections of all churches which were supposed to apply to the Roman See. Concomitant with this Saravia said Leo the Great had arrogantly drawn the power of bishops to himself and had thereby violated the rights of other ancient Sees. This was a reference to the time when Leo obtained a decree from Valentinian III granting him supreme authority over the Church in Gaul. In designating Leo as the first to cause this alteration in the nature of episcopal power Saravia seems to have chosen well, for *Leonis Magni Opera* are literally full of such claims. In the context of these claims of the supremacy of papal power Leo spoke of the power and divine grace of

---

1. *Ibid.* On p. 92 Davies recorded a quotation by Whitney (*The Episcopate and the Reformation*, 103) in which Philip of Spain said, ""Those who went to Trent as bishops, have come back as parish priests."

2. "Examen...etc.," 63.

3. *Ibid.:* "Provisiones et electionum confirmationes omnium Ecclesiarum hodie pleno iure pertinent ad sedem Apostolicam."

4. *Ibid.:* "Unde obsecro hodie illud plenum ius, quod ignorarunt veteres Romani Papae? Leo epist. 89 in qua tamen primatum Petri insolenter iactarat, atque ad auctoritates suae sedis trahit, hoc ignoravit..."/rub. this is actually Epistle X in the Quesnel edition of 1753-59/.

Christ, "... quae per Christum Petro tribuitur, per Petrum Apostolis conferatur."¹

The unity of the Church no longer was bound up in the Lord as Head of the Church, but in the holder of the See of Peter. As Charles Gore, later Bishop of Oxford, observed, this meant that Peter did not simply have primacy of authority and jurisdiction, as popes before Leo had claimed, "... but a mediatorial position [italics his] and it is but a natural and less important consequence that he who is one with Christ in His mediatorial office should share His regal power."²

Therefore, Leo was claiming that Bishops of Rome were, "... the only immediate [italics his] recipient [italics his] of sacerdotal grace, and what the others receive they receive through him."³ This was the real beginning of that which reached its full doctrinal definition at the Tridentine Council of the sixteenth century. It was also to this beginning to which Saravia pointed as the rise of the papacy and the decline of episcopacy and as the point in which there was an attempt to finalize and to control the power of Christ and to transmit it horizontally from bishop to successor. It was this kind of a delegation of power which he rejected, as we shall see later in an examination of the Shalich concept.

The Episcopal Office

One authority has spoken of the Anglican apologetic which was adopted at the close of the sixteenth century as the beginning of "modern Anglicanism,"⁴ and another has described it as the emergence of "Anglican catholicism."⁵ It is beyond the scope of this thesis to judge conclusively on these assessments.

¹. Ibid., I, col. 18 (sermon IV); col. 19: "quod tantam potentiam dedit ei, quem totius Ecclesiae Principem fecit...."
². Charles Gore, Leo the Great (1880), 91-92.
³. Ibid., 93.
⁴. Davies, ibid., 57.
⁵. Allen, Political Thought...Sixteenth Century, 181-82.
of that period, but these ideas cannot be completely ignored. The major purpose of this study is to fit Saravia into his own times and to compare him with his Tudor contemporaries, but it also would be a very important part of his role during that momentous era if he and a few others had actually laid the groundwork for a significant movement within the Anglican Church in later centuries. Davies, for example, thought Saravia was breaking away from the position of Whitgift, Jewel, Field and Parker.¹ There is some evidence that this is true if one means that he was adopting new grounds to argue for old doctrines, but it would not be true if one understood him to have adopted a new form of episcopacy by virtue of the fact that he was supporting it with claims of a "divine right" and scriptural authentication. Keble, who made a very perceptive evaluation of the developments of this whole period, said that the school of Hooker [i.e., Hooker, Saravia, Bilson, and Sutcliffe] laid down some principles which, if strictly followed, would make a claim for the exclusiveness for episcopacy, but that all of these men shrank "... from the legitimate result of [their] own premises."² In a sense then both Davies and Keble are correct for these men did open the door for such conclusions to be drawn from arguments similar to, but more thoroughly developed than, their own by some Anglicans in later centuries; but, as Keble observed, they did not themselves draw such inferences. This led him to say that there was a definite difference between the school of Hooker and that of such seventeenth century figures as Laud, Hammond, and Leslie. We might even take this a step further and say that as far as Saravia and Hooker were concerned, they not only did not draw such inferences from these arguments which they made, but they pro-

¹ Davies, ibid. 32.
bably were not even aware that the logical conclusion of them would lead to an "exclusive" claim for that form of government. These premises have all been made earlier in this thesis but they needed to be restated at the beginning of this section for the proof of them should be apparent in an examination of Saravia's doctrine of Episcopacy. We shall be considering now the conclusions at which he arrived about the origin, nature, and justification of this office.

Saravia said that the Scriptures taught that the twelve Apostles and the seventy Evangelists served as the first bishops and presbyters in the early Church. As the number of Christians in Jerusalem increased it became necessary for them to create the order of deacons to assist with certain duties in the Church (Acts 6). He believed this to be the first order in time, but, that the presbyters were created soon after them (Acts 11:30). These presbyters were ordained by the Apostles and the Evangelists because the number of churches was increasing so rapidly they could no longer adequately care for them. These men were known as "... auxiliares et subsidiarii Apostolorum," and they were thought to have had the responsibility for several churches rather than that of one particular church. Saravia believed these first presbyters to have been Timothy, Titus, Luke, John, Mark, Demas, Sylvanus and many others who were often mentioned in the Scriptures. He called these men "primi Presbyteri" but he said they were also sometimes called Apostles and that they should be distinguished from another kind of presbyter created later in the

---

1. Hooker really made no attempt to prove episcopacy from the Scriptures, but he did say that it was that form of government "which best agreeeth with the Sacred Scriptures." (V. Doctrine in the Church of England, 1922 Report, 1962, 118, cited Hooker, Ecce. Pol. III, x, xi).  
2. "Defensio...etc., "De diversis...etc., 116-19 /.  
3. A Treatise...etc., 116-19 /.  
4. "De diversis...etc., " 11 /A Treatise...etc., 116/.
Apostolic period. This latter type was seen as necessary because the continued growth of some of the churches required that a presbyter be assigned to the care of an individual church which required more attention than the Apostles, Evangelists, or their "auxiliaries", could give them. This is a very significant interpretation of the development of the ministry in the early stage of the Church, for Saravia actually saw four different ranks or degrees of ministers at this stage! It is also important to note that he thought the first presbyters were always of a superior rank to the second kind of presbyters, although both were called bishops until the death of the Apostles, but after then this title was gradually applied more and more to the superior presbyters until it became the exclusive designation of that particular order. They were called επίσκοπος because of their responsibility for ecclesiastical oversight and care so the term was a functional one. The reason why both orders shared this title at first was explained partly because it described a function which both exercised and partly by the gradual development of the ministry of the Church. However, he said that the practice of calling pastors by the titles of presbyters and bishops, without any distinction, was quite different from saying that they were all of equal authority.

1. He said "Presbyter" came from the Hebrew "Zaken" which meant an elder, or a person of venerable age and of considerable authority in the state. It was used in the O.T. to designate magistrates and other honorable men, but was used in the N.T. to denote those men who ruled the Church of Christ. Other scriptural words used to designate the two kinds of presbyters were: ὁσιομούς (stewards), ἀρχιερεῖς (president), ἐπισκόπως (president), ἱερεῖς (priests), ἑρωμενοι (guides), ηγεμόνες (governors), δικαίους (ministers), συγγραφεῖς (writers), and ἑρωμενοι (ministers), (v. ibid., 11).

2. Ibid., 12: "Quae res veluti manu nos hunc deducit, ut sub Apostolis, et ab ipsis Apostolis duos diversae autoritatis presbyterorum ordinis constitutos, quos cum ipsis ecclesias regerent, fateri cogamur: quibus etsi Scriptura distincta non dederit propriae vocabula, posteritas dedit....Episcopi nomen post Apostolorum tempora proprium primo presbyterorum ordini mansit."

Many of these apparent contradictions in the Scriptures in the use of titles, etc., were explained by him as being the result of homonymy.1

Saravia himself used the term "pastor" homonymously for he applied it to bishops and presbyters to show that they were both "de duplici Pastorum ordine."2 This has made it difficult for the reader to understand in some passages which of the two he actually had in mind, for it confuses one to read in one place, "... Pastores et Presbyteri in duos ordines ab Apostolis distincti sunt,"3 and in another, "... Beza putat me Pastorem a Presbytero distinguere, et distinctos duos ordines ponere, errat: idea et unus mini est ordo Presbyteri et Pastoris."4 However, these are not contradictions for in the first quotation he meant that "pastors" who are also "presbyters" are divided into two orders and this was his way of using homonymous terms. His definition of a pastor was one who fed the flock of the Lord with wholesome doctrine so this included the presbyter in charge of one church and the bishop in charge of several.5

The greater part of the New Testament evidence which Saravia cited in support of his views was related to Timothy and Titus.6 He thought it particularly significant that the Apostle Paul prefixed their names to several of his epistles7 and therefore that these might be regarded not as the epistles of Paul alone, but also those of his colleagues such as were Timothy, Titus, Sosthenes, and Sylvanus.8 This was, he said, Paul's way of preparing the

---

1. E.g., ibid. 321, for a discussion of the homonymous use of words.
2. Ibid., Chapter X.
3. "De diversis... etc.," 2.
4. "Defensio... etc.," 8.
5. A Treatise... etc., 112 ("De diversis... etc.," 117.
6. E.g., "Examen... etc.," 17, 22; cf., Bilson, ibid., 83-90, who also stressed the role of these men in his book.
7. E.g., Phil. 1:1; Col. 1:1; II Cor. 1:1.
8. "Examen... etc.," 22.
churches to accept these men as his successors when he passed off the scene. Also, Saravia noted that Paul's habit of calling them "fellow-workers" 
\[ \text{\textit{μεταξύ}} \], "fellow-soldiers" 
\[ \text{\textit{koinōnōtēs}} \], and "those who shared in common" 
\[ \text{\textit{koinōnētēs}} \] was his way of designating them as very special workers with special responsibilities. Saravia said that I Tim, 5:22 alone should be considered adequate evidence of the Apostle's recognition of two orders of presbyters, for why else would he have said, "lay hands suddenly on no man"? 1 This he contended was direct proof that Paul believed Timothy to have the powers of ordination. When Beza disputed these interpretations, Saravia replied that "the unbroken usage of the Church" and the orthodox fathers should be the arbitrators of this matter. 2 He maintained that these fathers all believed Timothy to have had charge not only of the church at Ephesus, but of the whole of Asia. In another place he seems to have regarded Timothy not as a bishop of the province of Asia, but as a kind of archbishop, for he interpreted the angels in the passage in The Book of Revelation (chapters 1 - 3) as being bishops of these seven churches. 3

When the Apostles died Saravia said some of the churches were left in an incomplete state because many of them did not have a full complement of ministers. This was the result of an insufficient number of men suitable for the presbyterate having been found to serve in the many churches which had sprung up. 4 During this period of transition from the Apostolic to post-Apostolic times, he admitted that some of the churches had been governed by the community of believers, although they were also under the care and supervision of the Apostles. 5 Examples of this which he gave were the churches in Crete,

---

1. A Treatise...etc., 118 "De diversis...etc.
2. "Etiam...etc.," 171. 
3. Ibid., 18-19; "Defensor...etc.," 251-52. Other passages of Scripture which he used in his attempts to prove this doctrine will be discussed later in this section.
4. "Defensor...etc.," 81.
5. A Treatise...etc., 209 "De diversis...etc.," 257.
Corinth and Rome, but when suitable presbyters were found, they were "...thenceforth governed by the advice of those presbyters...." This idea of a gradual evolvement of the ministry in the Church is very important for understanding Saravia. He did not believe that the episcopate emerged at the end of what has been called the "tunnel period", for he felt that this order was in evidence in the Apostolic era and during the transition period when the Apostles were gradually dying and being replaced by the bishops. He did admit, though, that this order was not well defined in appellation and function until the Scriptures had been written and the Apostolic period was over. Therefore, he said that no one could really be precise about the exact time when the episcopate became an order clearly distinguished from other presbyters, but he did feel that it was related to the schisms which began to rend the early Church. Episcopacy, then, as Saravia understood it was not recognized as a well-defined and formalized order until these schismatic forces began to split the Church. Therefore, he said it was to that later period that the Church should look for an understanding of what form of government and ministry it should have for it had been incomplete in one way or another until then; in support of this he quoted Epiphanius as having said, "... they do now err, who would place the Church on the footing on which it was in its commencement, and incomplete form." The important point which should be noted about this is that it was when the Church was in that so-called "incomplete form" that Saravia contended these "superior presbyters" began to succeed the Apostles, yet he was very vague about how this transfer of authority took place. Since this was the most crucial part of the whole problem it can be said that Saravia failed to show how these presbyters actually became "successors" to the Apostles because he had already said that

---

1. Ibid., 209-227 [26-27].
2. Ibid., 204 [25].
they held a rank comparable to that of a bishop before the Apostles died. One explanation of this apparently irreconcilable contradiction in his thought is that he himself did not really think bishops succeeded to the full Apostolic office.¹ F. J. Shirley has drawn attention to a very important consideration which should be kept in mind when studying this period, and that is, the proper understanding of how each man defined the term "bishop."² He said that all the Protestant churches admitted that bishops were "primitive" in the sense of "senior presbyters" who had some responsibility for regional administration. Shirley said that Calvin had agreed with this understanding and that when "... Reformed ministers, like Saravia, defend Episcopacy, they have this conception in mind." It was, he said, this kind of episcopate which Jewel, Whitgift, and Hooker (except in Book VII) advocated.

With the preceding summary as background material we may now turn to see how Saravia and Beza differed about episcopacy, for this doctrine particularly must be evaluated in the context of that controversy. Beza had once held a semblance of the same idea about bishops as Calvin, who had said that he would agree to a form of constitutional episcopacy, but that he objected to monarchical bishops.³ By a constitutional bishop Calvin understood a presbyter who would be chosen "... to have dominion over his colleagues...," but who was "... subject to the meeting of the brethren." Calvin's main criticism of the bishops of his time was their neglect of the primary duties of their office.⁴

Nijenhuis even came to the conclusion after studying Calvin's correspondence and miscellaneous papers that he had "... a high appreciation of episcopacy if it served for unity in the pure doctrine and functioned in the Church in a pas-

¹. "Defensio... etc...," 155.
³. Calvin, Institutes, IV, iv, 2.
⁴. Sykes, Old Priest... etc... 40.
This was also the judgment of Saravia for he told Beza that Calvin had nowhere said that the episcopal order should be abolished for he desired only "... faith and vigilance..." in bishops.  We have already seen that Beza actually had changed from a grudging acknowledgement of episcopacy as reflected in his Confession of Faith in 1560, to a condemnation of it in later years in England, and of the superintendents in the Church of Scotland. Concomitant with this change Beza had advocated the exclusive rights of the eldership in the exercise of discipline. Evidence of his alteration of opinion about this doctrine can be found in his letter to Lord Glamis; this epistle became very influential in England among the Puritans, and in Scotland where Beza was generally held in high regard. Saravia even said that Beza's influence had become so great that if he had decided that bishops should be retained that no reformed churches anywhere would shrink from accepting them.

Beza, in his treatise to Lord Glamis, classified bishops in the following ways: (1) "divine bishops" were those presbyters charged with the pastoral care of one church, but who were called πρεσβύτεροι in regard to the sheep committed to them; (2) "human bishops" were those created for reasons of expediency and were therefore those presbyter-bishops who had been elected by their colleagues to serve as the moderators of presbyteries; (3) "satanic bishops" were those "human bishops" who exercised prelatical and tyrannical power over their fellow-presbyters and the people in their dioceses. Beza naturally felt the first type was authorized by Scripture, but

2. "Examen...etc.," Prolegom, 3rd p.; cf., "Defensio...etc.," 160. V. supra, Chapter I, "Saravia's Doctrine of the Imparity of Ministers," for reference to the way Saravia showed Beza that Calvin agreed to a hierarchy in the Church under certain conditions.
3. V., Donaldson, Scottish Reformation, 187.
4. Ibid., 191.
5. "Examen...etc.," Prolegom, 4th p.
6. Ibid., 3. Beza's letter was later published as De tripli episcopatu.
7. Ibid., 46.
8. Ibid., 46, 50.
he said that it was a matter of indifference whether the second type was retained and that the third kind should be rejected as against all Scriptural and ecclesiastical authority.

Saravia and Beza came closer to agreement about the last classification of bishops than on the others, so we shall look at this type first and later on we shall have opportunity to discuss their views about "divine" and "human" bishops. Both men thought that the Roman bishops were the main examples of those who had abused their offices and drawn to themselves unauthorized powers. Saravia sometimes spoke of the pope as the antichrist and he said all ministers who received their orders from the heretical bishops of Rome after the Reformation were themselves guilty of heresy. He emphatically stated that he was not defending such a tyrannical type of episcopacy, nor was he justifying the actions of any particular bishops for they could defend themselves without his help. He maintained that he sought only the restoration of the true episcopate, such as that which had been in the Church before the tyranny of Rome had overwhelmed the Churches of Christ. Examples of that kind of episcopate which he said to be divinely instituted were bishops like Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzus, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Irenaeus, Augustine, Ignatius, Basil the Great, etc. They had received "... an absolute power given by the Lord to the Apostles...," which consisted of celebrating the mysteries of Christ, of governing the churches, of administering discipline and of ordaining ministers to the work of the Church.

A rather lengthy and prolix part of the controversy between these men involved a discussion of the meaning of the titles given to patriarchs, metropolitans, and other officials.

---
1. "De diversis...etc.," 33; "Defensio...etc.," Prologus, 2nd p. "Responsio...Gretzeri," 352, 364, 381; "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," 195.
2. "Defensio...etc.," 327-32.
3. Ibid., 234, 252, 273.
4. A Treatise...etc., 243-49 /"De diversis...etc.," 337.
5. "Examen...etc.," 5.
politans, archbishops, and primates.1 This is related to the preceding paragraph for Beza felt that all of these offices were evidence of the way the episcopate had become corrupted through the passage of the centuries. Saravia maintained that all of these offices were necessary for the maintenance of unity, continuity, and order in the Church, but he allowed himself to be drawn away from a positive delineation of these offices to a rather tedious and unrewarding debate about whether these titles involved fastus, superbia, tyrannis, et ambitio, and whether the term χρήσις should be used of bishops at all. However, we can see in the context of all that he had to say about this subject that he has underscored a conclusion we arrived at earlier; i.e., that his whole doctrine of the Ministry was very heavily influenced by his ideas concerning the need for a hierarchy.2 Proof of this is seen in the way he adduced some of the same texts and Scriptural words to show a difference in the degrees of bishops as he had already used to show an imparity in the presbyterate.3 For example, he said that all of these offices were meant by the Apostle Paul when he spoke of "some, Apostles and some, Evangelists," thereby inferring that there was an imparity between these two orders. Saravia had already made it clear that there was a parity among the Apostles themselves,4 so he could not have been saying that that title could signify for bishops what it did not signify for the Apostles. We also have seen that he did not believe either bishops or presbyters to have succeeded the order of Evangelists,5 so the only reason he could have used these two titles together was to show a state

---

1. "De diversis...etc.," and "Defensio...etc.," chapter XXV.
2. "Defensio...etc.," 307, 313-317.
3. E.g., A Treatise...etc., 239-244. "De diversis...etc.," 31-327.
4. "Examen...etc.," 45: "Quisquis postulat inter Apostolos, qui eisdem gradus et ordinis erant, Archiapostolum et inter Evangelistas Archievangelistam dare, negatur, et seipsum aliosque fallit ignorantia substantiae Evangelici ministerii, quod unum tantum est."
5. A Treatise...etc., 79-80; cf., "Defensio...etc.," 107, 123.
of imparity which existed in New Testament times. It should also be remembered that in Chapter I we saw that these same offices were used to argue for an imparity between bishops and presbyters; Saravia believed an imparity in the presbyterate, ipso facto, proved an imparity in the episcopate. This same conclusion is proved when he said the πρεσβύτερος (Romans 12:8) and ιεράπετρος (I Cor. 12:28) both denoted these offices of archbishop, etc., although, these were titles which he had previously shown to mean presbyters of the highest order.²

In Saravia's responses to Beza's suggestions of some "bishops" as "human" and some as "divine" we can gain valuable insight about his conception of the episcopal office. The heart of their differences was whether the episcopos by the bishop was to be exercised in respect of the people of the churches, or in respect of his colleagues. Beza maintained that the latter was the correct view, for "human bishops" were first elected by their fellow-presbyters to maintain order and unity when heresy threatened the presbyteries. This type of bishop was therefore a creation of human wisdom for reasons of expediency and he had "... a kind of power..." over his colleagues which was limited by the canons adopted to prevent the usurpation of authority.³ This kind of bishop was really a prīmus inter pares, who acted as the presiding officer of presbyteries, synods, and assemblies. Beza said the "divine bishop" would have episcopos in respect of the people by virtue of his position as pastor of a church. Saravia naturally differed with both of these explanations of a bishop's episcopos for he believed this function to be neither of human origin, nor created for reasons of expediency.⁴ He believed the bishop to be divinely in-

1. Ibid., 117/12: "We see that two Orders of Gospel Ministers were at the first instituted by our Lord himself...."
2. "Defendens...etc." 102-104, 310; "Examen...etc." 8-10, 18.
3. "Examen...etc." 14.
4. "Defendens...etc." 102, where he said that episcopos was a word which he preferred not to use since it could not be found in the New Testament and seldom in the writings of the fathers, but Saravia seems to have been forced to use it for want of a better word.
stituted, although, as we have seen earlier, he did not deny that schisms in
the Church had a very important part in defining more clearly the difference
between the two orders of presbyters.

Saravia said that if episcope were only in respect of colleagues then
it would apply equally as well to deans, provosts, archdeacons, or anyone else
who had a position of authority over others, and they consequently should be
called "bishops" themselves.¹ It must, therefore, be thought of only in
respect of the grex Domini, or it would have no meaning. Presbyters were con-
sidered a part of the "Lord's flock" so the bishop's "oversight" included them
as well as the lay members of the churches.² The numbers of these presbyters
in the bishop's flock would be determined by the size of the diocese and
Saravia said that it was possible for a bishop to be over a diocese which had
only one other presbyter in it.³ In the next section we shall see how Saravia
thought the responsibilities between the presbyter and bishop should be divided
in regard to discipline, but here we should note that he felt they shared the
pastoral responsibility and spiritual care of the members. The extent to
which they shared this care of souls was related to the function of each order.
The presbyter as the head of a particular church had the pastoral care for his
parish and the bishop was to be considered pastor of the whole flock in the
diocese.⁴

In the context of this debate about episcope, Bosa introduced the state-
ment from Jerome's commentary on Titus I to the effect that bishops were created
by human custom rather than by divine institution and Jerome's statement that
presbyters and bishops differed only in that bishops could ordain.⁵ Saravia

---
¹ Eximen., etc., 16.
² Defensio., etc., 231, 252.
³ Eximen., etc., 10, 16.
⁴ Ibid., 15-16.
⁵ A Treatise., etc., 206-227 ["De diversis., etc.," 26-29]; cf.,
"Defensio., etc.,," 190.
maintained that Beza had misinterpreted Jerome by taking his words literally. To do so, he said, would put this father in agreement with Arius, who was the first man to have said that there was no difference between a presbyter and a bishop.¹ He cited in support of this statement the views of Epiphanius, an orthodox father, who refuted Arius' opinions about episcopacy. Saravia said that Jerome really meant no more by this than that bishops had been first created because of the schisms in the Church and that this did not mean that they were not divinely intended. To meet the emergency of these splits in the Church the Apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, had formally created this office. Saravia summarized his convictions about the first of Jerome's statements in these interesting and revealing words:

I accordingly conclude, that, although we should allow that the first appointment of one Bishop as head over several Presbyters was occasioned by schism, it will not therefore follow that Episcopacy was instituted solely on that account, or was not the appointment of our Lord.²

This clearly reveals again that Saravia believed "by divine right" and "by Dominical institution" to mean essentially the same thing that others meant "by Apostolical institution" for these splits did not become serious until late in the Apostolic period.³

Concerning the second of Jerome's opinions he stated that this father had really meant the bishop to have received his office in respect of his whole diocese and not in respect of the presbyters as Beza claimed, ergo, he was not primus inter pares, but the bishop was set above other presbyters and the care of the whole Church had been given to him and his fellow bishops.⁴ His argument for this was that a bishop could not create presbyters by ordination if he

¹. *Ibid.* 201-202 /257/
³. V. supra, Chapter I, "The Meaning of 'Divine Institution'...for Saravia."
⁴. *Examen...et al.* 15.
were no different from them, for only a superior order could create ministers of an inferior order.¹

Saravia’s interpretations of these passages of Jerome’s are a good indication of the subtle change which was taking place at that time in the Anglican apologetic. Earlier in the century many Anglicans had not felt that these passages needed to be refuted, for some like Jewel had cited them in their own arguments against the Roman Catholics.² Bromley has shown that Jewel also brought forth similar ideas for Chrysostom, Augustine, and Ambrose, "... to the effect that the bishop is the chief priest and not a separate minister in the strict sense."³ Field has been called the main advocate of the Hieronymian theory of episcopacy, for he often cited Jerome to show that the bishop must have "... an eminent and peerless power..." in order to prevent schisms in the Church.⁴ Whitgift also believed that Jerome’s words could be used to show not only the episcopal right to ordination, but a superiority in jurisdiction as well.⁵ Woodhouse has shown that there was widespread agreement among Elizabethans about both of these Hieronymian ideas,⁶ but we can see that by the time of Saravia the theologians were more interested in refuting what they believed to be a false understanding of these two passages than they were in making a positive use of them. Sutcliffe said that Jerome spoke "against all antiquity" and disregarded him in his treatise.⁷ Bancroft stressed that Jerome had really meant to show that bishops were preeminent to other presbyters,⁸

---

¹ "Defensio... etc.," 159-60, cited Bucer’s De Regno Christi, and De anima.
² "Jewel, Works, (1645) I, 340, 348-49; (1850) IV, 912.
³ "Bromley, "Anglicanism... etc.," S.J.T., VII, 78, cited Jewel, ibid.,
⁴ Field, Of the Church, III, 207, 214, 216-17; cf., Mason, Church of England... etc., 61.
⁵ Whitgift, Works, II, 254-57.
⁶ Woodhouse, Doctrine of the Church... etc., 89.
⁷ Sutcliffe... Ecclesiastical Discipline, 71.
⁸ Bancroft, A Survey... etc., in Tracts, 307.
while Bilson and Hooker, like Saravia, felt that Jerome could even be interpreted to have meant that Episcopacy was by divine intention.¹

Two parts of the episcopate which Saravia taught bishops to have will be considered later,² but now we should examine his idea of the episcopal role in keeping peace, harmony and unity in the Church. He saw this as being accomplished through the maintenance of the purity of doctrine rather than through a strict authoritarianism. Saravia believed that the bishop was charged with the responsibility of the doctrine of the Church in two ways: (1) he should give care that what the Church taught in all ages as the Word of God was faithful to the Scriptures and in harmony with the Apostolic and patristic tradition;³ (2) the bishop must faithfully relate the decisions of ecumenical councils to the Church and see that they are acted upon.⁴ These were tasks which the bishop carried out not as a ruler of the Church who enforced unity by his own word, but through his office as a pastor and teacher.⁵ In other words, every man who held the office of bishop, or of archbishop, was limited in his authority to the extent that he was under the explicit obligation to teach what the Word of God said and to exercise his episcopate according to the canons of the councils. He seems to have stressed heavily the nature of these episcopal limitations for several reasons. As we have seen before, he and others were still concerned about the way episcopacy had been corrupted in Roman Catholic practice. Another reason was his desire to reassure Beza and his readers in the Netherlands that episcopacy as it was then conceived of in the

². One of these will be the nature of spiritual discipline discussed in the next section, and the other will be the responsibility of the bishops for missions to the heathen (v. infra, Part II).
³. "Examen, etc.," 12.
⁴. "Defensio, etc.," 275.
⁵. Ibid., 298: "Episcopus, Pastor et Doctor legitimus totius Ecclesiae suae dioecesae in sig est."
Church of England could not go astray in this way. He felt that it would be impossible for the episcopate to draw unwarranted power to itself as long as it was subordinate to provincial or national synods. The only time he felt a bishop could go against the rulings of such bodies was when they were clearly opposed to the Word of God, but he failed to state how subjective interpretations of the Scriptures by one or more individuals could be reconciled with what he had already said about conciliar authority.

In regard to the relation of conciliar authority to that of the episcopate Saravia used the role of the "praeses" of a synod to give very helpful insight into his understanding of the authority which a bishop should have. He said in this connection that the authority of a bishop over his presbyters should be no greater than that of a "president" of a synod, or council over that of his colleagues. In as much as the head of a council has the opinions of his colleagues to follow so Bishops have the advice of their presbyters to go by, but not necessarily in the sense of being bound to them. In this way he called ecclesiastical government by bishops an aristocracy and said that it could be called a monarchy only in the sense of it being governed by the Lord Jesus Christ. This means that Saravia did not believe in monarchical episcopacy, but that he was in favor of a type of monopiscopacy. Tavard was quite right in concluding that it was Saravia's strong emphasis on conciliarism which made him repudiate the papacy and accept an aristocratic, ecclesiastical regimen rather than a monarchical one.

1. Ibid., 300.
2. "Examen...etc.," 12.
3. "Defensio...etc.," 190-91.
Saravia believed the main responsibility of a bishop was to teach or to feed the flock. "... it pertains above all things to the office of a Bishop to teach the Church entrusted to him, by himself, and by means of others."\(^1\)

We have seen that this teaching meant not only the interpretation of the Word of God and the canons of councils, but it also meant the exercise of oversight, or discipline in the Church. We have also seen that Saravia taught that all presbyters and bishops were equal in the preaching of the Word of God, but we can see from his interpretation of I Tim. 5:17 that he considered bishops to have a much heavier responsibility to "... labour in the word and doctrine."\(^2\)

He said that Paul's use of "\(\kappa\omicron\upsilon\iota\omicron\omega\upsilon\nu\tau\varepsilon\)" in this verse meant that he was referring to more than merely preaching the Gospel. So, he interpreted this word to refer to those who exercised great and painful toil in their ministry of the Word and therefore this referred to the work of the Apostles and bishops who had the responsibility of more than one church. He likewise connected the use of \(\kappa\omicron\upsilon\iota\omicron\omega\upsilon\nu\tau\varepsilon\) in I Thess. 5:12, and "\(\pi\alpha\nu\iota\iota\iota \tau\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varphi\alpha\iota\upsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon\nu \kappa\nu \kappa\omicron\iota\mu\iota\alpha\iota\upsilon\varsigma\)" in I Cor. 16:16 with this exegesis of I Tim. 5:17. The accent in all of these passages is placed by Saravia on "toil," "labour," and "working" to show that the Apostle meant that those who were called upon to do the most in the ministry of the Word should be those who received the greatest honor. In writing to Timothy, Saravia said this was the reason why Paul defined "... the office of a Bishop to be a work \(\xi\rho\sigma\upsilon\nu\), whence it follows, that to the higher office of Bishop are attached many and various troubles." Saravia was stressing here that the total office of the bishop was a "labour in the word and doctrine" whatever the nature of responsibility he had placed upon him. Therefore, he

---

\(^1\) A Treatise...etc., 269 /"De diversis...etc.," 37/.

\(^2\) For Saravia's interpretation of these passages v. "De diversis...etc.," and "Defensio...etc.," chapter XIII.
was not particularly concerned, as many have been, whether the bishop was supposed to be an administrator or a pastor. To him all of these activities would be one and the same as long as they edified and built up the Church.

Saravia did not assign a spiritual authority to bishops in any of these functions which was above or different from that of other presbyters. The fact that he spent so much time in arguing with Beza about the question of the primacy of ecclesiastical authority should not be allowed to mislead the reader of his works into thinking that this theologian felt that episcopacy was in some way an order independent from or spiritually superior to other presbyters. To say this would be the same as saying that he put the authority for governing the Church on a plane above the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments. He may have put the "authority" itself on the same level as these two, but he did not put the outward form which ecclesiastical government would take on the same level of importance as he did these two marks of the ministry. Therefore, E.T. Davies was wrong when he said that Saravia saw such "a spiritual authority" in bishops.\(^1\) To say this would be to imply that Saravia felt the unity or continuity of the Church was actually bound up in a certain order of the ministry and that he believed there were two different ministeries in the Church and that he doubted the validity of the orders of ministers who were not episcopally ordained.

We need look only at Saravia's attitude about non-episcopal churches to see how wrong it would be to say that he believed in a form of episcopacy which was spiritually superior to other presbyters. Although he made it clear that the abolition of episcopacy and the creation of temporary elders could be excused only on the grounds of necessity,\(^2\) he said he did not really see how episcopacy

---

1. Davies, Episcopacy...in the Church of England...etc., 32-33, 41.
2. "Defensio...etc.," 167-68.
could have been restored in some places,\(^1\) for in one passage he went so far as to say that those errors which had been made were made by the permission of divine providence.\(^2\) Saravia believed that in those places where the bishops had become heretical there had been no violation of the government of the Church when the whole episcopal authority had devolved upon orthodox presbyters and in such situations those presbyters were in their rights to exercise episcopate and to ordain.\(^3\) In another place he said that if Geneva wanted to have a consistory which assumed episcopal functions, "... then let Geneva enjoy its own law," but that ought to be considered a private matter which would not be recommended to other churches, for it was contrary to the Scriptures and the patristic evidence.\(^4\) This is an interesting point, for Saravia seems to be saying what Andrewes later was to say; \(i.e.,\) that just because episcopacy was by divine right "it doth not follow from thence that there is no salvation without it, or that a church cannot consist without it... To prefer a better, is not to condemn a thing."\(^5\)

In regard to those churches which had adopted a modified type of episcopal government there cannot be found any criticism of any of them.\(^6\) He did feel that some had exchanged good Greek names for bad Latin titles, but he did not think this was important for it was the res which mattered and not the nomen.\(^7\) This whole attitude was entirely in keeping with the very close relationship which he maintained all of his life with the Austin-Friars Church in London.\(^8\) It is noteworthy that it was also this church, of which John à Lasco was the first superintendent, that probably served as the model for the insti-

---

1. A Treatise...etc., 32-35 */De diversis...etc.,* Candido Lectori, 2nd. page.
2. "Examen...etc.," Prologus, 2nd. page.
3. "Defensio...etc.," 32.
4. Ibid., 216.
5. Sykes, Old Priest...etc., 74, qted., Andrewes, Opuscula, 191, 211.
6. E.g., "Defensio...etc.," 297-98, 300, for his favorable comments on the German superintendents.
7. A Treatise...etc., 226-27 /*De diversis...etc.,* 297.
8. V. supra, Introduction.
tution of the Scottish superintendents.1 If this was so, then we may justifi-
ably conclude that Saravia was very much in favor of those officers while
they lasted in the Church of Scotland.

In this discussion of the episcopal office there remains the important
matter as to whether Saravia considered episcopacy to be of the esse or de fide
of the Church. This, in a very real sense, is a natural conclusion to much
of the material in this chapter and in the preceding one for we are tying to-
gether here some of the loose ends of ideas previously left in an incomplete
state and we are also recapitulating several points which have been discussed
above. There are four ways that this material can be brought together to
show that Saravia believed episcopacy to be de fide and not of the esse of the
Church.

The first way that we can ascertain this is in the clear and simple state-
ment to his readers at the beginning of "De diversis...etc.,":

Whoever thou art, kind Reader, into whose
hands this book may fall, I would not
have you imagine, from the discussion it
contains, that any fundamental doctrine
of faith, on which salvation depends, is
called in question, by my asserting that
Episcopacy ought to be restored in those
reformed Churches which at present have
it not....

The question, then, which I discuss, is
not one involving salvation, but a question
concerning the best guides and masters by
whom we may be led in the way to eternal
salvation.2

He repeated this same idea in the Introduction to "Defensio...etc.," when he said,
"There is no controversy between us about religion but how it may be best held on
to amongst men and how it may be disseminated."3 This, then, is the general

1. Ainslie, Doctrines...in the Reformed Churches...etc., 110-111; Donaldson,
Scottish Reformation, 109.
2. A Treatise...etc., 27, 29, ("De diversis...etc.," Candido Lectori, 1st p.).
3. "Defensio...etc.," Candido Lectori, 5th. p., trans. by J. Russell.
doctrinal point from which Saravia began his doctrine of Episcopacy and there is no evidence that he departed from this principle anywhere along the way. As we have seen he blurred the lines at some points so that his position is not easily ascertained, but basically he did not depart from his conviction that episcopacy was not of the esse of the Church. In maintaining this position that episcopacy did not concern any "fundamental doctrine of faith" he also stood in agreement with Hooker and Andrewes.1

The second way this conclusion can be substantiated is that Saravia nowhere said episcopacy was "the only form of ecclesiastical government." This was revealed in his attitude towards those reformed Churches which did not have bishops. He did not believe that the episcopal rank could be cast aside "... without the great scandal of the whole of the universal Church,"2 but in times of necessity it was not only allowable, but "by divine permission, ..." that such changes could be made.3 As much as he lamented the way many churches had departed from the ecclesiastical polity which he thought to be taught in the Scriptures and the fathers, he did not suggest that those Protestants were any less a part of the Church of Jesus Christ because of their rejection of episcopacy. Consonant with this is the absence in his works of any idea that ordinations might be invalid, or that sacramental grace might be impaired, if ordinations were performed by presbyters rather than by bishops. We would be going further than Saravia himself went if we said that he taught this as a specific and exclusive form of government which was held by the successors of the Apostles; the next point will show why it would be contrary to his teaching to make what might appear to be a logical extension or projection of his thought in this way.

2. "Examen... etc.," Prologus, 5th p.
3. Ibid., 2nd p.; cf., Woodhouse, ibid., 193.
A third argument that Saravia believed this form of government to be de fide was the fact that he said that the commission of the Lord was given to the Church and not to individuals. This is a very important part of his thought which is often overlooked, but it explains much about his doctrine of Episcopacy. The Lord gave Apostolic power to the Church and the Church has the power to entrust it to bishops who act as stewards of the Lord's household, but, the Church can take this authority away from bishops in the same way that it has given it. Bishops are subject both to the laws of the land and to the canons of the synods. In this way Saravia was very close to Richard Hooker for the latter also believed that the bishop's authority could be given or taken away as the Church thought necessary. This principle really meant that the Church itself establishes the valid ministry and it cannot be established independently of the Church. As Bishop Robinson has observed, one may have as high a doctrine of the Ministry as one desires, providing always that the doctrine of the Church is higher. Therefore, it may very well have been Saravia's ecclesiology which prevented him from saying that a certain form of Church government was essential to it.

The last argument that Saravia taught episcopacy to be de fide can be seen in his claim that it was "necessary to the Church." One Anglican authority writing about this period has shown that the Oxford English Dictionary shows this word in the sixteenth century to mean "useful" without being absolutely indispensable. A very good example of this kind of interpretation of "necessary"

---

2. Cf., Carey, ibid., 15.
3. "De diversis...etc.," Candido Lectori, 2nd p.: "Quod me attinet, Episcopos Ecclesiae necessarios arbitror, et eam disciplinam et gubernationem Ecclesiae esse optimam, et divinam, quam piii Episcopi, cum veri nominis presbyteris, ex praescipto verbi Dei, et veterum Comiliorum administrant." Cf., the 1592 translation where "necessarios" is rendered "necessary." Street in his translation rendered this as "indispensably necessary"; I, also "Defensio...etc.," 294.
4. Carey, ibid., 109; cf., Peck, Anglicanism and Episcopacy (1958), 33-41, who seems to ignore this definition and interprets "necessary" to mean the same thing then as it does now, i.e., indispensable or essential.
can be seen in the way Archbishop Jewel used it: he spoke of bishops and presbyters as being "necessary parts" of the ecclesiastical government, but he did not mean by that that bishops were indispensable, for he stated elsewhere that the Church of England did not depend upon bishops.\footnote{Jewel, \textit{ibid.}, IV, 1299; III, 335.} Therefore, those Elizabethans like Saravia who spoke of bishops as being "necessary to the Church" were not arguing for episcopacy as if it were of the \textit{esse} of the Church, but as if it were \textit{de fide}. This would not prevent Saravia and many others, though, from interpreting episcopacy as being indispensable to the fullness or completeness of Church order. He would, therefore, say that it was "necessary" because it was of the \textit{bene esse} or even of the \textit{plene esse} of the Church.\footnote{For definitions of these terms, \textit{v.} A.E.J. Rawlinson, \textit{The Anglican Communion in Christendom} (1950), 48.} In so doing he was in the main stream of Anglican tradition and belief, for, as Montefiore has shown, this has been the most consistent view of the Anglican doctrine of Episcopacy in the Elizabethan period and in all subsequent centuries as well.\footnote{Carey, \textit{ibid.}, 107-108; \textit{cf.}, Sykes, \textit{ibid.}, 245, who also came to this same conclusion.}

**The Power of the Keys of the Kingdom**

We have noted at several points that Saravia's emphasis on the Commission of Christ having been given to the Church and not just to the Apostles has thrown invaluable light on certain parts of his doctrine of the Ministry. We shall find that also to be true as we consider his understanding of the power of the Keys. He usually made his references to the Keys of the Kingdom in the context of statements emphasizing that the Church as a whole had received them. Saravia felt this was a particularly important point for this was the only way he tried to show the continuation of Apostolic power in the Church after the death of the Apostles.\footnote{"Defensio...etc.," 173-74. The nature of this ecclesiastical emphasis will be seen also in Part II, Chapter II.} There are passages in which he spoke as if the Apostles...
themselves received the power and passed it on to the Church, but this doesn't really seem to be his real conviction even in those passages for he usually went on to say that this authority remains in the Church and is given to whomever the Church considers worthy of it.¹ Saravia never speaks of that authority as being a possession of the successors of the Apostles in the way he speaks of it as belonging to the Church and the Apostles. The reason for this is that he felt the Apostles received their authority immediately from God, but their successors did not; therefore, bishops receive what authority they have from the Church and through the Church.² Accordingly, he said that the Church is able to hand over the authority of ecclesiastical government to any minister of the Word of God whom it shall judge suitable to have the cure of souls of a number of churches and the right of overseeing them.³ So far as is known, Bilson was the only Elizabethan divine who differed from this view.⁴ He said the keys were given to the Apostles and by them to the Church. However, in interpreting a quotation from Augustine, Bilson showed that he did not think of the "'the whole church'" as meaning the people, but rather the successors of the Apostles. This is a very significant difference from the view of Saravia who felt it was given to all the Christians who heard Christ give the Great Commission on the Mount of Ascension.⁵

Saravia looked on the Apostles and their successors as being representatives of the Church, so that whatever authority they held they held it in obedience to the Church as the Body of Christ. These "successors" were not

---

1. A Treatise...etc., 190-191 /"De diversis...etc.," 23/.
2. Ibid.
3. "Defensio...etc.," 175: "... Ecclesia potest cuivis verbi Dei Ministro, quem maxime indicaverit idoneum, committere: ut plurium Ecclesiarum curam, et inspectionem habeat."
5. "Defensio...etc.," 173.
just bishops but were all presbyters whether of a superior or inferior order. 1

The former received the authority to preach, administer the sacraments and to
govern the Church. The latter received only the first two notes of this
authority fully, and, to some extent, Saravia felt that they participated in
the third note. He usually spoke of the Bishops as being "the successors of
the Apostles," 2 but this was understood in the sense that they were peculiarly
their successors only in the ecclesiastical government of the Church.

A recent study of the Reformed view of the power of the keys has broadly
defined the exercise of this power in terms of the mission of the Church in
which the reconciliation of God is brought to mankind, thus enabling men to
grow in the Christian life. 3 This was usually divided into two parts, i.e.,
the key of doctrine and the key of discipline or polity. This is a helpful
definition for it is in general agreement with Saravia's views of the power of
the keys; however, when he spoke of them he nearly always had ecclesiastical
polity in mind and not ecclesiastical doctrine. For example, he said that
the powers of binding and loosing on earth what shall be bound and loosed in
Heaven (Matt. 16:19; 18:18) could be divided into two parts. 4 The first
part was the authority to ordain and the second part was the censorship of
customs. The former part belonged solely to the episcopate, but the latter
part was committed to both bishops and presbyters. This he felt was neces-
sary so that all things might be done with "decency" and "order" and so that

---
1. Ibid., 32: A quotation from G. Altisiodorensis' Summa, Bk. 4:
"Presbyteri, sicut et Episcopi, in sua ordinacione, claves regni coelorum
acciunt; sunt enim etiam Apostolorum successores."  
2. "Examen...etc.," 27; cf., Whitgift, ibid., II, 355.  
3. A.G. MacDougall, "The Keys of the Kingdom" (Thesis, University of
4. "De diversis...etc.," 1: "Ha duo membra habet: alterum ordinationem
Ministrorum, alterum censuram morum continent."
might be maintained among Christians. Therefore, like Hooker, Saravia thought the potestas ordinationis to be the special prerogative of the bishop and the censura morum to be shared in a limited way with presbyters. Therefore, like Hooker, Saravia thought the potestas ordinationis to be the special prerogative of the bishop and the censura morum to be shared in a limited way with presbyters. 

We shall consider the latter first and then look at the powers of ordination which he believed bishops to hold. However, in both of these areas of thought it is surprising how little he actually said about them. Considering that he himself said that the main area of contention with Beza was about ecclesiastical government one would have expected him to say much more about the power of the keys.

In the passages dealing with the censura morum Saravia devoted most of his attention to the nature of the advice and help presbyters should give bishops in their consistories. The reason for this was Beza's claim that these consistories, or courts of ecclesiastical law, should be conducted by presbyters with a presbyter-bishop in charge. These consistories which he recommended were to be composed of two kinds of ministers, i.e., the minister of the Word and the teaching elder, whom he called a "κυβερνήτης". In support of this he cited the pseudo-Ambrose complaint that elders were no longer used in the ecclesiastical councils. Saravia responded to this by saying that the elders meant in that statement were the venerable and wise old men who deserved both honor and the right to share their wisdom with others. He was therefore agreeing to the use of laymen in such a capacity, but objecting to Beza's "κυβερνήτης" who were not ministers of the Word. Saravia would have no part in a "temporary presbyter" for he thought all of the government of the Church should be bound to the preaching of the Word and the administration of the

2. "Defensio, etc.," 272. A "κυβερνήτης" was sometimes called a senior.
3. Ibid., 273-74.
sacraments, because only such a minister was authorized to bind and to loosen.\(^1\) Therefore he felt it to be beyond all controversy that a minister actually "loosed" sinners when he promised remission of sins in the name of Christ and the promise had been sealed by baptism.\(^2\) In the same manner the minister could "bind" sinners by pronouncing the "wrath of God and eternal judgment" and by refusing them the sacraments. This strong conviction that the powers of binding and loosing should be related to the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments led him to reject the right of Beza's *kýbernētē* to share these powers, but he would not categorically say that magistrates had no right to some "censure of moral customs."\(^3\) However, as far as the exercise of this authority by ministers was concerned he felt that it was a very heavy responsibility for a minister did it at his own danger. By this he had in mind two things: (1) every minister must give an accounting to the bishop, or archdeacon, in his visitations, for then he must answer if he has admitted the unworthy to the Table of the Lord, or if he has wrongly prohibited those who were worthy;\(^4\) (2) excommunication should be used only for the building of the Church, for if more evil than good came of it then Saravia said that it should not be exercised.\(^5\)

Saravia contended that the bishop alone should decide about matters which were brought before the consistory.\(^6\) He said that if his own bishop were to ask him, or other pastors of churches, to hear and to decide ecclesiastical cases that neither he, nor any one of his colleagues, would obey such an order. He felt that it was his task as a pastor to show the bishop what sins had been

---

\(^1\) Ibid., 93, 95. \(\text{N. fratri...etc.}^\) 19-20 for his views on excommunication.

\(^2\) A Treatise...etc., 55 *De diversis...etc.* 2/.

\(^3\) Ibid, 53-55 \(\text{/1-2/}^\).

\(^4\) "Examen...etc.," 11.

\(^5\) "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," 260.

\(^6\) "Defensio...etc.," 273.
committed in the church and that which he thought necessary to put it right, but it was the episcopal duty to examine the matter and pass judgment on it. This was not to say that bishops should not heed the advice of lawyers and theologians whenever necessary, for the powers of bishops had been so delimited by laws that they could only act on the best judgment of what the ecclesiastical canons really taught.\textsuperscript{1} It seemed no less inconsistent to Saravia that one man should preside and adjudicate matters in a religious court than for one man to sit as a judge in a magistrate's court; and he felt that both courts must be ultimately presided over by God Himself if Justice were to be done.

Most of the writers of the Elizabethan period insisted on the constitutional nature of the episcopate; \textit{i.e.}, the bishops were not to have a princely power, but a fatherly and a pastoral authority, within which their authority was so limited that they "should do nothing on important matters without the advice of the presbyters."\textsuperscript{2} This was also Saravia's understanding of the powers of the episcopate, that is, as long as the presbyters were true presbyters of the Word.\textsuperscript{3} It was true he said that the Apostles were able to do much in the Church on their own authority without consulting the pastors of churches but this same right was not extended by the canons of the Church to bishops, for he said that they did not have the same direction by the Holy Spirit which the Apostles had had.\textsuperscript{4} This kind of consultation was necessary on any matters which were not covered in the Scriptures or in ecclesiastical regulations; however, in those matters about which a decision had been made at some time in the past there was no need of deliberations and the bishop could act on his own authority. Therefore, Saravia said that formerly

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} Ibid., 27f.
  \item \textsuperscript{2} Woodhouse, \textit{ibid.}, 90.
  \item \textsuperscript{3} "Examen..., etc.," 11.
  \item \textsuperscript{4} "Defensio..., etc.," 291.
\end{itemize}
bishops had had greater need of presbyterial advice than they did in his own day, for many regulations had already been drawn up to guide and to limit their powers. Presbyters were created not to govern the bishops but that they might be a help to them, and they governed their churches according to the canons drawn up for that purpose. Therefore, a Presbyter should not govern a church by his own taste, or by his own judgment, but by the opinion and consent of his bishop and archbishop, and evenly the common counsel of all of the bishops of the whole nation.

Saravia assigned the potestas ordinacionis to the bishops, but he did not mean by this that everything connected with ordination was completely in the possession of the bishops. In the first place he said the ministry of the Church is the gift of the Holy Spirit which God confers on men through men or directly by Himself. The Prophets, Apostles and the Evangelists had received an extraordinaria vocatio and they were therefore ordained by no man. Ministers who receive the ordinaria vocatio are called by God's Spirit but must be ordained by men. In the making of the latter type of minister, he said that there were two parts: the first is election and the second is ordination. The election of ministers he assigned to the governors of the Church who were made up of both the magistrates and the people. In this way Saravia said he was neither leveling a reproach against the laws of the state nor against the custom of patronage. In regard to patronage he said that he would like it reformed in some respects, but did not want it taken away from private authority.

1. Ibid., 273.
2. "Examen... etc.," 12-13.
3. Ibid., 31.
4. "Defensio... etc.," 7: "Electionem ministrorum Ecclesiae gubernatoribus ita tribu, ut nec ipsos Christianos magistratus, nec populum exclusam, quin illi, prout leges iuraque locorum ferunt, praesentent quos elegerint, consecrandos vel ordinandos vel constituendos Episcopis."
ever, create presbyters in the same way that electors might create a king.  

Saravia felt that the election of a king was a "true creation," but the election of a presbyter was but a necessary part of his creation. The real act of the creation of a presbyter came in the examination both of doctrine, of character and then the communication of ecclesiastical authority with prayers and the laying on of hands.  

All of these things fell within the province of bishops so a man might be fully elected as a presbyter but rejected by the bishop; therefore, he could say "I judge that nothing has been done by the people, or the magistrate, unless there is also the laying on of the hands of those who are in charge of the Church."  

It might appear from this quotation and from the preceding statement about "ecclesiastical power" that Saravia attached some charismatic significance to ordination, but this conclusion would not be true. He actually told Beza that the matter of the laying on of hands was of little real importance, and Saravia gave more emphasis to the matter of the examination than to the rite of ordination itself, or, as he sometimes called it "appointment" /"aut (si quis malit) constitutionem ministrorum/.

In regard to the transmission of a charismatic power in the ordination it would be a perversion of Saravia's use and understanding of "potestas Ecclesiae" throughout his treatises to interpret this as meaning either a transmission of the grace of the Holy Spirit, or a kind of sacerdotal power. He used potestas in the sense of "the authority or the right" to an office. In this manner the presbyter in ordination received authorization to perform the duties and tasks of a minister, but this did not mean that some "essential power" was given.

So far as is known the only Elizabethan divine to teach some "unique power" to

---

1. "Examen... etc.," 30.
2. "Defensio... etc.," 7.
3. Ibid., trans. by J. F. Russell.
4. "Examen... etc.," 30.
5. "Defensio... etc.," 7; of, "N. fratri... etc.," 14.
be received at ordination was Hooker, who said that the words in the Ordinal used at that rite \( \text{receive the Holy Ghost} \) mean that something really is given.\(^1\) Hooker believed that the power once given constituted a mark that was indeleble. Saravia apparently thought that God set a man aside at ordination for his life's work and gave him power to carry out that task, but he did not see this as a mechanical process guaranteed by virtue of ministerial ordination; rather it was the fulfilment of the promise of God that whatever was done, was done not by human strength, but in the power of the Holy Spirit who never gave His power in such a way that it could be "possessed" by a man.\(^2\)

In the preceding section we saw that Saravia had an understanding attitude and an open mind towards those churches without bishops and that he refused to invalidate their ordinations, for he felt that in cases of necessity that it was permissible for those churches to allow orthodox presbyters to ordain. Where bishops were heretics, absent, or were not able to be had, then ordinations by presbyters were possible but only in the case of real necessity.\(^3\)

Indeed, in such times when the higher ranks have gone off into heresy, or had been removed for some other valid reason, the whole power of the keys of the Church then devolved upon the presbyters. In some of his autobiographical references Saravia occasionally spoke of his ministry in the Netherlands as a Reformed pastor as if he himself had exercised the power of the keys in this way.\(^4\) There seems to have been little in this view which differed from the other

\(^1\) Watts, "Doctrine of the Church...etc.," 143, cited Hooker, Ecc. Pol., V, lxxvii, 8.

\(^2\) Cf., Woodhouse, ibid., 77. Saravia believed only the Apostles "possessed" the Holy Spirit in this way.

\(^3\) "Defensio...etc.," 32-33.

\(^4\) A Treatise...etc., 133-34. "De diversis...etc.," 14, pagination wrong. The translator, A.W. Street, said in a footnote on p. 133 that Saravia did not really mean that presbyters could assume the authority of the episcopate in such cases of necessity, but this is precisely what Saravia did say and evidently meant.
Elizabethans of the time, for Hooker, 1 Field, 2 Bancroft, and Andrewes, 3 all expressed themselves in similar terms. The views of these men would suggest that it was very likely that Protestants who had not been episcopally ordained in foreign churches would not have to be re-ordained upon coming to England. The really remarkable thing about all of this is that Saravia never once mentioned his own ordination, nor did he discuss his views about the need to re-ordain those coming from non-episcopal churches.

Saravia defined ordination as the "consecration, or sanctification of a man to the ministry of our Lord and God; in which, through the imposition of hands the authority [potestas] of teaching and of ministering the sacraments was given by those to whom such an act is appropriate." 4 In the last phrase of that quotation we can see again the point at which he and Beza differed about the meaning of those who could exercise the episcopate in the Church. Beza cited I Tim. 4:14 to show that the Apostle Paul had stated very clearly that it was the presbyters who had laid their hands on Timothy and that it had not been one of a superior order. 5 In another place Beza said these presbyters were a "presbyterium", or a college of presbyters. 6 Saravia disagreed with him on both counts for he said it was the understanding of the fathers that "presbyterium" did not mean a college, or assemblage, of presbyters. He then quoted Theodoret to the effect that "presbyterium" here meant those who had received the apostolic grace, and, Chrysostom, to the effect that Paul was not speaking of "presbyters" when he used "-presbyterium", but was speaking of

2. Sykes, ibid., 75, cited Field, Of the Church, III, 154-71.
5. Ibid., 28.
6. "Defensio...etc.," 212.
bishops. 1 Saravia went on to show that Calvin also understood the word in question to mean "the presbyteral office" rather than "an assemblage of presbyters." He adduced further proof for this contention by saying that II Tim. 1:6 and I Tim. 5:22 likewise referred to the function of the presbyterate rather than the presbytery and that they taught the same thing as I Tim. 4:14; namely, that the creation of presbyters was proper to the bishops and not to the presbyters themselves. 2 He was perfectly willing to say that presbyters also laid hands on the man in the ceremony but they did so in the sense of showing agreement with the ordination and not to signify that they themselves were authorizing the ordination.

One very interesting facet of the way Saravia interpreted these and other passages of Scripture (II Cor. 8:19; Luke 22:66) is that he sometimes taught them to mean ordination to the presbyterate and sometimes ordination and consecration to the episcopate. An example of this is where he said of I Tim. 4:14 and II Tim. 1:6, "these words are understood to be about the ordination of Timothy to the ministry of the Gospel, and about the gift which he then received...." 3 This "ministry" was understood by the fathers to have been that of a "...presbyter of a superior degree, that is a bishop...." Therefore, Saravia adduced these verses to show that Timothy had actually been ordained as a bishop, and this is congruent with what he said in another place to the effect that bishops were not always made from presbyters, but sometimes from the diaconate and sometimes from the laity. 4 Saravia apparently accepted it to be a

---

1. Ibid. : "nam per Presbyterium, collegium Presbyterorum Patres negant intelligi." No. ref. given for his quotations from Chrysostom and Theodoret, but on p. 291 he cited the ref. from Calvin as Institutes, Bk. IV, Chap. III.
3. "Examen...etc.," 28.
4. A Treatise...etc., 217-18 /"De diversis...etc.," 27-28/.
fact that the consecration of bishops was of a later period than this, but this raises a question which he failed to answer about the ordination of bishops themselves. Earlier we noted that he accepted Bucer's statement that only a superior order could create an inferior order,¹ so how did he see bishops as having been ordained after the time of the Apostles? Perhaps this omission can be explained by an oversight in his development of his doctrine which drew the attention of Fr. Tavard.² He said that Saravia actually mixed two questions which ought to be distinguished, that is, in his effort to establish the Apostolic origin of episcopacy, Saravia more or less took it for granted that bishops and priests were of separate orders. Tavard said that in doing this he accepted a dilemma which was implicit in the Presbyterian criticism of episcopacy, for either episcopacy is both an order and of divine origin, or it is neither. Saravia thought it was both, but, as we have seen at several points, he failed to give the proper attention to his understanding of "order", or "degree" and consequently to the relation of bishops to the Apostles and other presbyters, and as we have seen above he even failed to show the nature of imparity in the episcopal order itself.

Conclusion

The doctrine of Episcopacy was the most controversial doctrine in the Church of England during the closing years of the sixteenth century. The effects of the corruption of this office in medieval times and the strong opposition of many Protestants made it not only controversial, but these factors also determined to a very large extent the nature of the defense made for episcopacy by its adherents. Saravia was caught up in this polemic and controversy, but

¹ V. supra, p. 139; cf. "Defensio...etc.," 159-60.
² Tavard, Catholicity, 36-37.
there are signs in his works that he was looking towards a time when a dogmatic study of this doctrine might be given. His arguments for a divine right of episcopacy based on Scriptural grounds are definite indications that Anglicanism was moving towards a positive statement of this doctrine. Also, Saravia's efforts to base his case on the ancient Church and former bishops like Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyprian, etc., are additional signs that he was not trying to justify the continuation of episcopacy in the Anglican Reformation as much as he was seeking to prove that form of ecclesiastical government which he believed to have divine and traditional authority. We have seen that others like Hooker and Bilson were also moving in this direction, but Saravia is worthy of special significance because he gave this movement its initial impetus.

One way that Saravia did this was to put great stress upon the need for Apostolic authority in the Church. He felt this was the answer to the understanding of the true nature of the Church and the proper Constitution and role of the ministry. Even though he failed to be precise about that which was *sui generis* of the Apostolate we have seen that he considered the Apostles to be the foundation of the Church and as such that no one would ever be able to succeed them. Whereas, this role of the Apostles should have been considered that which was of the "essence" of the Apostolate, Saravia used this word to show that which was meant to be permanent in the Apostolate and not temporary. He sought in this way to indicate the continuity which all ministers had with the Apostles, but he did not mean that bishops as successors of the Apostles were actually added to the Apostolic college, or even became Apostles in the sense that that word was used of the Twelve. It would seem to appear from Saravia's interpretation of the "essence" of the Apostolate as consisting of the three continuing marks of the ministry that he had the same idea as that of
Bilson who taught that ministers themselves constituted the Church because they succeeded the Apostles in their only permanent functions. However, Saravia avoided that pitfall by vesting the authority of the Apostolate in the Church and not in an order of the ministry or in the hands of individuals. If he had not done this then it seems that inevitably he would have been forced to conclude that the ministry constituted the Church and not vice-versa. It was, therefore, Saravia's ecclesiology which ultimately determined the nature of his doctrine of the Ministry.

The ecclesiological context in which Saravia set this doctrine is also seen in the manner which he believed the Apostolica potestas to have been handed on from one generation to another. His insistence on the right of the Church as a whole to give the authority for the governing of the Church to those whom it chose, precluded any possibility of bishops transmitting a charismatic grace or power to their successors or in their ordinations. This meant that the power was not transmitted horizontally from one generation to another, but it was ultimately dependent on a vertical reception of power from Christ as the Head of the Church. Thus, Saravia ruled out those ideas of a legalistic or mechanical power tactually transmitted through ordination or consecration; instead, he pointed to the necessity of a proper doctrinal relationship with the Apostolic teachings and the complete and total submission of independence upon the Lordship of Christ as the true sources of the authority of the ministry in the Church.

Saravia taught the office of the bishop to be primarily a "labouring in the Word and doctrine" and this he believed encompassed all of the episcopal functions of oversight, pastoral care and discipline, teaching, administering the sacraments, and of the administering and governing of the Church. Many
of these tasks were shared with other presbyters but Saravia said that some were particularly those of the bishop by virtue of his role as a successor of the Apostles. Even though he did not assign a spiritual authority to the bishop which was superior to that of the presbyter we can see that he nevertheless had a very high conception of the role of the bishop in the Church. He saw him as uniquely responsible for maintaining unity with the decisions of the ecumenical councils of the past, as keeping harmony in the Church, and preventing schisms through his role as teacher and administrator, and he saw him as the one primarily responsible for seeing that the Church carried the Gospel to the heathen. The kind of authority which Saravia taught the episcopate to have is probably best understood in his analogy of the authority of the "praeses" of a council. The bishop was bound by prior decisions of the council and he was supposed to listen to the advice of his colleagues, but he was not necessarily obligated to act as they might wish him to. Saravia’s emphasis on counciliarism indicates a concept of ecclesiastical government which could be called aristocratic but not prelatical and a type of episcopacy which could be called monepiscopal but not monarchical. Episcopacy was for him not of the esse of the Church, but de fide it should be thought of as of the bene esse or even possibly of the plene esse of the Church.
CHAPTER III
THE RELATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Introduction

The problem of the relation of the Church to the State has never been completely solved and it probably never will be because the Church must exist in human society, but it recognizes and professes obedience to a supra-human authority.1 This has created a tension between the two which has made their association the preeminent problem of many periods in history. During the sixteenth century this tension was suppressed by the threat of external forces which accentuated their dependence upon one another and minimized their conflicts of interests. This kind of relationship gave many people great hope for a lasting and harmonious commonwealth of mutual concern between these two institutions. One of these people was Hadrian Saravia, who, although he wrote his main treatise dealing with this subject circa 1610, reflected the optimism which was more in keeping with the situation during Elizabethan times. Some of the tension which had been dormant in that earlier period was already beginning to come to the surface in the early seventeenth century and before that century was half over it overflowed in the form of a civil war.

Through the Middle Ages and even during and after the Reformation the political doctrines of European countries were dominated by religious considerations. This had been caused by the supremacy of papal power before the Reformation, and afterwards, by the residual tendency to regard politics as a branch of theology. With the coming of the Reformation, though, new life came

1. Davies, Episcopacy...in the Church of England...etc., 59-60.
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to theology and there was a growing tendency to begin to regard the study of political matters as having independent validity. This was caused not only by the renewal of theological thought, but also by the simultaneously developing consciousness of social and nationalistic aspirations. Even so, the Church and the State continued throughout the sixteenth century to impinge upon nearly every aspect of the life of the other, but with the all-important difference that there emerged the possibility of a new kind of relationship between them. This new entente was the result in England, and in other countries participating in the Reformation, of the recognition by political and ecclesiastical leaders that the power of Rome could only be thrown off with the help of the State.¹ The only logical alternative in England to papal supremacy was to replace it with Royal Supremacy whereby the King of England was designated "... the only Supreme Head of the Church."² This had far-reaching theological significance, particularly in regard to the doctrine of the Ministry. We shall see this quite clearly in our examination of Saravia's thoughts on the Church-State relationship. The conclusion has been reached in the two preceding chapters that Saravia had a high concept of the ministry, but surprisingly enough, we shall see in this chapter that late in his life he tended to minimize the role and authority of the bishop and presbyter in order to elevate the authority of the king and magistrate. Therefore, this chapter is important not only because it lays bare his thoughts on the Church and State in a Commonwealth and that nature of his Erastianism, but also because it throws additional light on his doctrine of the Ministry. In order to understand why these doctrines were so related to one another in his thought it is necessary

² Henry M. Gwatkin, Church and State in England to the Death of Queen Anne (1917), 152.
first to look at some medieval ideas which had a strong influence on Saravia. Following that section there will be one about the Commonwealth which represents his thought at the time of the writing of his first treatises (circa 1590-1595). The last two sections which are on the divine right of kings and Erastianism are representative of his thoughts towards the end of his life.

The Constitutive Principle of Society

The sixteenth century establishment of the Church in England reflected the medieval notion of a universe which was above all else unified and in harmonious agreement with itself and its Creator.1 This idea had been developed to a very high degree by Scholastics like Aquinas, Duns Scotus, and Occam, but it reached its zenith in the works of Nicholas of Cusa in the fifteenth century. In his "Concordantia Catholica", Cusanus drew a great portrait of all mankind organized in agreement with a divine, cosmic harmony.2 This work of thinkers like Nicholas of Cusa can be traced to the idea of Augustine that unity came before plurality and that ultimately the unity of the creation was founded in the unity of the Trinity. Naturally this theory had great significance for all theological concepts related to human society and it is to this source that we can trace the medieval idea of a commonwealth which was known as the corpus christianum or the societas perfecta.3 In this view mankind was thought to be bound up in a single, visible community which had been constituted by God into the two orders of life - i.e., the temporal and the spiritual.

Gierke has shown that these theologians saw this relationship not only as

---

1. I am indebted to the work of Professor Gierke for many of these ideas about medieval influence on the doctrines of Church and State, (y. Otto Gierke, Political Theories of the Middle Age, trans. by F.W. Maitland /1909/, 1-61 ).
2. Ibid., 23. Saravia was very familiar with this work and quoted many passages from it to refute the Jesuit claims that the pope was above the oecumenical councils, (y. "Responsio....Gretzeri...etc.," 366ff); cf., "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," 218.
3. Cf., Davies, ibid., 100.
a unity, but also as a duplicity, because the two were alike but were not actually synonymous with one another; *ergo*, they thought that there must be some conflict between these two states of being.\(^1\) It was in this conflict of the spiritual with the temporal that they found the origin of the relation of the Church to the State. However, the most significant thing about all of this for our purposes is that they refused to accept this dichotomy between the two as final and consequently they sought a synthesis in an ever higher unity. The great conflicts of these two institutions in the Middle Ages can largely be explained by the manner in which this reconciliation between them was continually attempted. None of these theologians could be satisfied with a separation of powers so they all looked for a distribution of them which would reflect their understanding of God's will for the ordering and arrangement of society.

The medieval doctrine of Society as a *corpus christianum* taught that every community must be ordered in such a way that it should be recognized as a component part of God's ordering of the whole world, for every "... earthly group must appear as an organic member of the *civitas Dei*, that God-State, which comprehends the heavens and the earth."\(^2\) Carried to its ultimate conclusion this theocratic notion of society meant that the eternal ideal and purpose of every individual man must reflect the aim and object of the larger community of which he was a part. Therefore, the world, which is "One Organism, animated by One Spirit, fashioned by One Ordinance,..." was supposed to evidence the same principles in the structure of each of its parts which appeared in the make-up of the universal totality; i.e., the *microcosm* in which the *macrocosm* would

---

be mirrored. This was a theory of human society which had two sides: (1) the divine plan of the universe must be accepted as a prototype of the first principles which govern the make-up of human communities; (2) the cooperative association in the community must be stressed to the extent that the duty of every member could be evaluated primarily in regard to the whole and not in regard to himself. In both of these ways the rule of law and the due process of its execution as expressed in jurisdiction was of the greatest importance to people in the sixteenth century. After all, it was this regard for law and order which made possible the almost unbelievable changes in England which occurred during the time of the Henrician establishment of Royal Supremacy, then the repeal by Mary and Phillip, and finally the re-establishment of that Supremacy under Queen Elizabeth. If the people had not been thoroughly conditioned to obey the laws of their sovereigns these vast changes never would have been possible.

Saravia was considerably influenced by these medieval concepts, for a glance at the chapter titles of "De imperandi authority... etc.," will show that he was simply restating for the most part what theologians had been saying for several centuries about society as a corpus christianum. The extent to which he followed these medieval paths is rather surprising for there was little evidence of this kind of influence in all those treatises written twenty years earlier. For example, in Part II we shall see that a very significant part of Saravia's doctrine of Missions, which he discussed only in "De diversis... etc." and Defensio... etc." was the way he broke loose from the

1. Ibid.
2. Allen, Political Thought... Sixteenth Century, 137.
stereotyped ideas of a corpus christianum to show that the Church had an interna-
tional responsibility for carrying the Gospel to the heathen. Yet, in "De
imperandi authoritate...etc." he seems to have slipped back into the pattern
of viewing christian society as being restricted by its national boundaries,
its social foundations, and its cultural qualities. Another example of this
kind of change will be seen later in this chapter when we examine his
Erastianism. This also was not at all apparent in those earlier works, but it
was a strong part of the last treatise he wrote. In "De diversis...etc.," Saravia
spoke of the Commonwealth as if it were one organic society of which
the Church and State were only different aspects of the one entity.¹ At that
time he spoke of the king as the ruler over the whole of society but there was
no mention of the civil power as being superior to the ecclesiastical power.
In "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," the Commonwealth is hardly mentioned,
but the emphasis is on an Erastian concept of the relation of Church and State.

Saravia's philosophy can be described in the following tripartite manner:
(1) human affairs are all governed and sustained by the providence of God;
(2) man was created for the worship of God and the cultivation of society;
(3) society depends upon some being in positions of authority and the rest being
in obedience to that authority - he indicated that he believed that those in the
first group all received their power from God and those in the second group all
were destined for servitude by God. He divided authority into four kinds,
private, public, civil, and ecclesiastical, and he said that the refusal of
people to be obedient in any of these areas was to wrong God and the law of
nature.² The logical deduction which Saravia drew from the premise of God as
the source of all authority was that all laws were complementary to each other

¹. This was very much like Stephen Gardiner's treatment of this subject
in "De Vera Obedientia" in 1535. Saravia expressed admiration of Bishop
Gardiner and very likely was influenced by his work, (c. "Defensio...etc.,"
45); cf., Davies, ibid., 118.
². "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," 120.
and that all governments were the gifts of the Holy Spirit. To him it seemed completely rational to say that if these governments were properly constituted every person within their domains would be able to see what his part was in serving the greater whole and also what the part of any other person should be in such a society.¹

Society, he said, actually originated at the same time as the creation of man, so theologically it should be thought of as a creation of God and a gift to man.² Society and its manifestations were therefore thought to be a part of that lex naturae to which some Anglicans gave a lot of attention in the sixteenth century. Hooker was the foremost advocate of the law of nature, but then he was also the one most convinced of the importance of the nature of all law for theology. In the first book of Ecclesiastical Polity he examined very carefully the nature of law as such and then wrote the remaining books of that work as an application of the principles which he had laid down in Book I.³ He gave particular attention to the lex naturae because he felt that man's reason taught it and by his own strength man could fulfill it;⁴ this law was for him the light of human reason which man might know apart from revelation. Hooker consequently equated lex with ratio and tended to stress the power of reason as complementary to the authority of the Scriptures. A basic part of his argument with the Puritans was that Scripture could not be considered an all-sufficient basis of authority since it did not contain a precise form of either ecclesiastical or civil government.

It is very likely that Saravia was influenced by Hooker's ideas, but he had different interests and purposes in writing his treatise than Hooker had

¹. Ibid.
². Ibid., 167-68.
⁴. For Hooker's ideas on law and reason, (v. Shirley, Richard Hooker... etc., 75-92; Davies, Ibid., 44-61). The lex naturae was a stoic term which was revived during the Renaissance.
had in writing the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity; e.g., he seemed to have been only slightly interested in the nature of law, and although he often mentioned the lex naturae he never defined its meaning. Once he spoke of it as being the same as the ius gentium, but this doesn't really help us to understand what he meant by the term for he also thought kings were above the law of nations but under the law of nature. 1 Whereas Hooker carefully differentiated between the law of nature, positive law, and the supernatural law, Saravia usually spoke only of the law of nature and of divine law. Like Hooker, Saravia could be said to have identified "law" with "reason" but here again he gave much less thought to the latter than his colleague had given. He believed Scripture was an all sufficient authority for civil and ecclesiastical governments and where he used reason it was simply to show that natural law agreed with divine law. Saravia was far from being the closely-reasoned thinker Richard Hooker was, but for our purposes here we can say that there was basic agreement between them that the State was a natural and not an artificial creation. 2  

The main emphasis which Saravia made in his treatise was on the sumnum imperium rather than on ius or the nature of law. He felt that this could certainly be traced to the time of Noah and that it probably existed even in ante-diluvian times. Noah, he said, was the prince of all the earth because he possessed the sumnum imperium, but when Noah died this was divided among his sons and grandsons so that no one could ever again rule the whole earth. 3 In each nation the laws and the order of the land must issue from the one, or ones, who held that highest authority. Originally this was intended to be monarchical in form and therefore only one person should have this sumnum imperium,  

1. "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," 2:4: "Ius gentium, hoc est, naturae lex..." Cf., "Examen...etc.," 105.  
2. Shirley, ibid., 93.  
3. "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," 167-68.
but Saravia said that where a few of the people, as in an aristocracy, or, all of the people, as in a democracy, had gotten control of it, then it could be held by them as well. He said that even though the monarchy was the divinely intended form of government that people should not try to overthrow a democracy or aristocracy in order to create a monarchy for there could be no rebellion against this sumnum imperium. Also, it was impossible, he said, for any of these forms of government to be mixed with a monarchy, for a monarch could not be a monarch if the people had any control over him through a constitution or in their laws.\(^1\) Thus, although a monarchy was a divine gift to mankind Saravia did not think it was of the esse of civil government. The thing that was essential was this sumnum imperium without which a State could not exist, for he said that in every country there must be an authority which was subordinate to no other power except to God and the law of nature.\(^2\) This, for Saravia, was the basic constitutive principle of society because he held that this above all else was necessary for the preservation of order and harmony in the State.

This emphasis on this kind of authority in society naturally meant that men were not born free but into a state of servitude. The greatest danger to such authority was the "Amor libertatis", for this sprang from the evil and selfish desires of man since it caused him to fight against the "Auctoritas imperandi".\(^3\) "Freedom", said Saravia, was oftentimes vulgarly defended and praised to the skies as if it were the most important source of human good. This desire for freedom in the State was not the product of rational thought, but of a primitive urge to rebel against being in subjection to another person, and, like the fall of man in the Garden of Eden, it could be said to be rebel-

\(^1\) Ibid., 162-64.
\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Ibid., 119.
lion against God Himself. Therefore, Saravia justified this notion of the natural state of people as being one of servility on the grounds that they lived in a theocratic society. The divine power then was the ultimate force in establishing and constituting the State.

The Commonwealth: Saravia's Concept of Church-State Relations in the Elizabethan Period

The influence of these medieval concepts of society which we have just discussed made it almost inevitable that the Tudor monarchs and reformers would adopt some form of a Christian Commonwealth when the Henrician and Elizabethan settlements were made. This met their need for a unified society which all felt to be necessary for the preservation of the Church and the State and at the same time it gave expression to the rising spirit of nationalism in England during that century. It seemed to theologians and politicians alike that it was to the mutual advantage of both institutions for the Church and the State to be established in the context of a divinely ordered society. The main difference in their conception of this new settlement and the medieval concept of a theocratic society was that after the Reformation the spiritual head was not to be the pope but the reigning monarch of the country. Therefore, under the Royal Supremacy, the king was thought to be competent to govern in matters of a spiritual nature as well as those of commerce or politics.¹

The theologians of the Tudor period considered the Church and the State to be unified under Royal Supremacy, but this did not mean that they thought of these institutions as being one and the same thing. Richard Hooker, who was the most influential Elizabethan writer on this subject, like all of his contemporaries, saw a functional difference between the two.² This was thought

¹ Shirley, ibid., 127-28.
² Ibid., 114.
to be a distinction of "nature" so that it could be said of the Commonwealth that, "... in its political aspect it is a State, in its ecclesiastical a Church." Hooker, like Saravia, realized that this distinction was of more than passing significance for two reasons. First of all, it distinguished their position from that of the Puritans who thought it blasphemy to identify these in this way and consequently said that there was a difference in "essence" between them. The second reason was that it gave them some protection from excessive royal domination in deciding about doctrinal matters. However, Hooker and all the other leaders of his century consistently asserted that the Church was established only by the Royal Supremacy for it was this which enabled them to break the papal power in England and later to charge that the Puritans were attacking the crown when they attacked the Church. For Hooker, then, the unity of the Commonwealth was a necessity because "reason dictated it, the times demanded it, and the government intended it." We shall see in this and in the following sections that Saravia was in complete agreement with this idea of the Commonwealth and the Church being unified, and, if anything, he saw even less danger from royal intervention in ecclesiastical affairs than some of his contemporaries did. This may very well be one explanation of why Saravia became more Erastian in later years.

Parenthetically, it would be well to note here that a very large part of the Elizabethan thought on the Commonwealth was related to and probably influenced by Martin Bucer’s De Regno Christi. This thoroughly creative attempt to
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1. Ibid.
2. Cf., Ibid., 27, for Whitgift’s charge that Cartwright and the Puritans would soon want to move against the crown as well as the Church.
3. Ibid., 114.
4. Saravia’s ideas on the Commonwealth should be considered as representative of his thoughts in the Elizabethan period, and his Erastianism as representative of the last decade of his life under the Stuart monarchy.
5. This was printed at Basle for the first time (1557), and in 1577 was incorporated into the Scripta Anglicana (v. Hopf, Bucer... etc., 100).
show how there might be a "... 'solid restitution' of the Kingdom of God in England..."\(^1\) broke much of the theological ground in which those like Saravia later would be planting and nurturing their own ideas about the relation of the Church to the State. Briefly, Bucer's vision was that there needed to be a reorganization of the public and national life so that both of those institutions would be obedient to the Gospel of Christ.\(^2\) He saw this as both necessary and beneficial because of the interpenetration of the Regnum Christi in hoc seculo, in mundo. He thought of the "Kingdom of Christ" as being that manifestation of the eternal Regnum Dei which has entered into all the activities of human society in such a way that there is an eschatological overlap in the present age. As this Kingdom spans the entirety of creation and human existence it necessitates the reorganization of that society into a "...regnum externum in the service of the Regnum Christi.\(^3\) Bucer spoke of this as the Respublica which would express the State-character of the Church, and the Church-character of the State, that is, to the extent that it remained obedient to Him who rules over it. As servants of Christ the Church and the State are called upon to serve Him and one another in a spirit of love, and, in their different functional capacities to form a Societas Christiana,\(^4\) under the Kingship of God the Creator and the Redeemer.

Saravia's main evidence for the establishment of the Respublica in England was drawn from the Old Testament, for during those ancient times God founded there "a peculiar Commonwealth" which contained the best forms of civil and ecclesiastical governments.\(^5\) Thus Saravia revealed that he believed God to have
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\(^1\) T.F. Torrance, *Kingdom and Church* (1956), 75.
\(^2\) Ibid., cited *De Regno Christi*, in *Op. Lat.* XV, 90, 293f.
\(^3\) Ibid., 79, cited ibid., 293f.
\(^4\) Ibid., 87, cited ibid., 6-20.
\(^5\) Of the honor...etc., 137, (faulty pagination), "De honore...etc.," 537; "Defensio...etc., 131."
been the author of the political structure of the Commonwealth as well as of the ecclesiastical, for he thought the settlement in England was founded on the same principles as that in ancient Israel. He contended that God has this right to determine the nature of civil governments because He is the Creator and Governor of all things and He has the right to determine ecclesiastical affairs because He is the Redeemer of mankind. To put this another way, like Hooker, he could say that, "in a word our estate is according to the pattern of God's own ancient, elect people!"

Saravia admitted that under the New Dispensation this arrangement of civil and ecclesiastical affairs had not been possible, for the temporal rulers were hostile at that time towards the Christian faith. The Lord, he said, had accepted this state of affairs when He refused to seize earthly power and had ordained that His followers do likewise, for when He sent them forth to all nations He did so with the understanding that they would not attempt to alter any form of government or to overthrow their rulers. This did not mean that the form of government under the Old Dispensation had failed but it did mean that Christians should wait until the rulers of those nations had been converted before they should attempt to form a new Commonwealth. When the magistracy was Christian then the example from the Old Testament, the law of nature, and all of the best customs and institutions of nations ought to prescribe a Commonwealth between the Church and State as the best ordering of society. When this was done the two need not be confused or mixed together for each had its

1. A Treatise...etc., 124-25 /"De diversis...etc." 137.
3. Of the honor...etc., 137 /537/.
4. "Defensio...etc.," 15. In "De imperandi authoritate...etc." Saravia did not mention his own part in the rebellion against the State in the Netherlands, but he clearly violated at that time this principle of non-resistance to the government.
5. Of the honor...etc., 137-38 /"De honore...etc.," 537.
own proper functional purpose, yet they both could be considered one and the same society.¹

Since the authority for both Church and State flowed from the same origin, it seemed logical to Saravia that they should both be caught up in the same goals and purposes for mankind and that they should be limited by the same divine laws.² It also seemed logical to him that ministers, who were responsible for the government of the Church, and the magistrate, who holds the authority over his fellow-citizens should be in agreement and in harmony with one another. In secular affairs he declared that civil rulers should do nothing without listening to the advice of the pastors and likewise the ecclesiastical leaders should do nothing without seeking the counsel of their magistrates.³ Saravia spoke of these institutions as being mutually beneficial and of each needing the other for survival and growth,⁴ but his hierarchical convictions were far too strong for him to accept two heads of equal authority in this Christian Commonwealth, so we find that he, like his fellow Anglicans, conceded a position of preeminence to the civil ruler over the ecclesiastical leaders. This is quite apparent in the way he stressed that the magistrate by virtue of his office could not be shut out of the councils and synods of the Church;⁵ on the other hand he made it quite clear that bishops and presbyters had no authority over civil matters and would be allowed to have only as much civil jurisdiction as the monarch permitted.⁶ This is, naturally, evidence that Saravia was to some extent Erastian even in this earlier period when "De diversis...etc.,” and "De honore...etc.,” were written, but certainly not
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¹ A Treatise...etc., 124-25 /"De diversis...etc.,” 137.
² "De imperandi authoritate...etc.,” 21.5.
³ "Defensio...etc.,” 110-111.
⁴ Of the honor...etc., 97-102 /39-40.⁷.
⁵ A Treatise...etc., 124-25 /"De diversis...etc.,” 137.
⁶ Of the honor...etc., 188-89 /"De honore...etc.,” 717.
to the extent that he was two decades later when he wrote "De imperandi... authority...etc.,". Later, when we shall examine his concept of the divine right of kings we shall see why he was so unconcerned lest this give the monarch too much authority over ecclesiastical affairs.

Even though Saravia thought the Commonwealth to be the best arrangement between the Church and the State he did not think that it was an essential ordering of society. He maintained that God has never given any nation a "... fixed and perpetual form of civil government, such that it should not be lawful to alter as time or place might require." That form of civil government which was most useful to Church and State could be decided by both of them for there were no commands from the Lord about this matter. He even said that there was no need for the Church to have any say in the State, or vice versa, if it did not seem to be in the best interests of both of them. This is rather unexpected since Saravia believed God to be the author of both kinds of government, but it is an indication that he was willing to concede that the convictions of others about these matters differed from his own and that they might have been right in some instances whereas he might have been right in others. This was also a very important indication that he differed from those like Archbishop Whitgift who said that the external government of the Church under a Christian magistrate should mirror the form of the civil government. Saravia was a firm advocate of Royal Supremacy in the Commonwealth, but he felt that the Church should order itself according to the revelation in the Scriptures, according to the customs of the ancient Church, and in accordance with

1. A Treatise...etc., To the Reader, 30-31 [Candido Lectori, 1st p.]
2. "Defensio...etc.," 111: "Nulla de hac re habemus Domini praecepta: libera res est, nec civilibus negotiis Ecclesiarchum Ministros interesse, nec Ecclesiasticis civilibus Magistratus cognuntur, nisi velit: et ita fieri, Ecclesiae et reipublicae intersit."
3. "Examen...etc.," 44.
4. Davies, Episcopacy...in the Church of England...etc., 130.
the needs of the times. The Elizabethan settlement satisfied all of these conditions as far as he was concerned, but under James I he apparently felt, as did the king, that the Doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings was more in keeping with conditions at that time.

The Divine Right of Kings

It is not possible to understand the sixteenth and seventeenth century thought about the divine right of kings unless it is clearly understood that people in those times thought all authority was divine in origin. In other words, any person who had any kind of socially accepted superiority over his fellowman could claim that this preeminence had been divinely given and must therefore be accepted by all. The reasoning behind this notion is found in the relation between "right" and "obligation". People then thought of a right as being but one side of a matter, and on the other side there must be a corresponding obligation. It was also inconceivable in the thought of that time that obligation could be owed only to another human being, for they thought that ultimately all obligation was owed to God. The conclusion to this syllogistic reasoning was that all right or authority must have been given by God. This meant that any authority which princes, clergymen, magistrates, fathers, husbands, landlords, or even a man who only employed laborers, had over others could be said to be de iure divino. Therefore, this concept actually had far more to do with the way the people understood their society to be ordered divinely than with what might be called the "inherent rights" of those who held civil or ecclesiastical posts.

1. Allen, Political Thought...Sixteenth Century, 122, 135; cf., Davies ibid., 97-98.
2. Later we shall see that a fundamental argument by Saravia for a ius divinum regum was, "praeposterum est superioris electionem confirmari ab inferioribus."
This understanding of the true connotation of the term *ius divinum* is particularly important for our evaluation of Saravia's thought. He followed the reasoning given above as meticulously and as consistently as he possibly could. We have already seen the evidence for this statement in several places. In his doctrine of the Ministry, in his insistence on order and authority throughout society, and in his doctrine of the Divine Right of Bishops, he adhered to this principle of all authority being divinely gifted. Now that we come to consider his views of civil power it is not at all surprising that he should say that kings ruled by divine right. If anything is unusual, or unexpected, about the way he treated this particular subject it is that he stressed the principle more strongly here than he did elsewhere.

The idea of "the godly prince" had been a fundamental part of the Henrician and Elizabethan settlements,¹ but the Anglican reformers had not felt that it was necessary to outline the way the English monarchs had received or exercised divine authority. They had searched the Scriptures and found in the Old Testament the accounts of "godly princes" in the historical books and from these they made their arguments *a fortiori* that the Christian sovereign had a similar authority to those Jewish kings. The extent of their interpretations was that it was the religious and political duty of the people to obey their sovereign. Late in Elizabeth's reign this theological rationale for civil authority no longer seemed to be sufficient, for many began to give serious consideration to the doctrine of Kings by Divine Right.² As noted earlier, people in the sixteenth century had attributed this right to the sovereign almost without questioning it and consequently theologians had not specifically enunciated it. However, some developments in the latter part of that century induced this
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1. Sykes, *Old Priest...etc.*, 2-3.
new appraisal and the subsequent statement of the *ius divinum regum* in its most uncompromising terms during the reign of James I. It rapidly became a very popular concept in England and as one authority said, it was "... proclaimed in the pulpit, published in the market-place, [and] witnessed on the battlefield." Two of the men whose writings inadvertently caused this reformulation of this doctrine were George Buchanan and Cardinal Bellarmine. It was in rebuttal of their opinions that Saravia stated a large part of his own convictions about this theory.

King James had adopted this theory long before he came to the English throne, and, this, probably more because of a reaction to the influence of Buchanan and the Kirk of Scotland than for any other reason. Buchanan was a brilliant classicist who had been profoundly influenced by French humanism. Because of his great intellectual powers and the fact that his political views were similar to those of some of the Scottish leaders he was chosen as tutor of James VI. He was charged with the liberal and political education of the young prince and many hoped that by instilling the proper ideas in him that James would one day become the ideal Protestant king. His views were not entirely those of the Presbyterians in Scotland but there was enough similarity in their attitudes towards civil power that James came to feel that they were one and the same. Buchanan advocated a constitutional monarchy whereby the king having been elected by the people must also answer to them for his every action. He held that by the *lex naturae* no man could rightfully assume any authority over his fellows unless the people gave it to him. If a monarch became a tyrant the people therefore had the right and duty either to depose

or even to kill him. War against the tyrant was, he said, the most just of all wars and any person had the right to slay him. These ideas were set forth in a very influential treatise entitled "De Jure Regni apud Scotos" which was first published in 1578. Many people in Scotland heartily agreed with these very advanced ideas, but James VI was not one of them. He developed a very strong dislike for these egalitarian principles and he determined that he would press as hard as possible for absolutism in the monarchy. The theory which best suited this purpose was the divine right of kings, so he adopted this to bolster the temporal power vis-a-vis the ecclesiastical claims of the Calvinists on one side, the Romanists on another side, and the views of the humanists on what might be thought of as a third side. This theory basically comprised four related ideas: (1) the monarchy is a divinely ordained institution; (2) the indefeasibility of hereditary right; (3) the accountability of kings to God alone; (4) the necessity of obedience and of non-resistance to the king.

Saravia was a very loyal supporter of the theory of divine right as it was advocated by King James. To prove this position he drew from the accounts in the O.T., from which the reformers themselves had interpreted their "godly prince", and thence he sought to show that all kings were of divine origin. Earlier we saw that he contended that the *summus imperium* held by a king could be traced to the time of Noah and possibly even into the ante-diluvian era as well. It was his contention that Noah was the first king over God's people mentioned in the Bible, but he was also the last man whom God intended to have authority over the whole earth. After Noah's death the *imperium* passed to his sons and grandsons and Saravia said that a total of seventy-three kingdoms

---

could be counted in the second and third generations after the flood. The first laws which these kingdoms had were the decisions of the kings, and these early monarchs could even be said to have been the very foundations of those nations; ergo, the people flowed from them and not the kings from the people. The fact that these early leaders like Noah, Moses, Joshua, Gideon (and the other judges), and Samuel, were not called kings was not important, for Saravia said that a monarchy did not consist in titles or ornaments, but in the *summum imperium* which was theirs by the law of nature and the gift of God. The basic point he was arguing was that the people did not create these kings but that God did.

He found additional evidence for this contention in the passage in I Samuel 8 in which the people of Israel asked Samuel to ask God to give them a king like those of other nations for they knew that by law only God could give them a king.

Buchanan's contention that kings were created by their people and owed allegiance to them was the main point against which Saravia directed these Scriptural arguments. Such passages as that in which Solomon is recorded as having said of God, "... by me kings reign and princes decree justice ...," or Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in which he told the king that his kingdom and power had been given by God, were thought by Saravia to be irrefutable proof that all kings ruled by divine right and not by popular sovereignty. Like James VI, who had written to his son that kings were "little gods," "lieutenants of God," and "vicars of God," Saravia also spoke of the king as being the foremost representative of divinity and of being second only...
after God Himself. This showed Saravia's idea of the relation of the king to God, but the question naturally arises, in what way did he feel that the monarch should relate to his people? The best answer to this question is found in that passage where he said that the king should be as a father to his sons, or a master to his servants. This father-son relationship of course would be vastly different from the understanding of this in modern times, for Saravia thought of the rights of children in regard to their parents as being little better than those of slaves to their masters. "Royal domination (he said) produces a certain kind of slavery of its own." 

Saravia did not cite any New Testament evidence of a divine right of kings except to adduce certain passages from the Pauline epistles to show that people were supposed to be subject to princes and higher powers. He contended that Apostolic doctrine required Christians of all ranks and levels in society to obey civil authorities even if the latter were tyrants. This was a part of his argument not only against Buchanan, but also against Cardinal Bellarmine, who was the leading spokesman of the Jesuits. King James I had taken a very strong line against the Jesuit advocacy of tyrannicide, so Saravia was simply following the argument of the king at this point. It was, Saravia said, far better to have a king who was a tyrant than to be subjected to the tyranny of the people when they somehow had gained control of the sumnum imperium. He had little if any respect for "the people" when they held the political po-

1. Ibid., 294, (in an interpretation of II Chron. 9:8): "Unde colligitur Regem augusta sua maiestate imaginem referre Dei, et ipsius solium non esse populi, nec a populo, sed Dei, et a Deo"; cf., 263: "qui post Deum in terris secundus est"; V. Hearnshaw, ibid., 113, 119-20.
2. Ibid., 307.
3. Ibid., 125.
4. Ibid., 179-80.
6. V. "De imperandi authoritye...etc.," 240-46.
wer in their hands - the basic reason for this was that he thought that "a good king" could occasionally be found but never "a good people."

No theologian in the sixteenth century has been found who advocated a total and complete obedience to the king for all said that a man must obey the will of God rather than the will of his king if the two were in conflict. This was the view of Saravia, but he like most, failed to give any help in showing in what ways the monarch might go against the will of God, or even who should be considered the final authority as to what was the will of God. The way Saravia left this matter dangling in the air it would appear that he felt each man must decide according to his own conscience, but this hardly fits the religious authoritarianism of which he was an advocate. Hooker also left this particular problem undefined, but he put more emphasis on showing that men must obey their rulers in lawful matters. He said that fundamental law should determine the prerogatives of both the monarch and the people. Saravia, however, was far less concerned about the rights of the people than he was about the prerogatives of the monarch. This can be seen in the way he completely ignored the authority of the English Parliament in his last treatise. Yet, by the time this work was written the sovereignty of the country had long since passed to the role of the king working with the Parliament.

King James failed to understand this or even to accept the English Parliament

---

1. Ibid., 290: "Et quod maius est, bonus Rex inveniri potest, sed bonus populus rurquam, in quo peior pars semper non vincat meliorem: et facilius est unum invenire bonum Regem, quam multos Optimates bonos."
2. Ibid., 121.
3. Shirley, ibid., 103-104.
4. In his "Letter to the ministers of Guernsey" he had spoken of the great authority of the parliament but that even their legislation was invalid if it did not have the approval of "the king" (v. A Treatise...etc., xviii). This letter was probably written ca. 1590-95; even though he spoke of "the king" this probably was a reference to Queen Elizabeth (v. A.S.E. Ackermann, Popular Fallacies 4th ed., 1950/, 426-27, for a discussion of the usage of this title in Elizabethan and other periods without reference to the sex of the sovereign). As far as could be determined Saravia made no mention of parliament's powers after that period.
and it was this error which caused him much of the trouble which he had during his reign. The significant omission in Saravia's work about the role of this legislative body indicates that he too failed to understand the nature of the civil power of his time and the direction in which it would move in the future.

Saravia in the Netherlands under a representative form of government had been a rebellious and unhappy citizen; Saravia in England under a monarch who desired near absolute powers was a satisfied and loyal subject. This love of the monarchy explains many things about his past actions and political thoughts. While in the Netherlands he had pleaded with Queen Elizabeth to take his country and make it a part of her kingdom. In his letter to Lord Burghley he went so far as to suggest that the Queen could hold the Netherlands in complete subjection if she would take the sons of the noblemen and outstanding citizens as hostages and keep them in England—suggesting then that these families would be grateful and happy if after a few years she would exchange these hostages for the sons of other leading families in the same way that the Romans had once done to hold their empire in subjection! In accordance with this view he was to say later that nations should not fight for their freedom when attacked by foreign rulers. It was, he said, far better for men to live on their knees than to die on their feet. With some people the principle of non-resistance was no more than a pragmatic expression of the best way to keep order in society, but with Saravia it was a part of his religious convictions. To him, a rebel in the State and a schismatic in the Church were two of a kind.

In one way Saravia deviated from a strict defense of the divine right of

1. V. Strype, Annals... etc., Vol. III, Pt. ii, pp. 351-53, for the text of this letter written in June, 1585. N.b. the closing sentence, "Vale et me in numero clientum tuorum habe."  
2. "De imperandi authoritate... etc.," 193.  
3. A Treatise... etc., 259 /"De diversis... etc.," 357.
kings, for when he denied that the monarchy was the only allowable form of government he left at least this one exception in his case. In doing this he followed the example of Hooker, but he differed with Hooker in that he placed the king above all law. However, Hooker defended both absolutism and constitutionalism, while Saravia really believed in and defended only the former though he was willing to admit that some governments existed with constitutions protecting the rights of its citizens; however, Saravia was completely opposed to mixing the monarchy and constitutionalism. For him there could be no appeal to an authority above the king; therefore, he contended that the king was above all civil laws and answerable only to God.

There were four ways in which Saravia said that a king might receive legitimate power in a kingdom: (1) by the direct call of God; (2) by hereditary succession; (3) by a just war; (4) by the election of the people. Regardless of how a king might obtain his power he was nonetheless a king and the manner of his elevation to the monarchy should not affect the right or the nature of his rule. Since the kings of England could trace their rights to the Norman invasions then they held this kingdom as a legitimate conquest. This, he said, was handed on by the law of Primogeniture and both the king and this law of succession should be considered sacrosanct. In opposition to the Roman contention that all secular power could only be considered of a mediately divine origin, Saravia claimed that it was of an immediately divine origin. This meant that a king was a king by virtue of his rights of succession and not because of oaths, the ceremony of coronation, or because of episcopal blessings.

1. Shirley, ibid., 105.
2. "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," 272-74, 305.
3. Ibid., 169.
4. "Examen...etc.," 21-22.
5. "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," 223.
Even when a king had been elected by the people he should not be held answerable to them, for no social contracts or pacts of any kind could bind or limit royal power unless the king himself had agreed to such provisos.¹

In concluding this section, attention should be drawn to an amazing paradox in Saravia's use of divine right. In regard to the authority of bishops we saw in Chapter I that he spoke quite specifically of them holding this de jure divino. However, in regard to the authority of kings he did not use these words as such, but there can be no doubt but that he believed in and was defending the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings. Indeed, he advocated this doctrine more zealously and more thoroughly than he did that of bishops, yet he left us an unsolved mystery as to why he used the term in one place and not in the other.

Saravia's Movement Towards Erastianism in the Stuart Period

We have already touched briefly on the alteration of emphasis in the relation of Church and State which came very late in Saravia's life. This should really be thought of as a movement towards Erastianism rather than a change from one ideology to another. Even during the Elizabethan period when he stressed that the Church and State were joined in a Commonwealth he was influenced by some Erastian ideas. It would have been unusual if he had not been at least slightly Erastian then for it is generally recognised that all the Elizabethan bishops were Erastian, "from the point of view that they rested the government of the Church on the civil ruler...."² The important point is that he did not express this to any appreciable degree at that time as he did later during the reign of the first Stuart king. In this section we will find that Saravia did

¹ Ibid., 270-71.
² Shirley, ibid., 108; cf., Davies, ibid., 97-98.
not become quite as thorough-going an Erastian as Cramer once had been,¹ but he certainly went beyond Hooker who could be called Erastian only with real reservations.²

Reminiscent of the Henrician settlement in the "Act of Supremacy" in 1534, Saravia liked to speak of the king as the head "Caput" of the Church.³ He thought this title meant essentially the same thing as the Hebrew word "Rosh" which had been ascribed to the Israelite kings. Furthermore, when the title "head" or "prince" was used of the monarch he felt it was only metaphorical, for Christ alone was Head of the Church. However, this did not prevent him from strongly emphasizing the majesty, authority, and honor which the king should have in the Church. If we had not already seen in the foregoing chapters the high establishment of the ministry in divine law we would be tempted to think that he like Cramer was desirous of opposing an absolutized monarchy to a relativized ministry.⁴ This is a moot point, but it is not a debatable point that Saravia actually subordinated the work of Christ as Mediator to His work as Christ the King. He contended that both priests and kings "... gerebant imaginem Christi..." but the priests were nonetheless subject to the kings.⁵ Since the priest represented Christ the Mediator and the king represented Christ the highest Ruler and Judge of the World, he concluded that the mediatorial work of Christ was subordinate to His regal work. From this he drew other conclusions such as the fact that the king's work was as much concerned with "divine or heavenly affairs" as was that of the priest, and, that "... the kings were in possession of an office more outstanding than the

¹ G.W. Bromiley, Thomas Cramer Theologian (1956), 50-52.
² Davies, The Political Ideas, etc., 91-94.
³ "Responsio...Cretzeri...etc.,” 354.
⁴ Cf., Bromiley, ibid.
⁵ "De imperandi authoritate...etc.,” 246-47.
priesthood. He contended that the work of a king in ruling people, promoting religion and piety, exposing injustice, defending widows, punishing criminals, etc. was a divine gift and it should be thought of as far more outstanding than the work of bishops and presbyters who taught the Word of God and had charge of sacred ceremonies and rites. His Scriptural justification for this was the command of God to Saul that he should not gather spoil of the Amalekites to offer as sacrifices unto God, but that it was more pleasing for the royal ministry to punish wicked men and to slaughter them than to make offerings and sacrifices. To go even further with this idea he maintained that the principal part of the Old Testament priesthood now resided in kings for that part of the law and of jurisprudence which had once been the province of the priests and levites were now the domain of royalty. In the New Testament Saravia cited the subordination of the Apostles to earthly kings as additional proof that Christ wished His glory and honor to be reflected in kings and not in Apostles or ministers.

Probably the most significant thing about this whole subject is the explanation he gave as the reason why the work of a minister was of less importance than that of a king. He said he did not want to detract from the ministry but the external actions of a minister must be accompanied by the work of the Holy Spirit if they were to bear fruit; ergo, the Holy Spirit actually did the most important part of work, so Christ deserved the honor and glory for it. As Paul said, "neither he who plants nor he who waters is anything, but it is..."
God who gives the growth." This interpretation sounds very conventional thus far, but when he applied this to the action of the civil power then it is given a very unusual twist. The minister, said Saravia, even when he works with God to the greatest possible extent, cannot reach the efficaciousness of Grace in the same way as the civil power can when it accomplishes those things which God carries out through it as it goes about punishing the guilty or lifting up the oppressed.¹ Two things can be said about this: (1) Saravia has apparently reached the advanced point in Erastianism in which he believed all "civil power" to be related to and a part of the king's priestly work; (2) he contradicted himself in the most amazing fashion when he described the grace given to the minister as being less than that given to the civil authorities or to the king.²

The last point is seen in the way he spoke of the work of the minister as being actually the work of the Holy Spirit (ut supra), so Christ Himself should receive all the credit for that which is done in preaching, etc. If then the grace given by the Holy Spirit to the civil authority is even greater than that received by the ministry, then the greater honor for this work should also be given to the Lord. However, this is not the conclusion which Saravia drew, for the honor of which he spoke in this context seemed to belong only to the king.

One of the most important prerogatives of the king in the English establishment of the Church was the right vested in him to consent to the calling of all religious assemblies and to ratify their actions. In answer to an attack by the Jesuit, Jacob Gretzer, Saravia defended this right by explaining that these assemblies and convocations were all called in the name of Christ.

¹ Ibid., 2/§: "Cooperatur quidem Deo, sed Deus non semper cooperatur homini; sed ubi maxime cooperatur, ne tune quidem efficientiam gratiae attingit Minister, eo modo quo civilis potestas [Italics mine] ea quae Deus per illam executur, quando aut nocios punit, aut oppressos relevat."

² Ibid.
by the Primate of the Anglican Church but with the consent of the King. The role of the Christian monarch in the sixteenth century, he said, was no different from that of the Emperor Martin at the Council of Chalcedon or of King David when he called the priests, Levites, and nobles of Israel, to assemble themselves to discuss religious matters. He maintained that the king's delegates should be allowed to sit in the synods and to vote in them, but Saravia certainly was not suggesting that kings could make new canons without the consent of the bishops in convocation. He did feel that only spiritual causes should be considered in them but if the king desired they might also consider questions of a political nature in these assemblies and synods and he felt that the clergy should be allowed to discuss any of these subjects freely and without fear of reprisal. The ecclesiastical matters which he saw as the natural province of synods and convocations were the purity of doctrine and the regulation of worship and discipline.

Students of the Anglican establishment in the sixteenth century have usually agreed that the king did not really have the authority to decide about matters of faith. However, Saravia seems to have thought that they could make such decisions if they so desired. For example, he said that heresies, the prophaning of worship, and the blasphemy of God, should all be considered in synods, etc., but that they "... pertain also to the civil magistrate." In another treatise he made this more than an implication when he said that princes, or the supreme civil magistrate, were responsible for removing bad churchmen. These "... bad rulers of the Church..." were those archbishops and bishops who were guilty of heresy, schism, perjury, apostasy "..." and sim-

---

1. "Responsio...Gretzeri...etc.," 354.
2. "Examen...etc.," 92-94.
3. Ibid., 92; cf. "De homine...etc.," 65.
4. A Treatise...etc., 262 ["De diversis...etc.," 367.]
ilar evils.1 This leaves little doubt that Saxavia felt that Christian mon-
archs could decide what constituted the proper faith, for he made no mention
here, or elsewhere in this treatise, of kings needing the advice of clerics in
these matters. Later he broadened this conception to include all ecclesiastical power for he said that although pastors and bishops received this "potestas ecclesiastica" from God, nevertheless, those things which could become contra-
troversial could be judged by the royal power.2 In this context he not only
included the things for which bishops could be deposed, (ut supra) but also
moral discipline, excommunication, and the creation or dismissal of pastors of
the Church "... and several other things of that kind."

It is possible that Saxavia himself had once had first-hand experience of
the broad powers of the monarch in deciding about matters of faith. During the
Burret controversy Archbishop Whitgift had called together some theologians and
bishops to draft some articles to give guidance about the argument concerning
the doctrine of Election which had arisen at Cambridge.3 Whitgift failed to
get the Queen's permission to hold this meeting so when she heard of it she
condemned the articles (the Lambeth Articles) and all those who helped to write
them. Queen Elizabeth considered this a violation of the statue of the sub-
mission of the clergy (25 Henry VIII) whereby the clergy were bound in verbo
sacerdotii neither to assemble themselves nor to discuss doctrinal matters, nor
to publish points of religion without the royal assent.4 This right of the
monarch, of course, was considered by most to be different from that of making

1. "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," 229: "...et dican, Ius in Ecclesia
Episcopos abdicandi, atque eum, qui se omnium Coryphaeum esse iactat,
penes Christianos Imperatores et Reges est."
2. Ibid., 262.
3. Head, Royal Supremacy...etc., 29. There is no definite proof that
Saxavia was included in this meeting, but it is the most probable conclusion
since he was often at Lambeth Palace during this period and had already ad-
vised the Archbishop about this matter. V, supra, Introduction, pp. 49-50.
decisions about matters of faith, but in this particular case the Queen not only condemned these men for meeting to discuss doctrinal matters without her permission but she also made it clear that she did not like the strong Calvinistic tone of these articles.

A basic factor in Saravia's thought about such rights of kings was that they were not laymen, but were "vicars of God on earth." Since he felt that the king had inherited the better part of Christ's ministry and the better part of the Old Testament priesthood, then it is not surprising to find him saying that God could carry out anything through pious kings that He could through pastors of churches. It is very doubtful that he thought the king would choose to exercise sacerdotal functions or to claim the authority of ordination, for he seems to have been thinking more in terms of the cleansing of the Church of heresy, etc., along the lines we have seen above.

One final way in which Saravia's Erastianism can be seen was his denial that the ecclesiastical authorities had the right to excommunicate the king. He not only contended that this applied to kings, but also to any who held the sumnum imperium. If this was held by the whole people, as in a democracy, then the nation could not be excommunicated but the individuals in it could. This, of course, was said in rebuttal of the papal claim to be able to excommunicate kings, or high civil authorities. Saravia said that no Scriptural evidence could be found to support this claim, but that he had found in the Old Testament that bad kings were accepted and endured by the priests and people just as good kings were. Reason also supported this conviction for he said

1. "Examen...etc.," 13.
2. "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," 229.
3. Ibid., 234: "...nihil tamen per eos /pastores/ fit, quod Deus non etiam per pios Reges operetur."
4. "Defensio...etc.," 21, 38, 40, 42, 176, passim.
5. "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," 262-63.
that a doctor might cut off a diseased limb of the body when it endangered the health of the whole body, but no doctor would recommend that the head be severed in order to cure a patient. This, said Saravia, was the reason Jesus said that an eye or hand which offended might be plucked out or cut off, but that He specifically did not mention that the human head should be cut off if it offended. It would, he contended, be no less important to the life of the whole nation that its head not be cast out of the Church even if he were a tyrant or an evil man.

This is a fitting subject with which to conclude this section, for the Erastian idea that the king was above the censure of the Church was one of the few points of Erastianism which Erastus himself had held. Erastus had also said that the civil authority should have complete control of the censura morum, however, Saravia never agreed to that. All of the authority which the bishops exercised was thought by him to be under the Royal supervision but he had no idea that this meant that bishops had lost all manner of ecclesiastical authority.

**Conclusion**

The medieval idea of a divinely organized society was the most important principle in Saravia's understanding of the relation of the Church and the State. This was the predominating element of his thought both in the period when he stressed this union as that of a simple commonwealth and later when he granted the civil authority a superiority above that of the ecclesiastical authority. He never deviated from that purpose in the relation of Church and State which would maintain order and harmony in society through obedience to law and properly constituted authority. Like the Scholastics he felt that such an arrangement would inevitably have to be under one head, Although he
was himself a royalist he did not believe this was an essential form of government, but he did feel that it was essential to any government that it be constituted from the top - i.e., from the sumnum imperium - downwards. In attempting to devise a political philosophy which would be the framework for any kind of government, whether it be a monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy, Saravia undertook a task much too ambitious and comprehensive for the philosophy which he held. Outmoded medieval concepts simply could not be adequately applied to the increasing variety of civil governments, which were either then established or were in the process of emerging. Saravia's philosophy was far more conducive and congenial to the Commonwealth concept which he once held than to the other forms of political and ecclesiastical belief which he mentioned.

Within this framework of society we have seen that Saravia gradually shifted the emphases which he put on ecclesiastical and civil authority. At that time when he stressed the Commonwealth as a whole, with its two aspects functioning as either a Church or a State, he made the basic mistake of assuming all that he actually had to prove. This should have had the foremost priority in any examination of this union and the fact that he ignored this may well explain why he began to shift in his views from an equality in the Church and State in the Commonwealth to a superiority of the civil power over that of the religious. Of course, cognizance should be also taken of several external factors which acted in this: (1) the Roman Catholic apologetic which was attempting to justify the right of papal intervention in civil affairs; (2) the growing demand for popular sovereignty, particularly in Scotland; (3) the Puritan threat in England which was attempting to show the essential difference between spiritual and temporal affairs. Saravia's Erastianism, to be properly
understood, must be viewed more as a reaction to these forces which he considered to be threats to the Church and the State than as a deliberate and logical choice. To be sure, though, the groundwork for this kind of shift in emphasis of authority was laid when he failed to show why and how the Church and the State could be considered a union called a Commonwealth. In such a situation it was inevitable that one or the other of these powers would come to dominate the other. In the case of Erastianism the State gradually usurped the place and the function of the Church. The ironic thing is that Saravia himself sounded a warning that this would happen when the true knowledge of the limits of ecclesiastical and civil power was lacking. In such a case, he said, religion will be turned away to that end which is of the political power. He apparently never realised that he himself was opening the door for this to happen when he gradually moved from the idea of the king as a minister who had the right to make judgments concerning matters of faith to the notion of all civil authority and power as being spiritually superior to that of the Church. The proof of this error is nowhere more clearly seen than in the amazing way Saravia allowed this kind of inductive reasoning to lead him to the conclusion that this proved Christ's role as Mediator to be inferior to his role as King. The natural concomitant to this was the spiritual elevation of the monarchy at the expense of the whole ministry.

Saravia's doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings was the logical extension of several ideas: (1) he consistently adhered to the principle of the divine right of all authority; (2) he said of both civil and ecclesiastical authority that it was impossible for an inferior to confirm a superior, so ultimately God had to be the author of the highest persons in both fields; (3) it was for Saravia the only logical alternative to popular sovereignty and to universal

1. "De imperandi authority... etc.," 243.
suffrage, both of which he strongly disliked; (4) this appeared to him as necessary in that apologetic which he adopted to repudiate Roman claims that all civil power must flow mediate through the Church. The consequence of his adoption of this doctrine could be said to be virtually the same as his adoption of Erastianism, i.e., the Church could only end up by coming off second-best to the State.
CHAPTER IV

THE CATHOLICITY AND OECUMENICITY OF THE CHURCH

Introduction

Saravia did not believe catholicity and oecumenicity to be synonymous terms, but it is certain that he believed them to be so interrelated with one another that they could not be separated. When he thought of the "wholeness" or the "fullness" of the Church he also thought of its "unity" and vice versa. These were both seen as essential qualities of the Church so he actually looked upon them as integral characteristics of the Ecclesia as the Body of Christ. In this context it should also be noted that this chapter should be thought of as making a very close connection with those chapters in the second part of this thesis, for the mission of the Church to the heathen was likewise seen by him as an essential characteristic of the universal, catholic Church. Therefore, in those passages where any of these subjects were discussed by Saravia the reader of his writings should be conscious of the correlation of the fullness, expansion, continuity, and of the unity of the Church in his thought.

In this chapter we shall look first at the definition of catholicism which Saravia gave, and then at the various degrees of importance which he placed on the sources of this authority. Most of his views on these subjects were given in the context of the Reformation and post-Reformation polemics with Roman and Protestant theologians, so after that we shall examine the standards by which he would have liked to have seen the whole Church reformed. This raises the question of the nature of the Reformation in the Church of England and the
sense in which it could be said that Saravia deliberately sought or desired a via media to be followed there. To answer this question we shall need to investigate his views on the manner and means by which he thought the Anglican Church could proceed to complete its task of Reformation. Following this discussion we shall have opportunity to examine Saravia's irenic and ecumenical spirit as he expressed it in his exposition of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Finally, we shall consider his doctrine of Election and seek to determine how he related this to his understanding of the nature of the Church.

The Nature of Catholicity and Its Relation to the Various Sources of Authority

Saravia defined the meaning of catholicus as that which has been handed down in the Church from the time of the Apostles, and afterwards has been confirmed by the usage and custom of the Church; it is that of which only the Apostles are authors and with which the whole Church is in agreement. This definition was stated in a slightly different manner in a quotation from St. Vincent of Lerins. This fifth century father gave a three-fold rule which he said would enable the Church to distinguish true doctrines from those which were false. He contended that the catholic Church was true to itself and its foundations when it accepted and taught that doctrine which was believed everywhere, by all people, and in all times. Saravia assiduously adhered to this "Vincentian Canon" in all of his writings and for this reason ecumenicity, antiquity, patristics and the Apostolic tradition, and agreement should be considered together rather than separately. The

1. "Examen...etc.," Prologus, 4th p.
unity of these three in one was illustrated by Saravia himself for he spoke of them as forming a "Thesian thread" which, if faithfully followed, would lead a seeker of truth out of "... a labyrinth of opinions ..." to the freedom of the true Christian doctrine.¹

In his study of the development of catholicity in Anglicanism from the Reformation to the beginning of the twentieth century, Friar Tavard has chosen Saravia's writings in the Elizabethan period for special treatment because he believed him to have had a "'high' doctrine of Catholicity."² It was his conclusion that catholicity was Saravia's primary concern in his works, and it is true that a very good case can be made that he had a high estimate of this subject. However, Tavard sought to prove this by claiming that Saravia was satisfied with neither Scripture nor patristic unanimity, but that he always insisted on both in giving proof for his doctrines. This is misleading because it implies that Saravia attached equal value to both of these sources of authority, whereas he actually gave no reason at all for such a conclusion to be reached. Saravia stated quite clearly that he had always followed the procedure of making the Scriptures the foremost authority for Christian faith and practice.³ The authority which he accepted as being next to that of the Scriptures was the universal agreement of all of the churches in all ages; of this latter source it should be noted that he placed especial emphasis on the patristic period because of its antiquity and closeness to the Apostolic age.

In his theses Zanchius said that God has given us the necessary teachings in the Scriptures which would enable all to find and to follow the way to

1. Ibid. This reference to the "Thesian thread" was drawn from the story in the Greek mythology in which Theseus was given the task of finding his way through a maze. He accomplished this feat by using a string to enable him to retrace his steps.
2. Tavard, Quest for Catholicity, 33-38, cf., viii.
3. "Examen...etc., 102-104. His evaluations of the sources of authority are mentioned in several places, but nowhere are they discussed anymore thoroughly than in the nine theses of Jerome Zanchius', "De vera reformandarum Ecclesiarum ratione," which he appended to this treatise. This theses, which were Zanchius' recommendations for the proper standards by which the churches must be reformed, were enthusiastically endorsed by Saravia.
eternal life, for they contained all that He had revealed which was essential to man's salvation.\footnote{1} It was, he said, beyond all controversy that the Word of God is contained in the canonical Scriptures and that all matters of religion should be judged or defined according to this canon.\footnote{2} Having been exposed to the truth of the Scriptures, these ecclesiastical practices would be found to be either consonant, dissonant, or indifferent to the Word of God.\footnote{3} Those things in the Church which are found to be consonant with the Scriptures, should be retained, or even recalled to use if they have been abandoned, and those things which are dissonant should be rejected. However, those practices which were found to be only indifferent could be retained or rejected in a church and they should not be thought to be binding on the consciences of Christians. In the context of this same thesis Zanchius indicated that the longer a custom or practice had been retained in the Church the more it should be thought of as being true and the better it was for the Church to continue to abide by it.\footnote{4} It would appear from Zanchius' statement that "all which was consonant \textit{italics mine}$/ with the Scriptures should be retained," might lead to the interpretation that at least a part of ecclesiastical tradition was to be thought of as being equivalent with the canonical writings, but we find that he sealed off that possibility in his sixth thesis. In that thesis Zanchius reiterated that no other teaching outside of the Scriptures is the Word of God, and that only that which is in canonical writings can be considered as necessary for salvation.\footnote{5}

Zanchius said that he was aware that the canonical writings were sometimes

\footnotesize
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ibid.}, 102 (thesis no. 3).
\item \textit{Ibid.}, (thesis no. 4).
\item \textit{Ibid.}, 102-103 (thesis no 5).
\item \textit{Ibid.}, 103, cited Tertullian as the authority for this rule. Tavard said that both Jewel and Cranmer adhered to this principle (Tavard, \textit{ibid.}, 8-9, 28-29).
\item \textit{Ibid.}: "Extra scripturas canonicas aliquam aliam doctrinam esse verbum Dei, ac proinde quae in ea doctrina mandantur, esse ad salutem necessaria, demonstrari millo modo potest."
\end{enumerate}
obscure, but that some of those passages could be better understood if the reader had a proper knowledge of sacred history and of the languages of the Bible.\footnote{Ibid. (thesis no. 7).} In any event, he felt that anything which was "necessary for salvation" was taught clearly in at least one place in the Bible, and that the doctrine which might not be clear in one passage could be understood in some other passage.\footnote{Augustine was cited as the authority for this principle.} Having once again established that his catholicity was grounded in and built upon the Word of God, Zanchius repeated in his eighth thesis what he had said in number five about those things which were either consonant, dissonant, or indifferent to the Word of God, and then he proceeded to make a strong appeal for the value of antiquity in his last thesis.\footnote{Ibid., 103-104.}

In this point he stated that those things which have been accepted and recommended by writers \footnote{These references to antiquity should be understood to include the patristic writings of the first five centuries, the seven Oecumenical Councils and those Creeds which were adopted in them.} of proved worth and respected antiquity and have been accepted by the consent of all churches as having always, or nearly always, been in observance in the "Church catholic" from the beginning of the earliest times - that those things should not be rejected unless they were disproved by the Word of God, and, if possible, considered and decided upon by an oecumenical council.\footnote{Ibid., 17.}

The last of these theses is of particular significance, for Saravia had great confidence in that which the Church in the first five centuries accepted as authoritative.\footnote{"Defensio... etc.," 209.} It was during that period that he felt the best judgment could be found about that which was genuinely Apostolic, but he also explicitly stated that patristic teachings were not to be considered a canon of faith unless they were in agreement with the Scriptures.\footnote{Ibid., 17.} This raises again that very
interesting point, to which a reference was made in the preceding chapter, concerning those who are to decide whether patristic teachings are, or are not, "consonant" with the Scriptures. This is where universality and continuity actually come into Saravia's thought, for when the patristic evidence has been accepted, "... by all Churches throughout the world down from the times of the Fathers and Apostles, fit must be an Apostolical canon and immutable." This, then, is the answer which Saravia would give to our question - a doctrine is "consonant" with the Scriptures when it has passed the test of universality, antiquity, and continuity. He contended that this was not a confusion of the authority of the Scriptures and tradition because those early fathers themselves had had the Word of God to study and the universal Church would not have accepted their interpretations of it unless their teachings have been true. It was, he said, the Romanists at the Council of Trent who had confused and denigrated the correct ordering of authority by taking away the priority of the Word of God and placing it upon tradition. With some irony evidently intended he then said, "they wish to be called Catholics who have ignored the customs and institutions of the ancient fathers"

Saravia's catholicity is an integral part of all of his theology, but it is more apparent in his doctrine of Missions to the Heathen and in his doctrine of Episcopacy than anywhere else. In the former he revealed that the appeal of the Church to universality should encompass all the people of the world, for, "the teaching of heaven is indeed universal and is capable of being received by all." This particular statement was made in the context of an argument for episcopacy, but it is illustrative of what we shall find Saravia to have believed about the mission of the Church to the whole world. The words of

1. A Treatise...etc., 183.
2. "Examen...etc.," Prologus, 4th p.
3. Ibid., 3rd p.
Gustaf Aulen are a most fitting summary of Saravia's attitude about this—viz., the universality of the church is one with the universality of the atonement of Christ; 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.'

In a very real way, then, the missionary vision of Saravia was bound up in his understanding of the universality of the Church, just as it has always been so in the Christian Church, for in those times when it has been most aware of its wholeness and oecumenicity it has been most missionary.

Saravia's concern about the catholicity of the Church is much more apparent in his arguments for the doctrine of Episcopacy than it is even in what he said about missions, for almost all that he wrote about it was given in the context of this particular doctrine. A basic part of his apologetic for episcopacy was his belief in the unanimity of agreement about this doctrine by all orthodox fathers who maintained they were following Apostolic doctrine in their teachings. He felt this evidence to be so strong that if the Bible were to be lost the example of the first churches would be sufficient evidence itself that this form of ecclesiastical government was the accepted "... custom for the whole world." It was a cardinal rule for Saravia that it was both unwise and unsafe "to retreat" from the universal consent and custom of all churches. We can see in these arguments that Saravia felt that the historic episcopate was a mark of the catholicity of the Church, but he did not seek to prove the former by the latter. Therefore, he was far more concerned to show that the historic episcopate could be proved by appeals to antiquity, universality, and continuity than he was to prove the catholicity of the Church by episcopal succession. Naturally his apologetic was somewhat determined by the

2. A Treatise... etc., 198-99, cited Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," Bk. III, Chapter 3. For other fathers whom he considered to be "orthodox" v. "Examen... etc.," 17.
3. "Examen... etc.," 8, 35, 105; "Defensio... etc.," 294.
polemical expediency and necessity of the times in which he lived, but this should not be construed as the ultimate reason why Saravia followed this particular course. In other words, it seems to have been more by conviction that he stressed catholicity to prove episcopacy than by any external considerations. The relatively small amount of attention which he gave to Apostolic succession is sufficient evidence to warrant this conclusion, but the lack of evidence that he thought episcopacy to be essential to the Church is also a strong indication that he would not have reversed this order even if he had lived in times which were entirely different from his own.

Fr. Tavard has drawn attention to an important matter in this connection. It was his contention that Saravia's theological works, along with those of several others like Hooker and Bancroft, "... saved the Church of England from falling into Presbyterianism." In doing so, he claimed that these men made possible an Anglican return to a "catholic conception of the Church's structure." The principle way Tavard saw this as having been done by Saravia was in his emphasis on the three marks of the catholic Church. Since the third element given by Saravia had to do with "ecclesiastical regimen," Tavard concluded that, "the Church's institutional structure has thus found its way back into the definition of the Church." This author then said that this inclusion corrected the Protestant formula of Word and Sacraments and that it placed Saravia outside of the reformed ecclesiology of Calvinism or Lutheranism. It is understandable how this kind of conclusion could be gained from a few passages in Saravia's treatises, but not from a study of all that he wrote on this subject — viz., that it was not the structure of government as such which
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1. Tavard, ibid., 35.
2. Ibid., 35-36.
3. Ibid., 34, cited, A Treatise...etc., 144.
Saravia had in mind but the authority for ecclesiastical government. This is a distinction which must be made if we are to be true to what he said and meant, and if we are to avoid creating almost insuperable difficulties in understanding other parts of his doctrine because of contradictions. To say that Saravia's ecclesiology was outside of the theology of Calvinism or Lutheranism is a gross misunderstanding of his thought. We shall see in the next section that he preferred not to be called a Calvinist or a Lutheran in his theology, but he himself believed that he was in essential agreement in most of his doctrines with both Calvin and Luther. No one can deny the Calvinistic tone of the Belgic Confession, and we have already seen that all of his life he remained proud of being one of the authors of this work. We shall see in the section on the Lord's Supper that he had some very high words of praise for the Augsburg Confession as well. Of course these two documents do not specifically prove that Saravia was in complete agreement with them in regard to this third note of the Church; however, it seems logical to conclude that one who had felt so strongly about the doctrine of Episcopacy for so many years would have been careful to point out that these statements of faith did not agree with his own views about church polity - should that have been his understanding of them.

**Saravia's Evaluation of the Reformation**

Saravia left no doubt in his writings that he believed many changes were necessary in the sixteenth century Church, but it was of the greatest concern to him that these be carried out through reformation and not innovation. He, like Calvin, was desirous that "... the ancient face of the Church be restored," but we have already seen that in the realms of ecclesiastical polity he differed

---

1. V. supra, p. 84.  
with the later Calvinists, like Beza, as to the form of that "face." It was, he said, an innovation to abolish the hierarchical structure of ministerial orders, to join episcopal functions with those of presbyters (except in cases of real necessity), to ordain laymen to the eldership so that they might have a part in the dispensing of ecclesiastical discipline, and to say that the Church no longer had the command and obligation to preach the Gospel to all nations. These were the principal areas where Saravia thought innovations had been brought into the Church. All of these, naturally, were areas in which he and Beza spent the greater part of the force of their arguments against each other, but this did not prevent him from seeing that he agreed with Beza where he truly followed "... the orthodox and catholic doctrine of the Church of Christ."¹ Such areas of agreement, however, did not convince him that he should be called a Calvinist, as the Jesuit, Jacob Gretzer, had insisted.² These replies of Saravia to this opponent are more indicative of his catholic and oecumenical predilections than of his antipathy to the teachings of Calvin. He made this clear in the following points which he gave in his rebuttal of a part of Gretzer's treatise:³ (1) it was conducive to divisions in the Church to call oneself a follower of Calvin, Luther, or Loyola, because all orthodox Christians should recognize no ruler besides Christ; (2) he said that he had sought to draw truth from the same fountains as Luther, Bucer, Oecolampadius, Martyr, Bullinger, Calvin, and Zanchius; (3) when, he said, Gretzer could prove that he or the Church of England, gave the same degree of importance to the writings of Calvin which he gave to the decrees and decretals of the Roman Pope, then it would be correct to call them "Calvinists." He contended that he attributed no more to the writings of Calvin than to those

---

¹ "Examen...etc," 105.
² "Responsio...Gretzeri...etc," 350.
³ Ibid.
of the other leading men of his century, but in saying this, Saravia revealed
that he was himself unaware of how much he had been influenced by the Genevan
Reformer. The main point in this particular part of his argument with
Gretzer was his unwillingness to say that this was in fact Calvin's "own"
thought, because he felt that it was actually that of the ancient and ortho-
dox fathers of the Church. Two things should be noted about this interpreta-
tion: (1) Saravia was arguing de facto that his theology and Calvin's were
both derived from the ancient, catholic theologians; (2) he was reacting
strongly to the "Calvinism" at the close of the sixteenth century which was in
reality more "Besaism" than the teachings of John Calvin himself. It is un-
fortunate that Saravia was not himself always aware of the need of making such
a distinction clear in his writings, although there have been several points
made in earlier chapters in which we have seen that he clearly showed that
Besa had departed from Calvin's original doctrines.

Saravia felt that some of the mistakes made in the Reformation were the
result of an undue reaction to the practices of the Roman Church;¹ this, he
said, had blinded some of the reformers to the truth of ancient doctrine and
practices. Saravia, like Archbishop Jewel, quite often argued that the abuse
of a thing did not annul it; therefore, as Tavard quite rightly concluded,
"... anti-Romanism is no longer ... a criterion of faith" with him.² We have
seen earlier that he repudiated the papacy and the corrupted form of Roman
episcopacy, and we shall see later that he also rejected transubstantiation,
but this did not prevent him from calling the Roman Church "mater nostra."³
He said that it always has been and always will be possible for external and
visible churches to be corrupted and to wander from the truth, just as the

¹. "Defensio...etc.," 158.
². Tavard, ibid., 35; cf., Mason, Church of England...etc., 17, cited
Canon 30, of 1603, based on Jewel's Apology.
³. "Defensio...etc.," 30.
Jews had done under the Old Dispensation, but there would also always be found a remnant of faithful believers in such adulterous churches. This led him to maintain that as long as the Roman Church, or any other corrupted Church, gave evidence of still retaining the sign of the Covenant of God (viz., the New and Old Testaments), the sacrament of Baptism in the name of the Trinity, faith in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit and belief through the Son of God that they had been saved by His death, then - Saravia said, regardless of their impiety and inconsistency with the Scriptures - they will be nonetheless members of the universal Church. The unity of the Church cannot be destroyed by perfidious members or ministers for the Church is one and it cannot be torn or divided. Those who are born in that Church are understood to be members of the people of God until they imitate the idolatry of this sinful mother and separate themselves from God. Saravia's feelings are best summed up in these words:

\[\text{Nam quamvis Romana Ecclesia nec orthodoxa, nec catholica, nec catholicae Ecclesiae sanum membrum sit; Ecclesia tamen est: et vide quid amplius dicam, ipsae est mater nostra, in qua et per quam nos Deus regeneravit, et filii sui sanguine timent, et a peccatis abluunt, atque in numerum haeremum regni coelorum adscripsit: sed quia materetrix et adultera est, contra eam merito contestamur: utpote qui reverentiam fidesque Deo patri, eiusque filio Domino nostro maiorem debeat, quam matre adulterae.}\]

Saravia thought the best reformation of the Church had been achieved in England. The reformers there had not adopted innovations, or made unnecessary changes, but had taken careful note of all that had been handed down in the Church from the times of the Apostles. Yet, this did not mean that he felt

1. Ibid., 31-32.
2. Ibid., 31: "Ecclesiae tamen sunt universalis partes et membra."
3. Ibid., 30.
4. Ibid., Candido Lectori, 3rd-4th pp.
the Church of England was unique in its appeal to antiquity, for we have already seen that he felt that all the reformers had drawn from these same sources. 1 In fact, Saravia claimed that one of the major reasons he accepted office in the Church of England was to show the unity between it and the Reformed churches on the Continent. 2 His "Protestant" inclinations were also revealed in his statement that the Reformation under Henry VIII had been partially thwarted by those who opposed it, so it would appear from this that Saravia was not especially in favor of Henry's non-papal catholicism. 3 Also, we find that he spoke favorably of the Edwardian changes, 4 but it was the Elizabethan settlement which he liked best of all. To be more precise about this, it was probably the nascent Anglicanism which came to birth after the Bull of Excommunication against Queen Elizabeth in 1570, and the adoption of the Thirty-Nine Articles in a slightly revised form in 1571, with which he was in the greatest agreement. The reason for this would be that Saravia felt the form of ecclesiastical polity which he favored was more firmly established after that time. It was, after all, primarily in this area that the most significant difference is found between Saravia's views and those of continental Reformed theologians like Beza.

The Anglican theology which was developed subsequent to that date tended to choose a position between that of the Puritans on the one hand and the Roman Catholics on the other. Some have chosen to designate this as a via media, but it is doubtful whether this term adequately expresses either the
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2. "Defensio..." Candido Lectori, 2nd p.
3. Ibid., 43, 46.
4. Ibid., 38.
doctrine of the leading theologians like Jewel and Hooker, or of lesser men like Saravia. The phrase does have genuine meaning and usefulness, but it also seems to include the suggestion of the intention of compromise.¹ This suggestion would be unfortunate for the content of theological thought at that time was not the negative result of reactions to these two extremes, but it had positive direction and purpose. It is true as Bishop Williams observed that the English temperament in most of its history has been characterized by the genius of repudiating extremes and the ability to make adaptations to the changing exigencies of each age. This has often produced in the Anglican Church a characteristic doctrinal position, but this hardly proves that this Church during that century "...set itself to a middle course by means of a conscious avoidance of extremes."² This is what via media has since come to mean to many Anglicans, particularly in the nineteenth century, but it would not fit either the situation three centuries earlier, or the thought of Saravia. To support this contention Carter has quite conclusively shown that it would be necessary to prove that there was at that time a "...deliberate adoption of a via media doctrinal position and the existence of a distinctively 'Anglican' party supporting it."³ Carter's conclusions that no proof can be found that the Anglican "'centre of gravity in religion'" was materially different in its doctrine from that of the continental Reformed theologians is certainly germane to this study of Saravia, for apart from ecclesiastical polity, he remained in harmony with the Reformed tradition to which he once openly adhered on the continent.

Saravia's attempts to heal the divisions in the Church are a further indication of the unity which he felt existed between Anglicans and continental

² Ibid.
³ Carter, ibid., 238.
Protestants. He was convinced that Anglican reformers had found "... a very easy and a very smooth way of reformation" and that it was the only real hope of uniting the Church because it had been reformed by orthodox and catholic doctrine.\(^1\) Like Cranmer, who earlier had appealed for a general council, Saravia also requested that a meeting of all Protestants be called by sympathetic Christian princes.\(^2\) In such a council where all Churches would be equal and could discuss their differences freely he was sure that others would recognize the wisdom of the way the English Reformation had been carried out and would themselves adopt the same form of ecclesiastical government.\(^3\) In another treatise he said it would be odious to make comparisons of churches, for each had its good and its bad points and that there was no reason why the example of reformation should be sought from any particular one as being more orthodox than the others.\(^4\) The Lord Jesus Christ is the Master of all the Church, he said, so He alone should be obeyed, and, where the early fathers were to be found in agreement, that ought to be thought important enough to compel the consent of all the churches. In this same spirit of oecumenicity, Saravia professed to have the greatest desire to keep peace and communion with all the Churches of Christ, in which the true doctrine of faith about God the Father and His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ was kept.\(^5\) It is most significant that in this context he made a strong appeal that such things "... as external rites and different forms of Church government which were caused by the necessity of the times ... should not be allowed to split the Church any further."\(^6\)

---

1. Cf., "Defensio...etc.," 39.
2. "Letter to Pastors...Netherlands," in A Treatise...etc., 19-20.
3. "Defensio...etc.," Candido Lectori, 2nd p.
4. "Examen...etc.," Prologus, 2nd p.
5. "Defensio...etc.," Candido Lectori, 3rd p.
6. Ibid., trans. by J.F. Russell.
This very strong appeal for unity in the Church and his desire to resolve differences in a council is a very clear indication that Saravia did not believe the Reformation was over, or would be over until the wholeness and fulness of catholic doctrine was brought to bear on the splits and divisions in the visible Church.

**Ecclesiastical Unity in the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper**

The interrelation of catholicity and oecumenicity in Saravia's theology is more apparent in his treatise on the Lord's Supper ("De Sacra Eucharistia") than anywhere else in his writings. He believed the doctrine of the Real Presence to be taught in the Word of God, by all ancient, orthodox fathers, and by the foremost writers of all ages.¹ It was, therefore, a true doctrine according to its catholicity, universality of agreement, antiquity, and its oecumenicity. However, since the beginning of the Reformation the doctrine of the Lord's Supper had been more divisive than any other doctrine, so Saravia felt that the unity of the Church must be found in this doctrine and through the agreement of all parties in their interpretation of it. The schisms and wounds which had done great harm to the witness of the Church could be healed only through the correction of Eucharistic thought and practice. Therefore, his avowed purpose in writing on this subject was to put aside the discussion of needlessly controversial matters and to follow "... that royal way..." in which theologians should walk - viz., the way taught by the Scriptures and by the orthodox fathers.²

Saravia felt the way to this unity and renewal in the Church would be for all divines to put aside their particular viewpoints, and to take up again where the Church had once made an excellent beginning in the peace which had come

---

¹ Saravia...Eucharist, 15; v. supra, 74-76.
² Ibid.
through the Wittenberg Concord in 1536.\(^1\) In addition to this, he suggested that no one should object to, or contradict, what was said about this matter in the Augsburg Confession.\(^2\) In regard to the latter document it is noteworthy that he did not specify whether he meant the 1530 version or that of 1540, called the "Variata."\(^3\) This is important because it shows that Saravia was attempting to broaden his doctrine so that it would include the views of those who were willing to accept one of these statements of faith but not the other. Melanchthon had written both versions, but the later Confession is more conciliatory in tone, especially in regard to the Eucharist, for it spoke of the body and blood in these words, "... vero exhibeantur...", whereas the 1530 version had said, "... vero adsint et distribuantur." We can say, therefore, that Saravia felt both versions were in agreement with one another and with the Wittenberg Concord, and we shall see that he actually used the thought and terminology of all three to try to prove his point. Another important, though unstated, reason for mentioning all three documents was to show that he was in agreement with Peter Martyr who had subscribed to the "Variata," but refused to agree to the Concord,\(^4\) and with Calvin who repeatedly agreed to the 1540 version, but felt he could not accept the 1530 Latin edition.\(^5\)

---

1. Ibid., 7, 17. He quoted the text of this agreement of Luther, Bucer, Melanchthon, Capito, BUGERHAGEN, ET AL. on pp. 123-25.
2. Ibid., 17. This Confession was mentioned in the context of his plea for blotting out "all dissension touching the Sacrament," but he did not specifically mention Art. X anywhere in his treatise. The implication may have been that he was willing to subscribe to the whole Confession and not to just one article of it. If this was so, then it gives added weight to the conclusions reached in Chapter II about his doctrine of Episcopacy, for Articles VII and VIII in the Confession mention only preaching and the sacraments as being marks of the Church.
3. W. Schaff, Creeds... of Protestant Churches, 13, for the 1530 version, and E.E. Pusey, The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ (1857), 59-60, for a discussion of the differences in the "Variata" in regard to Art. X.
5. McNeill, History... of Calvinism, 197-98.
mary person whom Saravia indicated he was following in this doctrine was Bucer, but the Strassburg reformer only differed with Martyr and Calvin in the emphases which he felt should be made in regard to the theological components of this doctrine. Bucer, more than either Martyr or Calvin was desirous of using broad definitions which were sometimes vague and even ambiguous. It was this feature of Bucer's thought which appealed to Saravia so much, for he felt this was the only way agreement could be reached about the Eucharist.

Bucer was motivated by an irenic spirit to try to bridge the gulf which some saw as existing between the Lutheran and Zwinglian interpretations of the Supper. He himself did not believe the differences between Wittenberg and Zurich insurmountable for he was convinced that the two sides disagreed more in respect to the manner in which they expressed themselves than in the context of their various doctrines. After six years of diligent effort he succeeded in getting a large number of theologians representative of both points of view to meet in Wittenberg. The statement which they subsequently signed was one drawn up by Melanchthon and was Lutheran in tone. Bullinger, Zwingli's successor, was not at this meeting and Bucer was never to win him over, and many of the Swiss gradually withdrew from this agreement; ergo, the peace which had been achieved was consequently short-lived. Some have thought of Bucer as a "... Trimmer of Protestantism ..." because of his efforts to find a common basis on which these groups could agree, but this is neither fair to Bucer nor a correct assessment of what he actually accomplished. One practical result was the preservation of the Schmalkaldic League, but even more important was the theologically valid "... middle position ..." which he worked

1. McLellan, Visible Words...etc., Appendix C, for a comparison of the Eucharistic doctrines of Bucer, Calvin, and Martyr.
2. Dimock, ibid., 555-56.
3. Hopf, Martin Bucer ...etc., 10.
out between Wittenberg and Zurich. One of the most important characteristics of this center ground was the work which he did in showing that the unity of the Church must at least involve, if not actually begin in, the correcting of Eucharistic thought and practice.

Bucer believed that the Lutherans and Zwinglians differed in the manner in which they expressed themselves primarily because of the way they put so much emphasis on different aspects of the same doctrine of the Supper. He felt the former were trying so hard to avoid giving the impression of a mere docetic and spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament that they overstressed the objective nature of His presence to the point that some thought them to believe in a form of a carnal eating. On the other hand, he contended that the Zwinglians were reacting so much to the sacramental - sacrificial notions of the Roman theologians and the impanation of consubstantialists that they fell into the opposite error of making it sound as if they believed in a sacrament from which Christ was virtually absent. Bucer certainly realized that some divines in both parties did hold such extreme positions, but he was confident that the majority on both sides held views which substantially overlapped each other. Therefore, his solution to this problem was to get them to broaden their definitions of this doctrine so that they could not only see but also could show their essential unity.

Saravia was in complete agreement with this approach, for he himself was convinced that whatever differences there were, they were "... in no wise... touching the thing which they express...," but were found in the manner of their expression. Bucer, he said, did not differ with Luther's version of

1. Hopf, ibid., x, cited Beard, The Reformation...etc., 283.
2. Ibid., 43-44.
3. Ibid.
4. Saravia ... Eucharist, 121.
this doctrine, and, to prove his point, Saravia quoted the text of a letter from Bucer to Bishop Edward Fox in which he retracted all that he had ever said against Luther.\(^1\) Saravia was quick to point out that this did not mean the Strassburg reformer was in agreement with all of Luther's disciples, because he rejected the doctrine of Ubiquity.\(^2\) Although Zwingli and Oecolampadius had both died before the meeting in Wittenberg, he quoted Bucer as saying that the Concord did not say anything which was contrary to that which these men had said or agreed to before their deaths.\(^3\) Therefore, Saravia believed Bucer was entirely justified in contending that the differences between the majority of Lutherans and Zwinglians were in the ways they expressed themselves and not in the actual content of what they believed. One way, then, that unity could be realized, involved the problem of semantics but he also knew that this approach must be concurrent with the effort to get to the root of the theological meaning of the Eucharistic doctrine. The latter part of this problem is where he thought that unity must be found in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

We have seen that Saravia accepted the thought of Irenaeus that the Eucharist consisted of two things - \emph{viz.}, the earthly and the heavenly, or the physical and the spiritual. He contended that both of these made up the nature of the sacrament and that both must therefore be received alike by the believer and the unbeliever. The sacrament, he said, is a sacrament by virtue of God's creation of it and not by virtue of the spiritual worth or faith of the recipient or its administrator.\(^4\) We have also seen that he followed

\(^1\) Ibid., 127-51. This retraction was first given by Bucer just after the Wittenberg Concord in his treatise, "Enarrations upon the Four Evangelists."
\(^2\) Ibid., 147.
\(^3\) Ibid., 143. Both men died in 1531.
\(^4\) Ibid., 79.
Augustine in contending that a third thing is present in the partaking of the sacrament for the believing person and this he called the "virtue" or the "grace" of the meal. This, he said, was not received ex opere operato, but it was given because of the faith of the one participating in the meal. Therefore, one who partakes of the sacrament in an unworthy manner receives condemnation rather than this grace. In Chapter I we also saw that Saravia explained the relation of the earthly and the heavenly parts by means of the analogy of the hypostatic union of the two natures of Christ - i.e., that they could be neither confused or mixed with each other nor could they be separated from each other. The conjunction of the parts in the sacrament, he said, is therefore one of relation and not of substance, and the doctrine which he held could be called neither transubstantiation, consubstantiation, nor a memorial feast. For this reason Saravia preferred to call a sacrament a "mystery" because it was beyond human comprehension. Although we cannot understand the "how" of this miracle, he contended that the "why" was easily explained by virtue of human infirmities. By this he meant that since the Lord intended that both the physical and the spiritual bodies must be raised then there must be a sacramental eating in which there is food for the body and for the soul.

The principle difference between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians about the Supper was in their doctrinal expressions concerning the manner of Christ's presence in the elements. It was precisely here that Saravia thought the language of the Supper should express the inherent unity of the Church "in Christ." He

1. Ibid., 24, 26: "...virtus sacramenti," and the "...sacramentalis gratia..."
2. Ibid., 153.
3. Ibid., 103.
4. Ibid., 57.
6. Ibid., 28: "Mysteria divina non sunt physicis rationibus examinanda; excedunt enim humani ingenii captum."
7. Ibid., 33.
8. Ibid., 157.
did not believe that the presence of the Lord in the sacrament was the same as that presence which He has had in heaven since the Ascension, but he said that it was nonetheless the real and true body and blood of the crucified Lord. 

It was a presence which was "... after a manner Divine and Spiritual, Heavenly and Supernatural without any multiplication or extension of His Body." As Calvin had said, this was not the body of Christ given "... unto us 'simpliciter,'" and without deeper consideration involved therein: we must rather have regard therein to that promise by which He testifieth that His Flesh is truly that food, and His Blood that drink, whereby we be fed unto life eternal:"

Or, in the words of Bucer, "... the very Body and Blood of the Lord be given and exhibited to all who do take this Sacrament." This, he said, should show that there is no natural union of Christ with the elements for there could be neither a local inclusion, nor any abiding continuance of Christ apart from the use of the sacrament. Christ Himself is left in His heavenly glory and in no respect is He brought down to the relations of this earthly life, for it is only by faith that He can be discerned to be present in the sacrament.

The importance of this discussion of the manner of the presence as understood by Saravia is that he felt the communicant truly fed upon the flesh of Christ and drank His blood as he believed Christ had commanded in John 6:54. This incorporated the believer into the "... Very Substance of the members of His own Body, that we may be made One Body together with Him [italics mine], and may be Bone of His Bone and Flesh of His Flesh." This, he said, is the...
proper discernment of Christ's Body in the sacrament, and this was the essential unity which he believed the Church to have in the Lord's Supper. The Lord wills to signify to all who partake worthily that He Himself is the unity of the Church, for He draws each person into so close a union with Himself that he is one with Him, and the Church is even closer to Him than Eve ever was to Adam. This is a new Covenant which God has given us in His Son so that He might show forth His grace and love for us. Because of this, every person must come humbly, repentantly, and faithfully to this table and partake of this meal in which Christ gives the wholeness and fullness of Himself to all who are worthy. Having received Him, we must testify that we are His true disciples in our love for one another. This, then, is the reason why there is unity in this sacrament according to Saravia: (1) it is an incorporation of the participant into Christ; (2) it is a strengthening of the spiritual life of all who believe in Christ; (3) the reality of the union with Christ is witnessed to by the love which is shown towards the brethren.

Saravia evidenced his belief in the witness of unity found in the Lord's Supper long before he wrote his treatise on this doctrine, or even before he left the Netherlands to come to England. In that early period he had thought, as John Strype has recorded, that participation in the Supper with the churches of England was his way of showing his unity with them. He had been so impressed with the fact that "the best sort of men" did not themselves refrain from joining in communion with those churches on the continent that ...
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1. Ibid., 176: "Extra controversiam est hoc Sacramentum, quam intime et proxime fieri potest, Christum Dominum Se unire nos Sibi significare voluisse ut cum Ec Umm simus, Caro de Carne Ipsius, et Os de Ossibus, ut Ecclesia magis sit intima quam Eva unquam fuerat ipsi Adamo."

2. Ibid., 187.


4. Strype, Whitgift, II, 204; cf. "Defensio...etc.," Candido Lectori, 2nd p.
whensoever it happened that he should be present in their churches [Anglican] when the Lord's Supper was celebrated, he partook with them in those sacred symbols of the peace and unity of Christians."

The Doctrine of Election

All that Saravia wrote about this doctrine is found in the statement requested from him by Archbishop Whitgift in connection with the Barret controversy. In the preface of that treatise Saravia made some brief comments on the six points which Barret had given in his sermon, but the body of this work is a censure of Barret's recantation. Saravia did not agree with all that Barret said, but he felt that Barret was wrong to recant, so we must conclude that Saravia was in essential agreement with this doctrine as expressed in that sermon.

In the first of these six points Barret made the statement that no man has so much assurance ["finitas"] or certainty ["certitudo"] of his faith in this fragile world - i.e., unless through revelation - that he can be unconcerned ["securus"] about his salvation. In the retraction drawn up for him by the Puritans at Cambridge, he confessed that a man should be both "...certain ["certus"] and unconcerned ["securus"] about his salvation by the certainty ["certitudo"] of faith itself." Saravia did not like the phrase "...unconcerned about his salvation," and said that he wished that Barret had used

---

1. V. supra, Chapter I, pp. 49ff., for a synopsis of this affair. Cf., P. M. Dawley, John Whitgift and the Reformation (1955), 210, who said that Whitgift had not carefully investigated the matter when he consulted with Saravia, or before he censured the Puritans at Cambridge: it is very likely that he was therefore relying solely on Saravia's judgment, and, as we shall see later, he and Saravia were not at all in agreement about the doctrine involved - i.e., if the Lambeth Articles really reflect Whitgift's views.

2. For a summary of these six points as agreed upon by Barret and the Cambridge professors, v. Strype, Whitgift, II, 229-30; the recantation is in another volume (v. ibid., III, 317-20). Saravia did not write about these points individually, so the content of the points will be quoted or summarized and included in this section in the way he dealt with them (ibid., III, 321-37).

3. Ibid., III, 329.
"certus" only, for he felt that there was a great difference between these two terms in regard to the assurance of salvation — viz., the latter came by faith, while the former was the result of pride or presumption. 1 Certainty about salvation frees one from doubts and arms one against temptation, but an unconcerned or untroubled faith makes one slothful and complacent. It was, he said, the will of the Lord for Christians to be concerned about their own salvation and that of their brothers, for they must constantly guard against the wiles of Satan and they must always be watchful and ready since they do not know when He will return. 2 This really means that although eternal life has been vouchsafed to the Christian, he also must carefully follow the way which leads to that blessed goal. 3

Barret had contended in the second point that Jesus' words to Simon Peter, "...I have prayed for you..." (Luke 22:32) were meant only for that Apostle and not for all Christians, so the faith of some could be both temporary and lost. In his retraction of this he admitted that he had not taken note of John 17:20, where it says that Jesus prayed not only for the Apostles, but also for those who would believe because of their preaching; ergo, "...the faith of individual believers is not able to fail." Saravia said he wished that Barret had said that only the faith of the elect was certain not to fail, for the faith of many true believers could and very likely would fail. This is an important point in this doctrine for Saravia and it underscores what he alluded to in discussing the need for a concern among Christians about their salvation.

1. Ibid., 321, trans. by S. Simpson. Much of this treatise is devoted to the difference between the "certainty" and "security" of salvation. In the "Censure of the Censure upon Barret," which probably was written by Lancelot Andrewes, it is significant that this is dealt with in a manner very similar to that which Saravia followed (v. Paul A. Welsby, Lancelot Andrewes, 1555-1626 (1958/7, 44).


3. Ibid., 323.
To see this we shall need to examine carefully what he said about justifying faith, for it was this kind which he believed to be involved in this point. This will also cover the fourth of Barret's points which taught that there was no difference in the measure or degree of faith, but only in the ones who believed. In his retraction of this he said that the temporary faith of which he had spoken was not different in the measure or degree from permanent faith, but in the thing itself.

Saravia said there was only one true faith which could make believers one with Jesus Christ. This, however, could be either of a temporary nature, or of a permanent nature, and that there was no difference between either except in its durability. There was, he said, a temporary faith which could be called false, for, from the human viewpoint we cannot always tell whether a temporary, or even a permanent faith - i.e., lasting a lifetime - is genuine or only a pretended belief. This false kind of faith is not really important in Saravia's thought, for he only acknowledged that it existed, and then he proceeded to show that he believed there was a genuine and true faith in Christ which could be lost. This true faith makes us one with Christ and renews us through the Holy Spirit, so even a temporary faith can bring people so close to Christ and give them such a share of spiritual sanctification that if their faith were more lasting they would attain to everlasting life. Saravia's reason for saying this is found in several New Testament passages. One of these is the tenth chapter of Hebrews which he believed showed that all of the properties of a true faith could be attributed to a temporary faith. These properties are: (1) it is illumined through the Word of God; (2) it grants a

1. Ibid., 321.
2. Ibid., 324: "At temporaria fides quorumdam eos Christo ita inserit et Spiritus sanctificationis facit participes, ut si perseverarent, vitam consequerentur aeternam. Ergo illa fides vera est." Saravia differed with Calvin on this, for the latter felt that only the elect were engrafted into the Body of Christ (v. Calvin, Institutes, III, xxii, 7).
3. Ibid.
taste of the heavenly bliss which is bestowed by the Word of God and of the blessings of the life to come; (3) it makes men sharers in the Holy Spirit; (4) through repentance it makes them new. No further benefits, he said, can be granted to those who are justified by true faith whether it be temporary or permanent.

Barret had contended in regard to the final perseverance of a Christian that only pride could make a man unconcerned /"securitas"/ about the future, but in his retraction he said that justifying faith could not be lost for it was both fixed and certain. Saravia said he was not entirely certain what the authors meant by this point in the retraction, but he felt that every security of perseverance was not to be commended, for it sometimes could turn out to be arrogance. It was, he said, possible for a person to be certain of salvation only as long as he continued to believe, for one must be careful of his faith as well as the perseverance of his salvation. What he meant by this can be seen in his interpretation of Matt. 24:13, which he said was meaningless unless it was understood that Jesus also believed that those who did not endure to the end would not be saved. How, he asked, could it be possible for these words to apply to those who have a true and justifying faith, if they could not also be applied to those who may have that same kind of faith but who will not persevere in it to the end: even the greatest persistence in a superficial or pretended faith would not help at all towards salvation, so Jesus must have thought that there was at least the possibility that some would not persevere to the end. In this case, backsliding alone appears as a possible cause of damnation for nothing more seems to be needed to win salvation except en-

1. Ibid., 325. Saravia also cited Heb. 6:6, in support of his contention that some would fall away from the true faith.
durance in faith.  

Saravia then gave the opposite view of this, which some understood to be taught in the Scriptures. In Romans 11:20, he said, it appears that Paul clearly taught the impossibility of losing the faith by which we are grafted in Christ, so how is this contradiction to be reconciled? To answer this objection, Saravia said it was necessary to notice in this passage the way Paul stressed the fear the Gentiles should have (who had been joined to Christ), lest they also be broken off from the tree because of an unbelief like that which had caused God to pull away the Jews who were the natural branches. This interpretation, he contended, is reinforced by a comparison with the parable of the vine in John 15, for, he asked, what force could Jesus' words have there if they did not really mean that the vine was "in Christ" and that it could still be broken off and cast into the fire? Again, he said, the words of the Lord that, "...many are called, but few are chosen" (Matt. 22:14), clearly meant that the reward of endurance is not promised to all the faithful, but only to the elect.

Saravia disliked the idea of predestination as issuing from an eternal decree of God for he felt it did not do justice to God's foreknowledge of events. It was, he said, the manner of some theologians to write about God's eternal decree as if they had been there to participate in it. However, they should realize that God had foreseen all fickleness and instability of will and that

1. Ibid. "...sola defectio hic indicatur futura causa damnationis: nec ad salutem quicquam praeter perseverantiam desist." Here, too, it should be noted that Saravia has deviated from Calvin's doctrine when he taught that salvation itself could be lost (François Wendel, Calvin, [1965], 265-66).
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., 326.
4. Ibid., 327.
5. Ibid., 332: "Male prodestinansionem [sic. - italics his] meo judicio suspicamur ab aeterno Dei decreto, praeterita praescientia." Of., Calvin, Institutes, III, xxi, 5, where he said that predestination and foreknowledge must be understood as being separate from one another.
when men turned from the perfection in which He had created them and rushed headlong towards the damnation which they deserved because of their sin, God, as a righteous Judge, had no choice but to condemn them in their sin. However, God also foresaw that he could turn evil into good and He did so by electing some to salvation. God's foreknowledge did not predetermine that man would commit this sin so God cannot be said to have hardened His heart deliberately against any man.\(^1\) We see here two things that are of real importance for our study: one is his denial of double predestination, and the other is Saravia's doctrine of Providence, in which he maintained that God's good-will is equally directed towards all men.

The emphasis which Saravia made in his doctrine of predestination was on the righteousness of God and not on the will of God.\(^2\) He felt that a stressing of the will of God led to double predestination and did not do justice to His righteousness. There can be no injustice with God, so we must firmly cling to the belief that God is merciful and that the hardening of Himself according to His will is a part of some hidden justice which is beyond human examination, but which can be seen at work in everyday life.\(^3\) God loves all of His creation and hates no man - He hates only the sin which is in man - but His sense of righteousness cannot let sin go unpunished.

The fifth and sixth of Barrett's points both dealt with the remission of sins. The former said that the remission of sins mentioned in the Creed was related to sin in general and not to those sins of particular people. The latter said that sin was "...the true, proper, and primary cause of reprobation."

---

1. Ibid., 334: "Sed neminem prius reprobat, neminem prius obdurat, quam de peccato cognoscat: praeceedit decretum scientia, ut judicium cognitio." Cited Augustine but did not give the reference.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., 335.
In his retraction he confessed that the remission of the sins of particular individuals was meant, and that individuals could definitely know that their sins had been remitted, but he denied that sin was the cause of reprobation. Saravia's comments on this are significant and closely related to what has gone before. Sins, he said, are remitted by God only to the penitent (i.e., to particular persons) and to those who have faith in God and call properly upon the name of the Lord. But, he also said that Barret was right in his original statement that sin was the real cause of reprobation.

Saravia believed that men after the sin of Adam were blind to spiritual things and could not find the way to eternal life - i.e., they were totally depraved. We have already seen that he rejected a supralapsarian decree in his doctrine of Election, because in his doctrine of Providence he believed God intended that all of His creation should share in His goodness. Above all else, God willed that His creation should have eternal bliss and goodness, therefore, Saravia contended, it would be illogical and inconsistent to place the decree of God before sin in point of time. Furthermore, God has no desire to grant anything which would lower or detract from man, but He desires only to give him that whereby he may become more virtuous, so it was wrong to say that by His everlasting decree He marked some out for eternal life and predestined others for eternal death without taking account of their sins.

All orthodox writers, he said, agree that election and predestination stem only from the freely given mercy of God. However, it was wrong to put reprobation or rejection on this same footing. This he said could be seen in the Scriptural examples of Jacob and Esau. Jacob was chosen by God through grace

1. "Examen..." 102. This is the second of the theses given by Zanchius.
2. Strype, ibid., 332.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., 327.
and not because of his works or worth, but Esau deserved his condemnation in the same way as any other human being (including Jacob) deserved reprobation; hence, Jacob was saved by a positive, free choice of God, but, conversely, God did not make a negative decision about Esau since he was merely abandoned to the results of his sin. We do not know why one received grace and the other did not, nor should we ask. As Augustine said, "'God has pity or mercy on whomever He wishes and He hardens His heart against whomever He wishes.'"1 This is free election, and because all men deserve condemnation there has been no injustice done to those who are reprobated.2 "His mercy is freely given, His harshness is justly deserved."3

This section on election would not be complete without showing Saravia's agreement and disagreement with the Lambeth Articles which were written later in that same year to bring peace in the Church of England about this controversy.4 In the first of the Lambeth Articles double predestination is taught, so Saravia clearly differed with that. He also differed with the second Article, for he contended it was not so much by the will of God as by the righteousness of God that men were declared elected. It is noteworthy to point out in this context that Saravia seemed to prefer to use the term "elect" only in regard to those who persevered in the true faith, which implies that he left some room for the operation of men's free moral will - this also prevented him from agreeing with the third Article which taught that a certain predetermined number were predestined to salvation. However, Saravia agreed with number four, that those not predestinated to salvation would be damned because of their

---

1. Ibid., 328, cited, Aug. "De Praedestin. et Grat."
2. Ibid.; cf. 331 for cf. of Aug. writing to Sixtus the Elder.
3. Ibid., 329.
sins, but he would not have agreed that true, justifying faith could not fall away (no. five). To some extent he agreed that a truly faithful man could be certain of the remission of his sins, but he would have also contended that the faithful man must be concerned about his salvation (no. six). The last three points concerning the nature and scope of saving grace were probably all acceptable to Saravia. Therefore, we can say that Saravia disagreed with these articles fully as much as he agreed with them. If we were to look for one to whom he stood closer on this doctrine than to any other it would not be Whitgift, or Calvin, but to Lancelot Andrewes, for they were remarkably close to one another on this particular doctrine.¹

**Conclusion**

Saravia's high regard for catholicity is patent in every doctrine about which he wrote. This willingness and desire to be guided in his theological thinking by the ancient and universal customs and doctrines gave him a direction and purpose in his writings, which in a sense tended to make him an independent and constructive thinker. It was this adherence to what has been called the Vincentian Canon which caused him to object to titles such as Calvinism, Lutheranism, etc... However, his objection was not to the men themselves, or even to their theology, but rather to the way he had seen some of their followers alter and even corrupt what these men had taught by making it into a system: men like Beza, he contended, had taken the teachings of their mentors and had tried to improve on them without going back to the sources from which Calvin and the other Reformers had drawn. This had caused Beza to advocate innovations in the Church rather than to work for its reformation. Saravia insisted that the catholic Church must continually be going back to the sources of its

¹ Cf., Dawley, *ibid.*, 209-12; Welsby, *ibid.*, 43-44.
life and purpose and that these were in the past, not the present. This insis-
tence on the authority of antiquity was stressed to the point that the more an-
cient a doctrine could be proved to be, the more validity and worth it should
have for the Church.

The ultimate source of authority for Saravia was undoubtedly the Scriptures.
The fact that he contended that that which had been accepted everywhere, by all
Christians, in all times, should be considered Apostolic doctrine, was not an
equalization of tradition with Scripture; it would have been if he had be-
lieved that tradition need be subjected no longer to the searching power and
healing corrective of the Word of God. However, Saravia felt that all the doc-
trines of the Church must be studied again and again in every age in the light
of the canonical writings. It seemed to be this which gave him a sense of
humility in the light of the way many in the sixteenth century differed in their
interpretations about some ancient customs and doctrines of the Church. He was
not willing to unchurch those who differed with him as long as they accepted
certain fundamental propositions in their theological thinking. It was the
rediscovery of this principle of the preeminence of the authority of the
Scriptures which he thought to be the summum bonum of the Reformation. Yet,
he also thought the reforming of the Church should be carried on until it was
united. It was in the corruption of the Roman Catholic Church and in the fail-
ure of many Protestants to accept or agree on catholic doctrine that he saw the
cause of the disunity of the Church in his day. This is precisely why he al-
ways seemed to be thinking catholicity and oecumenicity into one another.

The clearest exposition of Saravia's manner of relating the oecumenical
nature of the Church to its catholicity is seen in his doctrine of the Lord's
Supper. This doctrine was chosen because it had been so divisive among
Protestants and because he felt most of them already held essentially the same doctrine, but were expressing it in different ways. He felt that the Church would take a great step towards unity if it would accept the ancient and universally accepted formulation of this doctrine. Bucer, he felt, had accomplished this in the Wittenberg Concord, so the Church should return to that agreement and begin again from there to find its unity through a common understanding of this doctrine. Also, Saravia chose this doctrine because he felt it expressed the internal relation of the unity of the Church to its wholeness; i.e., in the participation in the crucified body and blood of Christ we have already been made one. This is an eschatological fact which he saw to be realized again and again as the Church participates in this sacrament. The Church gives witness to the wholeness of its nature as the Body of Christ in the manner in which it shows forth its unity with the Lord who is its Head.

This unity is also seen to be expressed in his doctrine of Election. Here, he was anxious to show six basic things: (1) God freely elects whom He wills to be saved; (2) the providence of God is such that He is always completely for man; (3) the certainty of faith in salvation must not be taken as a licence for indifference or unconcern about one’s soul; (4) sin is the just cause of reprobation, therefore God has not hardened His heart against any man without cause; (5) true faith can be lost, but only the elect will endure to the end; (6) the foreknowledge of God does not necessarily predetermine subsequent human actions. There is a very interesting duality about the way Saravia looked at election. From God’s point of view he thought of it as a sovereign act which was neither merited by man nor dependent upon human righteousness or faith; from man’s point of view Saravia seemed anxious to stress the fact that true faith could be lost and only those who endure to the end may be called the elect. In taking this latter approach Saravia seemed to be
allowing for the operation of man's free moral will, but in the former he apparently was desirous of protecting the sovereignty of God's will and His free election. However, through this whole doctrine he was obviously more anxious to stress the righteousness and providence of God than he was to explain His will. It may well be that the best answer concerning this duality in his doctrine of Election is Saravia's conception of the catholic Church as being more than just the visible Church: it was the Church which was always imperfect but moving towards perfection - the Church which must be understood as being composed of both earthly and heavenly elements, just as he had expressed in the Christological analogy which he had used in explaining his doctrine of the Lord's Supper.
PART II

THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH

TO THE HEATHEN
CHAPTER I
SARAVIA'S DOCTRINE OF MISSIONS TO THE HEATHEN

Introduction

Saravia's doctrine of Missions to the Heathen was his unique contribution to historic Christian thought.¹ He showed in his treatment of this doctrine a freshness and originality of thought which flowed out of his understanding of the Word of God. The thing which makes his doctrine so significant is that he gave a far more comprehensive and dynamic interpretation to the missionary nature of the Church than any other theologian connected with the Reformation. This is not to say that Saravia's doctrine was fully developed, for it was not; but he spoke about this great need of "missions" far more perceptively and with greater conviction than did any other Protestant or Anglican theologian in the sixteenth century. Another extraordinary thing about his doctrine is that he based it almost entirely on one passage of Scripture, Matthew 28:16-20. This is a practice which many authorities consider to be unwise, but we shall see that he gave an essentially correct interpretation of the passage and this particular choice of Scripture made it possible for him to stress the ecclesiological nature of his theology of missions.

Since the nature of Saravia's contribution in this area of the life and thought of the Church is much greater than in any other, and since he developed

¹. He thought of "missions" as the work of the Church in making Christianity coextensive with humanity in two ways: (1) the proclamation of the Gospel in those nations where the people had never heard it; (2) the restoration of Christianity in those nations where it had once been preached and practised, but had since declined to a point of near extinction.
his thought so unusually, we are required to change our approach somewhat in this chapter. Previously we have examined his doctrines in the context of the theological thought of his Anglican contemporaries; now we must use a wider range of reference. After examining Saravia's interpretation of the last verses of Matthew, we shall see how they were dealt with in the patristic period. Next, we shall look at the relation of these verses to the reformer's thought about missions. Outside of the Scriptures these are the two periods to which Saravia always turned for guidance and help, and in these we shall find a very good perspective for a proper understanding of his own doctrine of Missions.

Saravia's Interpretation of Matthew 28:16-20

In these verses we read that the risen Christ met his disciples at a pre-arranged place on a mountain in Galilee and there delivered a great mandate to them. Saravia did not believe that this was simply a missionary command which the Lord gave to these followers for the first time on the Mount of Ascension; this was a summary of all He had said to them and done for them in His whole earthly ministry. It would be no exaggeration to say that Saravia saw in Matthew 28:16-20 the very heart of the Gospel which was to be shared with all the world throughout the new age which was ushered in at the Resurrection. These verses marked for him the laying of the cornerstone of the Apostolic foundation of the Church, which was authorized to continue in the true doctrine which they had received from their Lord. He felt that anyone who took away any part of the teachings of these verses was in essence undermining a part of the foundation of the Church itself. Very briefly we can summarize his interpretation of the application of this passage for his own age in these words:

1. He expressed his thoughts about this passage in many places in his works, but nearly all that he had to say about the doctrine of Missions which he found in them is in Chapters XVI - XIX in "De diversis...etc.," and "Defensio ...etc."
the mandate to preach the Gospel to all nations was given not to the Apostles alone, but to all the Church, and it is binding on all the Church in every century "...even unto the end of the world."¹

There are a number of very important points which Saravia made about the missionary implications of this command and they are as follows: (1) the absolute objective presupposition of everything in this mandate is the Lordship of Jesus Christ shown in verse 18, "...all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth"; (2) the command given in the verbs, "πάγκον Θεοντε...μαθητεύετε...βαπτίζοντε...διδάσκοντε..." are inseparably linked with the promise, "...καὶ ἐστιν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐμέ..."; (3) this order to go to "...all nations" was never given to individuals as such, but to all in the Apostolic age and all in later ages who were to be a part of the Church; (4) the ordering of the Church and its ministry is integrally related to the spread of the Gospel; i.e., Apostolic authority and power is still needed for carrying out the tasks first committed to the Apostles; (5) the Apostles themselves know that they were only beginning this missionary task for it was far too great for them to complete in their own life-times; (6) the Apostles chose socii et cooperatores to carry on this work after they died; (7) others, e.g., the 70 Evangelists and many other believers, were working with the Apostles to carry out this commission even while the Apostles were alive; (8) the history of the Church is evidence that the people of God have always understood that the Gospel must be continually disseminated among new peoples; (9) even after fifteen hundred years there are many people in the world who have never heard the Gospel and this fact alone should be sufficient evidence of the need for the Church to be

¹ Matthew 28:20 (K.J.V.). Stephen Neill has pointed out that many scholars feel that Matt. 28: 19-20 should be used with caution because this may have been an interpretation by the early Church rather than a record of the original words of Jesus (v. Neill, Christian Society, 20). However, this factor does not enter into our consideration of Saravia's usage of these verses since he believed them to have been the authentic words of the Lord.
missionary.

Since the time of William Carey these ideas would not be considered at all revolutionary. Yet, two hundred years before that great pioneer in missionary thought wrote, *An Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathen*, Saravia was saying much that Carey was to write later. We can see from the way some reacted and others ignored them that in Saravia’s time these interpretations of this passage were virtually unknown. No evidence can be found that anyone responded favorably to them, while those who did take notice of them were almost violent in their disagreement with the ideas which Saravia had expressed; most of this dissidence was about points 2-6.

One author on missions in recent years has suggested that the Christian Church attached almost no missionary significance to the Great Commission until the time of William Carey. He maintained that it was the coming of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost to which the Church looked for eighteen centuries as the mandate for its missionary activities. In the Foreword to this book an eminent authority on missions, W.A. Visser’t Hooft, indicated that he agreed with Boer’s conclusion with the qualification that it was to the total *kerygma* that the Church looked for its authority. Visser’t Hooft also pointed out that there has been a noticeable weakness in the theology of missions whenever the Church has sought to let only certain parts of Scripture speak explicitly about its missionary task. We need not judge conclusively the merits of these proposals in this thesis, but it is very apparent that these gentlemen

---

1. Harry R. Boer, *Pentecost and Missions* (1961), 15-18. Unfortunately, he did not give any documented evidence for this statement about the Great Commission, but on pp. 49-50 he dealt briefly with the subject of Pentecost in patristic literature. I have not been able to find an exhaustive study of the interpretations of Matt. 28: 16-20 in either the patristic period or in any other period of ecclesiastical history before the eighteenth century. This would be an invaluable desideratum for the Church.
have raised a subject of real relevance to Saravia's use of Matthew 28:16-20. Since he used this as the sole foundation of his doctrine we must take into consideration what they have said. It might be noted here that Saravia was not unaware of other missionary passages in the Bible and he occasionally referred to them. It is remarkable though that he never treated them as adding anything to what he had already interpreted from the passage in Matthew. This was not his usual method of showing biblical authority for what he said, for ordinarily he ranged far and wide in quoting from the Old and New Testaments in supporting his doctrines. Since Saravia sought to use this passage in this way it seems necessary to go back into the history of the Church and to see how others have felt about it. The logical place to look first is the patristic period for the fathers were Saravia's foremost authorities on biblical interpretation.

The Patristic Interpretations of Matthew 28:16-20

Harnack's study of the early part of this period is a great help in determining what some of the Fathers said about these verses. He began with the presupposition that these were not even authentic words of the Lord, but an interpolation of the early Church. However, this led Harnack to contradict himself in a most extraordinary way for after saying that the "Heidenmission" did not even lie in Jesus' vision he nowhere showed that the Apostles or the Church fathers thought of this as anything other than the actual words of Jesus. Again, he made the remarkable statement that this commission is "...true in the

---

1. It would simply swell the size of this section without adding to its value to try to give every passage which has bearing on this subject. The views of the fathers which are included are representative of the period.


ideal sense" and the disciples understood and fulfilled the universal mission because it was the "Spirit of Jesus" which led them to it.\(^1\) In support of this he cited Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Hermas, Justin and the anonymous author of the \textit{Epistle to Diognetus}. Each of these in his own way referred to the fact that Christians were to be found throughout the whole world because the Apostles had carried the Gospel "to all nations."\(^2\) Harnack accepted this as a literal fact when it would seem that he would have been wiser to have concluded that these were metaphorical, or, hyperbolical statements. These literary devices were quite common in Scripture and in the apologetic writings of the early Church.

In the patristic period one must always be conscious of the struggle for survival through which the Church was going. The persecutions, the heresies, and the insidious temptations to seek accommodation with a secular society were present most of the time. Therefore, the writings of the fathers were more generally geared to defending the faith, or even to keeping the world out of the Church, than to getting the Church out into the world. \textbf{Even so, this whole period was one of unusual missionary expansion}, so the need was far greater to deal with the problems which were arising from such rapid growth than to remind the Church of its missionary nature.\(^3\) This is important to remember when we see how these Fathers interpreted Matthew 28:16-20, for they often mentioned it in arguments against heresies, but seldom to show its missionary significance for the Church. This is clearly seen in the writings of Athanasius, for his only use of this passage was to point out its teachings of the doctrine of the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{\textbf{1.}} Harnack, \textit{ibid.}, I, 49; II, 171-73.
\item \textit{\textbf{2.}} \textit{Ibid.}, II, 148-51, 172-73, passim.
\item \textit{\textbf{3.}} V. Stephen Neill, \textit{A History of Christian Missions} (1964), Chapter 2, for a discussion of the missionary expansion of the Church from A.D. 100-500. \textit{\textbf{Ibid.}}, 59: "in the year 500 the Church could look back on five centuries of miraculous success."
\end{itemize}
Trinity in rebuttal of Sabellian and Arian notions of the Sonship of Christ.\(^1\) Irenaeus saw in these words of Christ that the promise of the Holy Spirit was an answer to the Gnostics and there were other Fathers who, like him and Athanasius, were more concerned with the apologetic uses which could be made of them than they were of making a full exposition of their entire meaning.\(^2\)

It is not until we get to Tertullian that we can see a more noticeable outward look of the Church reflected in an interpretation of these verses. Like most of the fathers Tertullian quoted them in support of the doctrine of Baptism, and the prescribed form of administering it, but he also commented on the command of the Lord to go into all the world with the Gospel.\(^3\) He did not believe that the Apostles had fulfilled this commission, nor did he believe that these words of the Lord were meant only for the Apostles; he believed they were meant for all Christians. Yet, Tertullian put an unusual twist on the end of his interpretation for he saw this as a command to the Apostles, but as only an example or special admonition for all others. He believed that all Churches were Apostolic in their foundation whether or not founded by the Apostles so long as they were in communion with those Apostolically founded Churches through participation in the Sacraments. Saravia did not credit Tertullian as an authority for his doctrine of Missions, but there are some similarities in the views of both men on this passage. Both indicated that they believed the Lord spoke these words to the Apostles and to all other members of the Body of Christ, although Saraavia believed it to be a mandate to all, whereas, Tertullian did not. Likewise, Saraavia’s emphasis on the need

---


\(^3\) Tertullian, *Tertullian’s Apologetic and Practical Treatises*, No. 10 in Library of the Fathers, trans. by C. Dodgson (1842), I, 272, 443, 452-53, passim.
for Apostolic authority is reminiscent of Tertullian's stress on the Apostolic nature of all properly founded Churches.

Eusebius has special significance for this study because Saravia devoted an entire chapter to the corroboration of a part of this doctrine which he based on the writings of Eusebius. The particular part of the interpretation which he made of the verses in Matthew and for which he used Eusebius as an authority can be seen in point (4): "the ordering of the Church and its ministry is integrally related to the spread of the Gospel, i.e., Apostolic authority is needed for carrying out Apostolic tasks." Saravia said this meant that Apostolic authority was needed as much for the conserving and strengthening of New Testament Churches as for the founding of them. In other words every true Church must have the same authority and the same relation to the Lord Jesus Christ as any other church, whether it be founded by an Apostle or by the successors of the Apostles. This was a strong point in his thought about missions for it meant the Church had the same essential validity in every age because it was built on the foundation of the Apostles created by the Lord. Although he did not quote further from Eusebius to support his doctrine he also could have shown that this father in several other places pointed out that this passage of Scripture applied to all the Church and not to the Apostles alone.

Chrysostom is the father who gives the clearest insight into the missionary nature of Matthew 28:19-20. He believed in these words the Lord put into the hands of the Apostles ".... a summary of the doctrine, that expressed by the

---

1. V., "De diversis... etc.," and "Defensio... etc.," Chapter XIX.
form of Baptism, commands them to pour forth over the whole world." A most
important feature of the way he dealt with these verses was to show the con-
nection which existed between the command of Christ in v.19 and His promise in
v. 20. Even more clearly than Eusebius, he stressed the universal nature of
the recipients of both command and promise. He said it was meant for "... all
that believe after them. For plainly the Apostles were not to remain here un-
to 'the end of the world'; but he speaks to believers as to one body." Yet
this is as far as Chrysostom went in drawing attention to the missionary ob-
ligation of the Church found in this passage for disappointingly he turned as-
side after reaching this high point and continued for the remainder of his homily
in warning against the deceitfulness of worldly riches. Saravia often quoted
from Chrysostom but he did not use him as an authority in explaining this pas-
sage. Since he was thoroughly familiar with his writings it is quite likely
that he was influenced by the ideas of this father. Two of the main points,
(2,3) which we have noted about Saravia's interpretation can be clearly seen
in Chrysostom's thought.

Most of the fathers treated this text very much like the Cappadocians did.
They were not seeking to give their full views about it, but adduced it to
prove other theological points which they wished to make. For example in his
treatise "De Spiritu Sancto" Basil the Great spoke of Matt. 28:19 to show that
the Holy Spirit should be numbered with the Father and the Son, thus making a
Trinitarian formula. Gregory of Nazianzus, as did Gregory of Nyssa, also men-
tioned the Trinitarian teachings which can be found in these verses, and went

1. S. John Chrysostom. The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom on the Gospel
of S. Matthew, Pt. III, No. 34, in A Library of the Fathers, trans. by G.
Prevost and J.E. Tweed (1851), Homily XC, 1167-75. Cf. Thomas Aquinas,
Commentary on the Four Gospels Collected out of the Works of the Fathers, trans.

2. S. Basil the Great. The Treatise, De Spiritu Sancto, vol. VIII of
Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, trans. by B. Jackson. 2nd series (1895), 27-
28, 35, 37.
on to show that they should also be construed as teaching that we are incorporated into the Body of Christ through baptism, but neither he nor the other two Cappadocians mentioned anything about the missionary aspects of this passage. The last father whom we shall mention is the one we should consider as the most likely to have noted the concept of missions in these verses, for St. Prosper of Aquitaine is distinguished as having written the first treatise in ancient literature on the problem of the salvation of the infidels. However, this book speaks only vaguely of the doctrine of Missions taught in these verses, for it was written primarily against the semi-Pelagian heresy.

Even if there is no unanimity of patristic opinion about the closing verses of Matthew, there are some conclusions which can be drawn from the literature of the fathers. As has been noted earlier the challenges of their era were somewhat different from those of later times and their attention was directed accordingly to the needs which they saw. This can be seen in the manner in which they interpreted this command of Christ to His disciples. There were some, like Tertullian, Busebius and Chrysostom, who noted that Christ meant for His Church to be missionary in every age, but they evidently did not see the need to stress this in strong terms. It appears that Boer and Visser't Hooft are on the whole right in their contention that the Church drew its missionary mandate more from the total kerygma than from this or any other one passage of Scripture, but Boer overstated the case when he said there was "apparently /a/ complete absence of this motivation as a conscious factor in the missionary life of the early Church.”

---

seems to be apparent is that Saravia went much further in developing the Doctrine of Missions found in these verses than any of the fathers did.

The Doctrine of Missions to the Heathen during and after the Reformation and Its Relevancy for Saravia

When Protestant and Anglican thought and action during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is closely studied it is remarkable that the leaders of the Reformation and post-Reformation periods gave so little attention to the need of carrying the Gospel to the heathen. This has long been a concern of many historians and theologians and much has been written on different aspects of this problem. They have been almost unanimous in lamenting this deficiency, but they have differed widely in their explanations of it. Most have sought to show that it was the result of a combination of theological and circumstantial factors, but their emphases on the former or on the latter have accounted for their differences. It would serve no useful purpose to try to summarize all the various conclusions which they have reached, but we shall be looking at those few points which have affinity with ideas which Saravia put forward. Since he is credited by some as being the first theologian connected with the Reformation to have developed a doctrine of Missions to the Heathen,

1. Authorities whose comments and conclusions have been particularly helpful in this study are: Gerald H. Anderson (ed.) The Theology of the Christian Mission (1961), 97-100; Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, ed. by G.W. Bromiley and T.F. Torrance (1961), IV, Pt. 3, 1st half, 23-24; P. Drews, “Die Anschauungen Reformationischem Denken über die Heidemission,” Zeitschrift für praktische Theologie, XIX (1897), 312-17; H.W. Gensichen, Missionsgeschichte der neuesten Zeit (1961) T5-T13; Grössel, Die Mission... im 17. Jahrhundert, 70-73; Von Walter Holsten, “Reformation und Mission,” Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, XLIV, No. ½ (1953), 1-32; Kenneth Scott Latourette, A History of the Expansion of Christianity (1940), III, 25-26; Neill, ibid., 220-23; Johannes van den Berg, “Calvin’s Missionary Message,” The Evangelical Quarterly, XXII, No. 3 (1950) 17-87; ibid., Constrained by Jesus’ Love (1956), 4-29; Gustav Warneck, Outline of a History of Protestant Missions, trans. and ed. by George Robson from 7th Ger. edition (1901), Chapters I & II, (this work would have been of greater value if it had been properly documented).
we may be able to throw a little more light on the treatment of this doctrine
by the reformers and we certainly will see more clearly why he succeeded where
others did not.¹

A very serious hindrance to the conception and carrying out of a program
of missions to the heathen was the struggle for survival which confronted the
reformers during these times.² This survival was not really assured for the
Protestants on the Continent until the Peace of Westphalia in 1648; therefore,
for well over a century the energies of most were consumed by the necessity of
rethinking and cleansing Christian doctrine and by the need for establishing
a stable milieu in which their churches could grow and flourish. We tend to
minimize the difficulty which this posed for non-Roman churches in these two
centuries as we look back from the vantage point of the twentieth century.
The real nature of this particular problem may be seen more clearly when we ex¬
amine it in the light of what we know about the life of Hadrian Saravia. The
survival of the Church of England was not in the kind of jeopardy after the ac¬
cession to the throne of Queen Elizabeth that the churches on the continent
were facing in the latter half of the sixteenth century. The haven of peace
which Saravia found in England and the influence which it had on his life and
theology after all the turmoil which he had so abhorred in the Low Countries
has already been mentioned in other chapters as a very important factor in our
understanding of his work. It would seem probable that this factor had some
part, too, in the development of his doctrine of Missions. In the Introduction
the conclusion was reached that we could not be certain when he first wrote the

¹. Charles H. Robinson, History of Christian Missions (1915), 43; M. Galm,
Das Erwachen des Missionsgedankens im Protestantismus der Niederlande (1915),
33; Van den Berg, "Calvin's Missionary Message," ibid., XXII, (1950), 181-
82. Van den Berg said Saravia was the first Calvinist to become an ardent
champion of the missionary obligation of the Church; of., Die Religion in
Geschichte und Gegenwart, dritte auflage (1960), IV, 934.²

². Neill, ibid. 220.
twenty-six chapters comprising "De diversis gradibus...etc.".¹ We do know that several of the chapters may have been published as early as 1561, in Frankfurt, but since this edition is not extant we do not know if chapters XVI-XIX were in it or not. The internal evidence of the book would seem to indicate that this doctrine of Missions was in the 1561 edition in at least a rudimentary form, but not in the full development of it that we see in these four chapters in the 1590 edition. The reason for this conclusion is that missions was not an afterthought of Saravia, but it was an integral part of his understanding of the Church. He referred to it in enough places in "De diversis gradibus...etc.," to show that it was well woven into his thought and must have had at least a little space in that earlier work. The significance of all of this is that Saravia probably had some idea of missions to the heathen while in the Low Countries, but it was not until he reached the safety and serenity of England that he was able to think it through and show why he believed it to be so important a responsibility of the Christian Church.

Closely akin to this rather mundane conclusion is the fact that most Protestants were unfortunately located in countries where they had little opportunity for contact with the heathen portions of the world. The Roman Catholic countries of Spain, Italy and Portugal were the pioneers in exploration and colonialism, so they often barred the way to contact with other peoples. It certainly seems to be more than coincidence that the first two countries with significant non-Roman Catholic populations to begin foreign explorations in the latter half of the sixteenth century were the two in which Saravia spent all of his life, the Netherlands and England. Of course this is only supposition, but it may well be that these first ventures out into other areas by both nat-

¹ V. supra, 4:1-42.
ions caused him to be more aware of the importance of this new age for the Church than were many of his contemporaries. Prior to Saravia's arrival in England for permanent residence in 1587, there seems to have been some interest in missions already being manifested. If others were beginning to take note of these rapidly expanding horizons it may not be so far-fetched to assume that he also was being led to think more seriously about these seminal ideas of missions.

We come to what is a more positive reason for the development of this doctrine by Saravia in an examination of the prevailing view of the corpus christianum. This idea of a vast, unified, transnational Christian society reached its zenith in the thirteenth century and it had begun to be doubted and disputed long before the Reformation. The reformers greatly furthered the dissolution of this myth but most of them were not able to free themselves entirely from this medieval doctrine. Luther is a prime example of one whose thoughts about missions were strongly influenced by this view of the interrelation of Church, State, society and culture.

He justified his position on missions by saying that the Apostles had carried the Gospel to the most important parts of the world. After the Apostolic age any missions to the heathen were thought to be the responsibility of ruler of the State; this seems to have been consonant with his doctrine cuius regio, eius religio. The only real responsibility which the Church had in this was to extend its boundaries wherever it was contiguous with paganism; this he felt was analogous to a stone cast into the water where the waves moved away from the center in ever increasing concentric circles.

1. V., Eugene Stock, The History of the Church Missionary Society (1899), I, 20. This author said English missions grew out of the colonial enterprise.
2. Van den Berg, Constrained...etc., 14-15.
3. Ibid., 6: "...und zu der Aposteln zeyt schon ynez groste und beste teyl der welt kommen war!" (Werke, Weimar Ausgabe 10 I a).
Therefore, bishops or pastors were to extend the influence of their dioceses, or parishes, locally in their own lands. Christian rulers were responsible for spreading the influence to other lands and thus the Christian witness would eventually reach the ends of the earth. This view can be interestingly compared with the way Calvin saw the subject of missions in this context of the Church and the State. His was a clearer and healthier joining of the two for he stressed that both were agencies ordained of God and under His dominion.

He saw a distinction between them but they both had the same goal and they were to cooperate with one another ".....to bring the government of Christ to the ends of the earth." Because of this view of Church and State relations and because of those circumstances which limited their contact with heathen nations, Calvin and the other reformers thought mainly in terms of missions which would be controlled by the government. Some, like Luther, would have agreed to a partial or total surrender by the Church to the State of any responsibilities in this area. Calvin had no idea of this being a "surrender" for he had a higher conception of what was involved than most, if not all; he saw this as the fulfillment of the Church's task ".....by means of an instrument which was seen as given by God to promote His Kingdom and to serve the Church as its 'nursing father' (Isaiah 49:23)."

We have previously seen the way this medieval notion of a corpus christiann influencer Saravia very late in his life and in particular the way it became so determinative in his conception of the ordering of State and society. However, he did not seem to have been under the influence of this doctrine when he wrote the two treatises in which he discussed missions to the heathen. In

3. Ibid.
fact, there is no indication in Chapters XVI-XIX in either "De diversis...etc.," or "Defensio...etc." that he would ever adopt such a limited and sterile view of Christianity and its relation to the world; rather, we see in these works a conviction that the mission of the Church to the heathen was the same in every age regardless of cultural or social conditions and their relation to religion or State. When he discussed his doctrine of Missions he did not do so as if he saw the Church as set down in the midst of a pagan world with responsibility to continue preaching and embodying the Gospel in nations which had already received this Good News. This responsibility extended also to those areas where the Gospel had been proclaimed and adhered to in the past, but where it had been abandoned and forgotten in the present. Finally, it was part and parcel of this same responsibility for the Church to spread the Christian faith to the heathen who lived in lands where the Gospel had never been proclaimed. There certainly are traces of medieval influence in some of Saravia's other doctrines, but in this particular one he showed a marked independence of thought.

We also noted in Chapter III that Saravia became strongly Erastian during the Stuart era, but again there is no evidence of it, in the way he unfolded his doctrine of Missions to the Heathen. This is very interesting because there is a trace of this in Article 36 of the Belgic Confession, for there under the title "Of Magistrates" we see the only reference to such a doctrine in the entire confession in these words: "kings, princes and magistrates .... must .... countenance the preaching of the Word of the Gospel everywhere, that God may be honored and worshiped by everyone....". As one of the authors of that document Saravia may have written those words himself, but, if he did, they
were a far cry from that which he wrote thirty years later.\(^1\) There is no hint of missions being the responsibility of "kings, princes and magistrates" in "De diversis...etc." for he made it the general responsibility of the Church and the particular responsibility of the bishops. His thought about the Church and its duty to evangelize all the peoples of the world is a significant shattering of a static conception of a Christian society which spread only as fast and as far as culture and politics permitted or dictated. Also, there is no suggestion in his unfolding of this doctrine that the Church must merely extend the frontiers of Christendom or convey the blessings of a Christian civilization to those who had hitherto been without them.\(^2\) It will be seen in the next chapter that Saravia looked on the missionary nature of the Church in the sense that it was leaven which was instrumental in bringing the power of the Kingdom of God to all areas of the world instead of as a conveyer of western wisdom and superiority. This is important, for, as Bishop Newbigin has indicated, the beginning of the modern missionary movement was largely controlled by this unfortunate idea of a corpus christianum. Also, Brutsch quite correctly pointed this out as a limiting factor in most of the reformers' missionary thought, and in showing Saravia's success in rejecting it as the framework for his doctrine of Missions.\(^3\)

Saravia made no mention of political, economic or cultural interests which might have some bearing on this spread of the Gospel. The German scholar, Drews, implied that Saravia had such motivation in developing his doctrine of

---

\(^1\) V., Horst R. Flachsmeier, Geschichte der evangelischen Weltmission (1963), 110, who says that with Saravia we find the beginning of the idea that missions was not the task of the State alone, but of the Church itself and its many members.


\(^3\) J.R. Brutsch, "La pensée missionnaire dans le Protestantisme de Luther à Zinzendorf" (Thesis, University of Geneva, 1946), 167.
Missions, for he believed him to have recommended a type of colonial-missions program. In such an interpretation Drews read more into Saravia’s thought than he should have, for there really is very little evidence that Saravia saw anything in those early days of colonialism other than a new opportunity for missionary expansion. Therefore, we should be very cautious in trying to find in Saravia a connecting link between the Reformation and the later colonial mission period of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It would be more correct to show that he is a connecting link between the Reformation and twentieth century ideas about missions. Gensichen also was only partially right when he spoke of Saravia’s Calvinistic “love of the Bible” and his “thirst for action” as a “line of communication” to missions of the west European-protestant Colonial mission. This use of Saravia could be allowed only in the sense that he had a doctrine of Missions in a period when no one else had one and was therefore historically a connecting link. Possibly the main similarity of his missionary ideas to that in the period of colonialism would be the heavy stress made on what Saravia once called the “ampla legatio” or the Great Commission as a missionary text. But even then his interpretation of that passage was more Church centered than much of the mission work of that period.

Previously we have seen that the real key to Saravia’s doctrine was his interpretation of Matthew 28:16-20. His understanding of these verses was very different from that of any of his contemporaries on the continent or in England.

1. Drews, ibid.
2. He attributed this idea to the following statement from “Defensio...” 186: “...sicubi etiam in remotissimis terrae partibus Evangelii nuntiandi est opportunitas, illum ardorem gloriae Dei et salutis hominum promovendae refrixisse, qui olim fuit in Patribus”.
4. V., “Defensio... etc.,” 170.
Many reformers had real difficulty in being objective about this passage and some were never able to overcome this difficulty. To some extent this is understandable when we consider the claims about it which the Roman Catholics were making on one side and the Anabaptists on the other. The Romanists used it as a proof-text for papal supremacy, based as that doctrine was on their understanding of Apostolic succession. The rejection of the papacy was the one doctrine on which more Protestants and Anglicans were united than on any other so it was inevitable that their strong reaction to papal claims would tend to influence their about these verses. Quite often Roman apologists would adduce Matthew 28:19 as a missionary text in the context of its adduction to support the papacy. In doing so they linked the command found in v. 19 with the promise in v. 20 to argue the infallibility of papal doctrine. Some, like Cardinal Bellarmine, also "... included among the eighteen marks of the true Church its missionary activity, and made it a subject of reproach to the Protestants that they had no comparable missionary activity." It was not easy for the reformers to reply calmly and dispassionately to words such as these by Bellarmine: "'Heresies are never said to have converted either pagans or Jews to the faith, but only to have perverted Christians. But in this one century the Catholics have converted many thousands of heathen in the new world.'"

The result was that their opponents tended to deny all of these claims including the quite legitimate missionary command in v. 19. This also explains why most of the argument between Saravia and Beza later revolved around the vocatio extraordinaria and the vocatio ordinaria or munus extraordinarium.

1. [Referee's note: 221, Ibid., quoted, Bellarmine's Controversiae, Bk. IV.]
The argument most often put forward by the reformers against the hierarchy of the Roman Church was that the Apostolic office was a *munus extraordinarium* with a temporary character. As Van den Berg has pointed out, the reformers in the heat of those debates were in, "...danger of forgetting that the task of the Apostles to spread the Gospel...is the task of the Church as a whole, whose Apostolate it is to go out into the world with the apostolic kerygma." The large number of Saravia's opponents in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, who attacked his doctrine of Missions is a verification of this statement; this is particularly significant in light of the fact that no one can be found in either century who defended or supported him in this area of his theology.

Saravia argued the Apostolic office to be extraordinary as far as personal gifts were concerned, but ordinary in all the features of government and doctrine which were committed to the Church through them. Yet his opponents ignored the logic of what he was saying and the fact that he was in essential agreement with them on everything except the doctrines of the Ministry and Missions.

Luther seems to have been the man who first prepared the ground for this later rejection of what was the heart of Saravia's thoughts about missions by men like Beza and Gerhard. He did this by claiming that the promise in v.20 must be separated from the command in v.19; the former was eternally valid, while the latter died with the Apostles. It certainly seems plausible that this incorrect exegesis was largely caused by a reaction on one hand to the anthropocentric element in Roman missionary activity (which actually grew out

---

2. Bosch, *Die Heidenmission...etc.*, 190; cf., Walter von Loewenich, *Luther als Ausleger der Synoptiker* (1954), 116, 214, for Luther's interpretations of the Trinity from these verses.
of their doctrine of Works) and on the other hand the Roman interpretation of this verse showing the papacy and the Apostles as munera extraordinaria.

The only room this left for an idea of missions for Luther, Beza, Gerhard, and many others in the 16th and 17th centuries was to make it wholly the work of God and "extra nos". This within itself can be a legitimate and commendable attitude towards missions if it means a dependance on the sovereignty of God for all its success and power and that it involves us in giving witness to the love of God even "to the ends of the earth." It unfortunately did not mean that to these men for they felt it relegated them to the role of spectators, rather than participants, in the missionary work of the Gospel. As we shall see later, the reformers' fear of what they thought were arbitrary and subjective elements of Anabaptist missionary activity based on these verses was likewise a contributing factor in what Warneck has called a polarization of their ideas by the controversies of the times.¹

The names of reformers like Melanchthon, Zwingli, Bullinger, etc. have not been mentioned for they did not differ significantly from Luther's views. However, Martin Bucer deserves special attention for he, like Calvin, evidenced a genuine missionary concern. This can be seen in a statement which he made in the context of discussing the nature of both those within and those without the Kingdom of Christ:

The Lord does not wish to make known to us the mysteries of election, but commands us to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature - in all the world and [italics his] to every creature.²

In another treatise he spoke with deep feeling of the spiritual need of the heathen and petitioned the elders of the Church to take this matter in hand.³

¹ Warneck, ibid., 20.
² Torrance, Kingdom and Church, 79, n. 1, qted. Scripta Anglicana, 296.
³ Martin Bucer, Von der Waren Seelsorge (1538), pp. xlv-xlvi.
He stressed that Christians should go out and seek the lost sheep, i.e., "Juden, Türken und andere Heiden" and win them to the Kingdom of Christ. Bucer revealed the real power of his appeal in making this task the concern of the whole congregation and he obviously freed himself from the prevailing Protestant view that the commission was limited to the Apostles, but he failed to show how this was all to be implemented.

Bucer stood very close to Calvin in this doctrine, just as he did in nearly all of his theology. Calvin stressed the fact that the sending forth of the Apostles by Christ was proof, "...that the middle wall of portion" between the Jew and the Gentile had been broken down. Christ thus made the teaching and preaching of the Gospel an essential part of Apostleship and a means of salvation for all whether near or far. Thus, like Saravia's later interpretations, Calvin saw in Matthew 28:16-20 the close linking of the doctrines of the Ministry, the Sacraments and the Word. The Apostles as ministers of God's Word and administrators of the Sacraments went forth into the world to spread God's Kingdom by laying the foundation of the doctrine of the Church. They did not fulfill this task and the possibility of a temporary renewal of this office was left open, but the Apostolic functions were to be carried on by ministers. In his Sermons on Deuteronomy he said ministers must preach the Gospel over all the world as Christ had commanded "...and he limits no short time to it, but will have it done to ye worlds end". Even though Calvin's

2. Ibid., 385.
3. John Calvin, The Sermons of M. John Calvin upon the Fifth Booke of Moses Called Deuteronomie, trans. Arthur Golding (1583), 258a; cf., Samuel Zwemer, "Calvinism and the Missionary Enterprise," in Theology Today, VII (1950-51), 211: Calvin was the only Reformer who actually planned and organized a foreign mission enterprise." This was the effort by Calvinists in Brazil to evangelize Indians beginning in 1555. Zwemer's article, pp. 206-16, is a good summary of the positive appraisal of Calvin towards missions. Cf. Karlfrid Fröhlich, Gottesreich...bei Calvin, 48-90, who also reveals Calvin's breadth of vision about the Church in the world (n.b., pp. 70-74 for an excursus comparing Loyola and Calvin).
emphasis was far more constructive than that of his contemporaries he still said much less about missions to the heathen than we should expect. His fine exegesis of Scripture and his love of the early Church would naturally lead us to look for a wider and broader vision in this respect than we find. It would appear that Calvin’s ideas on missions also failed to break completely clear of the polarizing tendencies of his times.\(^1\)

In his book, *Constrained by Jesus’ Love: an Inquiry into the Motives of the Missionary Awakening in Great Britain in the Period between 1698 and 1815*, van den Berg has shown that one cannot accurately determine the causes of the British missionary awakening without going back to the Reformation and post-Reformation periods.\(^2\) This must be done first on the continent and then in England, for the problems which arose in the latter in regard to missions were similar, though more restricted, to those on the continent. In England, too, a major reason for difficulty in arriving at and acting on a doctrine of Missions was a form of reaction to Roman Catholicism. An example of this can be seen in a treatise called *Unwritten Verities* by a Roman theologian who based claims of papal infallibility on the last verses of Matthew’s Gospel. Cranmer replied to this work and in a rebuttal of this particular claim he showed the promise in v.20 to be conditional: "...that is, if you preach the gospel truly, if you baptize rightly, if you teach the baptized to do all things that I have commanded you, lo, I am with you unto the world’s end".\(^3\) On this basis the

---

3. T. Cranmer, *Works...etc.*, 54. Earlier Wycliffe had said almost the same thing about this passage when he interpreted it to show the obligation to preach the Gospel to every creature (v. Matthew Spinka (ed.), *Advocates of Reform: From Wyclif to Erasmus* vol. XIV of *A Library of Christian Classics* (1953), 49.
command and promise were still binding on the Church but for some inexplicable reason he failed to comment on the logical conclusion that in his day the Church must therefore "go...to all nations". In this particular passage he seemed almost preoccupied with his opponent's arguments and this may have prevented him from carrying his thoughts to their logical conclusions.

Jewel did not go as far as Cramer in this respect for he believed the command to go into all the world and to teach the Gospel was accompanied with extraordinary power given to the Apostles alone. He did not deny the need for missions to the heathen but when he was taunted by Dr. Harding with the rather fantastic results Jesuit missionaries were seeing in distant countries he lamented the way they were going about their work and said nothing about what non-Roman Christians should do. This same ability of Roman theologians to put their opponents on the defensive is seen in an argument between Stapleton and Wm Fulke. Stapleton taunted Fulke with the accusation that Protestants had not converted any infidels to the Christian faith. Fulke's reply is a classic:

The religion which we hold, whom he calleth Protestants... hath converted all nations of the world, that ever were converted, from infidelity to the true faith and religion of Christ...If Protestants could brag as well as the Jesuits, they might boast of many thousands converted by them in the new-found lands of Gallia Antartica /Brazil/ and India, beside many Jews that are known to be turned to the Christian faith in this part of the world.

In Lancelot Andrewes we can find still another interpretation of these words of Christ to His disciples. He saw v. 19 as a command to preach, but it was the command "to observe all things...etc." in v. 20 which he emphasized. In another work he said the power of propagating and continuing the spread of the

---

1. Jewel, Works...etc., III, 289-30; cf., Field, Of the Church III, 156, who said essentially the same thing.
2. Cf., Jewel, ibid., 179.
Gospel was not given to the Apostles alone, but to all the Church and was common to all ages. He made the distinction in this connection that this "grand commission" to the Apostles was mandatory to them but permissive to their followers. Here Andrewes, like Cranmer before him, seemed on the threshold of a doctrine of Missions to the Heathen, but he stopped short of it for later we see that he made no mention of the responsibility to spread the Gospel or to found new churches when he listed the charges committed to the office of the bishop. This seems to have been the greatest hindrance to Andrewes for he spoke of the episcopi as overseers of the ordained of the Apostles over a particular church or region but with no responsibilities beyond that specific charge. Here we see Saravia's conception of the episcopal office to be much more comprehensive than that of Andrewes or of other contemporaries in the Church of England. He stressed that bishops were successors of the Apostles in the sense that they have received not only charges to oversee particular congregations, but that they were just as responsible for founding churches in new areas where the Gospel had not yet been preached. Saravia seems to have been the only Anglican stressing this aspect of the office of the bishop during his lifetime and nowhere do we find any comment by a contemporary on this profound observation, not even from his close friends Richard Hooker and Lancelot Andrewes. This may well be explained by the fact that the idea of the corpus christianum was also strong in England before the eighteenth century. The Church was not in the ascendency there as it had been in the Middle Ages, but the State was.

1. Andrewes, A Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine and Other Minor Works, in L.A.C.T. (1846), 355-57. V. also pp. 36-46, in which he spoke of the spiritual condition of the heathen but said nothing of the responsibility of the Church to carry the Gospel to them.
2. Ibid., 355-62.
3. "Defensio...etc.," 157.
saw it as a part of the dream of a Christian empire which would extend itself to the ends of the world. "The unity of Church and State made the extension of ecclesiastical control corollary [sic] to the establishment of civil jurisdiction over newly occupied regions." The natural concomitant of this was to put the onus of missions to the heathen on the King, as Luther had done, and not on the bishop as Saravia did.

We have seen that Saravia's progressive missionary ideas were partially made possible by his understanding of the weaknesses of the prevailing view of the corpus christiarcum. Another significant way that this progress was made possible was in his understanding of the Roman Catholic Church. Saravia desired to reform that Church, not to repudiate it, so he looked with unusual objectivity on its doctrines of the Sacraments, of the Ministry and of Missions. He rejected the Roman episcopate as a munus extraordinarium, but he said those reformers were wrong who argued the need of a temporary renewal of this "extraordinary office" in order to continue the Apostle's missionary task. It was true that the Apostolate itself was a vocatio extraordinaria, but none of that extraordinary character was still needed in the Church after their death. That Apostolic doctrine and authority which continued in the Church was ordinaria and not extraordinaria because it was committed to the Church and not to the Apostles alone. In another place he said this somewhat differently in these words: "...nam omnia fuere in Apostolis extraordinaria, quorum multa lapsu temporis facta sunt ordinaria". He meant by this that the Church really had neither continuity nor connection with its Apostolic foundations if the doctrine and authority of the Apostles was limited to themselves alone.

---

2. Y. supra, Chapter IV for more on Saravia's "catholic views."
3. "De diversis...etc.," 18.
4. This will be discussed in the next Chapter.
part of that doctrine and authority was the command given by the Lord to these eleven men and to all the Church represented in them in Matthew 28:19. Saravia, therefore, questioned whether the Church had any right to preach or to baptize at all if it denied that it had the same responsibility as the Apostles to go to all nations with the Gospel. All of these things, he believed, were mutually inclusive. It was precisely this which caused him to make such a close connection in his thought between the "fullness, expansion, continuity, and unity" of the Church. He felt all of these characteristics of the Church strengthened and proved one another because they were Apostolically founded. In other words he looked upon the mission of the Church to the heathen as having the same validity in all ages as any of the other features of Apostolic tradition might have.

The Roman Catholic theologian, Maurus Galm, came to the conclusion that Saravia had been influenced in his missionary ideas by Roman theology. Galm, like other Catholics in recent decades, was struck by Saravia's advanced attitude towards that Church. The fact that Saravia adopted the approach that the abuse of a thing did not necessarily destroy its importance and value for the Church convinced Galm that he had drawn some of his thoughts about missions from Roman theologians. He believed in particular that there was some agreement with and dependence upon Erasmus; although he did not elaborate on this con-

1. V. supra, Chapter IV, "Introduction".
2. Galm, Das Erwachen des Missionsgedankens...etc., 35-36, 76-77.
3. Ibid., 35, cited the Frankfurt edition of 1591, p. 32, for the following quotation which he felt best summed up Saravia's attitude: "Nam quod ecclesiastica potestate per sumam tyrannis olim abusi sunt, et adhuc hodie abuntur pontifices Romani, rei bonae et a Deo institutae non abrogat legitimum usum." The thesis of Galm's book is the Roman Catholic influence on the men who marked the beginning of Protestant missions in the Netherlands. The first man he mentioned was Saravia. Cf., A. Goslinga, "Die Anfänge des Missionslebens in Holland," Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift, XLIX (1922), 79-85, who answered Galm's book but admitted only "...im Stramin der alttholländischen Mission einen katholischen Einschlag...."
clusion, he must have had in mind the very impressive plea for missions to the heathen which Erasmus had once made. ¹ There is actually very little similarity in the way these two men dealt with this subject for Erasmus developed this as if he needed only to appeal to the conscience of men. Galm was closer to the point when he said Saravia was influenced by Roman missionary activity and literature. ² This is probably true for he had a comprehensive knowledge of the history and theology of the Roman Church. One example of the way this influenced him may be found in a statement which he said was beyond controversy — i.e., that Christ "...is able to be preached to the people, who have heard nothing about the Lord...". ³ The wording of this statement and the context of the argument show that he must have had the bull, Pope Innocent VIII's, mind. ⁴ Another example is a reference which Saravia made to show that he rejected the methods of Spanish missionaries. ⁵

Earlier the reference was made to the negative influence which the Anabaptist doctrine of Missions in general, and their interpretations of Matt. 28:19-20 in particular, had had on the reformers. Their strongest reactions in this direction stemmed from the subjective and arbitrary manner which they believed characterized Anabaptists' missions. This was not as strong a force as the Romanist influence but it was considerable even at that. Anabaptists differed widely in their doctrines but they were united in their belief that the verses in question were a mandate for a missionary witness to the heathen

¹. The heart of this appeal is quoted in George Smith, Short History of Christian Missions, 6th ed., (1904), 116-118, from Ecclesiastes sive Conciliator Evangelicus.
². Galm, ibid., Chapter 1 and the Conclusion.
³. "Defensio...etc." 170.
⁵. "Defensio..." 187: modo qui id pro movent, eam rationem convertendi ignaros nostrae fidei non sequantur, quam Hispani tenuerunt, sed quam Dominus noster docuit".
One authority of this more radical part of the Reformation described their views in this way:

Basic was the conviction that upon all who had been experientially forgiven the Great Commission of Matthew 28:19-20 was laid to proclaim repentance and true baptism among all the peoples in programmatic heedlessness of the territorial and prudential limitations imposed by the Magisterial Reformers. This meant that every convert was to be a missionary witness - based upon the conviction of personal accountability and explicit faith, so that the Lutheran doctrine of the Priesthood of All Believers was interpreted in such a way that the laity generally were considered to be successors of the Apostolate.

Here we can see a very decided difference between the Anabaptist doctrine of Missions and that of Saravia. The latter believed only ministers to have been successors of the Apostles, and he would have undoubtedly rejected the arbitrary and individualistic manner which the Anabaptists were advocating as their basis for missionary activity. Saravia would have agreed that all believers are witnesses of their faith, but he would have also felt that any missionary activity undertaken by the Church to the heathen should be done by the ministers of the Church under the direction of ecclesiastical authority. One very important thing should be noted here about the strong suspicions of Anabaptist or Roman Catholic influence which Saravia's espousal of a doctrine of Missions to the Heathen would (and probably did) cause in the minds of most Protestants who read his works at that time; viz., that this one fact alone should be

---

3. Ibid., 844-45.
4. "Defensio...etc.," 175. He indicated there that he had been accused of Anabaptist influence even before "De diversis...etc.," was published in 1590, (cf., "De diversis...etc.," 19). E.g., some may have thought he was influenced by someone like the Spiritualist, Paracelsus, who developed a doctrine of Missions in the 16th century, but who stood closer to the Anabaptists than to Protestant or Anglican thought (y., Gensichen, ibid., T8-T9).
sufficient to silence any arguments that Saravia used his doctrine of Missions to the heathen as a proof-text for episcopacy. It would have been foolish to use such an argument in a treatise to the Reformed ministers in the Low Countries in the hopes that it would help to persuade them to accept the episcopal form of Church government. Actually, Saravia undoubtedly must have known that this doctrine would prove to be a complete liability to his whole argument. Therefore, we can rightly conclude that he was deeply convicted of its independent validity, even as he was of the truth of episcopal government.

Those who look beyond the matters discussed thus far in this section for clues as to why Saravia developed a doctrine of Missions whereas others did not will be disappointed. A great deal of attention has been given by scholars to theological reasons which would explain the deficiency in thought about missions during the Reformation. Some have looked for explanations in such doctrines as Election, Eschatology, and Predestination, but Saravia would provide them little, if any, help in this respect. Much of his theology, apart from the doctrine of the Church, is poorly developed in his writings and for the most part one has to read between the lines to determine what it actually was. As much as is possible the relation of these doctrines to his doctrine of Missions will be examined in the next chapter.

In conclusion we can see that Saravia deserves more attention and far more credit than he has generally received in this particular area. The idea of missions can be seen in the reformers on the continent and in England, but no one developed these ideas to the extent which Saravia did. When we look at his predecessors in the Reformation it seems reasonable that he went further than they because he enjoyed advantages which most of them did not have. He took their theology, particularly that of Calvin, and carried it to its conclusion in this doctrine. Possibly they could have done this themselves if
circumstances had not formed what seemed to be insurmountable obstacles to missionary activity. They were not only cut off from opportunities to send missionaries, but they also had cut themselves off from the primary missionary agency of the Church for the previous five hundred years when they rejected monasticism. They saw no opportunity to send missionaries and they developed no practical methodology to do it when an opportunity did present itself. Saravia's contribution comes precisely at this point, he revealed the way the Church, when properly organized and authorized could and should take advantage of every opportunity to spread this Christian witness. He gave no plan as to how this idea was to be implemented, but he certainly would have agreed to no order, society or organization which would operate outside of the Church. He also revealed that the only way that it could be carried out was through the ministry of bishops and presbyters set apart for this specific purpose.

The Influence of Saravia's Doctrine on Others

Most of the attention given to Saravia's doctrine of Missions has been limited to the question of how much influence he had on his contemporaries or on later generations. Often we find that these examinations are more concerned with what others thought of what he said than what he himself really said about this doctrine. Even those who have studied his doctrine have sometimes done so in a narrow and rather restricted manner. For example, Calm made a good bit of the fact that Kawerau and Grössel had studied chapters XVII and XVIII in "De diversis...etc.," and "Defensio...etc.," but had failed to realize that chapter XIX also dealt with this doctrine. Yet, Calm himself apparently failed to see that chapter XVI had an important part in this doctrine and few if any of these investigators seem to have given more than a cursory

1. Calm, ibid., 34.
glance at the rest of these treatises. The reason for this fragmentary kind of study which Saravia's thought has often received is that most scholars conclude that he had little if any positive influence on any Christian leaders.\(^1\) Those who have concluded that he did have some constructive effect on the missionary ideas of others have done so without offering any proof. There was a considerable amount of negative reaction to his work and we shall come to that after a look at the unsubstantiated claims which have been made for Saravia.

It is likely that Brutsch, Galm, Kawerau, and others were correct in pointing out that Saravia marked the beginning of Protestant missionary thought in the Netherlands.\(^2\) However, this must be understood only in the sense that he had some idea of missions while living there and when he developed these thoughts he did so in England in a treatise written to the ministers of the Low Countries. He really had no influence on later Dutch mission thought as far as we know for no one there even mentioned his doctrine nor did anyone who later wrote on missions do so in a manner similar to the way Saravia had. The missionary ideas incorporated in the Dutch East India Co. charter in 1602 and the subsequent literature related to it belie any knowledge of Saravia's work. Without offering any evidence Drews said that Saravia influenced J. Heurnius, the father of Dutch missions and the author of De Legatione Evangelica ad Indas Capessenda Admonitio.\(^3\) This was most unlikely for Heurnius did not mention Saravia and he had a different theological basis for his doctrine. He ac-
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2. Brutsch, ibid., 149-50; Galm, ibid., 55; Kawerau, ibid., 337.
3. Drews, "Die Anschauungen Reformatorischen Theologen über die Heidenmission," ibid., XIX (1897), 315. Kawerau, ibid., 343, rejected this idea and said Drews had not even read De Legatione... etc.; cf., Galm, ibid., 37-38.
tually rejected Matt. 28 as a missionary text and based his doctrine on Matt. 24:14, which showed missions to be oriented eschatologically. Furthermore, Heurnius believed the responsibility for this task rested on the State and not the Church /suius regio, suis religio/. As Brutsch has shown this was a major reason for the subsequent failure of some of the colonial missions.1 Saravia hardly had any idea of this kind of methodology, so he could not really have had any influence on that system of thought.

Galm has made the suggestion, also without evidence, that Saravia was instrumental in getting John Eliot interested in missions.2 This, too, seems highly unlikely for Eliot was of Puritan persuasion at that time, and it would have been most unusual if any argument for missions would have favorably impressed him which was tied so closely to the doctrine of Episcopacy. Galm mentioned also the likelihood of some influence on the Reformed theologian Voetius and even on the founders of the Danish-Halle Mission at the beginning of the eighteenth century, but again without proof.3 There is really no evidence that Eliot, Heurnius, Voetius, or anyone else was positively helped to see the need for carrying the Gospel to the heathen by these arguments of Saravia. Probably a few would have profited from them if he had not bound them to his arguments for episcopacy, but this, too, is only supposition. We do know that Saravia was far ahead of his times in this particular area of thought and this must have been the major reason he was not able to get more people to follow him in it.

Whereas no one can be found who agreed with Saravia, some can be found who strongly disagreed with him. Beza was the first known person to attack his

---

1. Brutsch, ibid., 152.
3. Ibid., 37-38.
arguments and probably no where else is his thought as shallow and ill-conceived as in his rebuttal of Saravia's arguments for missions. He claimed that the commission in Matthew 28 had been fulfilled by the Apostles who spread the odor Evangelii across the earth.¹ He was the first Reformed theologian to give this kind of interpretation to Matthew 28 for he certainly did not get this idea from Calvin. One can easily see from Beza's arguments that he hardly knew where he stood on this doctrine himself.² He conceded to Saravia that the command and the promise in Matthew 28:19-20 belonged together, but he believed the only authority which the Church had to carry out the mandate was in the immediate vicinity of those areas where Christianity was then established.³ Missions, then, for him meant that the Church was responsible for those who lived in Christianized areas but who were not baptized Christians or who were heretics. After establishing this position he then contradicted himself by saying that the Genevan Church had already been actively missionary in many parts of the world. We shall see in the next chapter that much of their difference about missions came from their different interpretations of the ordinary and the extraordinary calls which they believed ministers could and should receive to carry the Gospel to the heathen.

A much more formidable opponent, Johann Gerhard of Jena, took up this attack on this doctrine just after Saravia's death. Gerhard strenuously assail-ed Saravia's interpretation of Matt. 28:16-20, by denying that the command and the promise were connected, for he believed the former applied only to the Apostles and the latter to all believers.⁴ Gerhard's most violent reaction

¹. Cf. Kawerau, ibid., 334: "Aber Beza...scheut sich nicht zu behaupten, dass sicherlich durch die Apostel doch wenigstens ein Geruch des Evangeliums bis nach Amerika gedrungen sein müsse."
². V. "Defensio..." 172-76, 180, 182, 185-96, et passim.
³. Ibid., 172-73.
⁴. J. Gerhard, Loci Theologici (1639), VI, cols. 247ff. Grüssel, Die Mission...im 17. Jahrhundert, discusses the attack by Gerhard (pp. 70-72), and the arguments of two other seventeenth century theologians which were similar to those of Gerhard—viz., Caspare Erasmo Brockmand (pp. 72-74), and John Fecht (pp. 76-77). Cf., Kawerau, ibid., 342-43.
in this matter stemmed from his understanding of what Saravia meant by "Apostolic succession". He believed three things should be considered about the Apostolate itself before the true nature of succession could be seen: (1) it consisted of the teaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments; the power of the keys of the Kingdom were to be found both in the former and in the latter; (2) it involved the supervision of the Church; (3) it contained the authority of preaching the Gospel throughout the whole world and a part of this authority was the gift of miracles and infallibility of doctrine. The Apostolate proper actually consisted only of the third consideration and there was no successor to it for Apostleship was an extraordinary and temporary office. In regard to the missionary elements of that passage he went so far as to say that even the Apostle Paul believed the command to have been fulfilled and he quoted Romans 10:18 and Colossians 1:23 as proof of this. This whole argument by Gerhard is a remarkable example of the sterility of thought about missions which had infected seventeenth century Lutheran orthodoxy; indeed it is considered by most scholars to be the classic formulation of orthodox views on missions for that period.

These same arguments appear later, in an official document on the subject of missions to the heathen by the theological faculty of Wittenberg in 1651.¹ In 1702, the Wittenberg professor, J.G. Neumann attacked Roman Catholic missionary methods and in the course of his argument he also strongly criticised Saravia as well.² Neumann was against missions as such, but it seems to be more than a coincidence that his arguments, the opposition of the Wittenberg faculty, and that of Gerhard and Beza are all found to flow more from their reaction to the papacy, and claims made for it on the basis of Matthew 28, than
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¹ Robinson, History of Missions, 43-44.
² Galm, ibid., 38.
from any other single factor. A hundred years after the Reformation many
Protestants were unable objectively and correctly to interpret this passage
lest it appear they were also subscribing to papal claims of Apostolic suc-
ession! This gives added weight to the conclusions reached in the previous
section that this was a very real obstacle for reformers who sought to develop
a doctrine of Missions. This also explains to a very large extent why
Saravia's ideas about missions had no positive influence on Protestants of non-
episcopal persuasion. By the time a genuine reaction had set in to the ster-
ility of orthodoxy in the latter part of the seventeenth century Saravia had
been long forgotten. As far as his doctrine of Missions was concerned he was
not seriously considered again until Drews "discovered" him in the closing
years of the nineteenth century. After that article appeared several other
scholars took an interest in him, but following this brief flurry of research
his thought was dropped back to the position of receiving only casual references
in surveys of the history of missions. In recent years interest in Saravia has
been reawakened by several scholars, but no one apart from Brutsch has known
enough about him to go very far in explaining his doctrine of Missions.

**Conclusion**

It is unfortunate that the Church has paid so little attention to this
pioneer in the theology of missions. He gave an essentially accurate inter-
pretation of Matt. 28:16-20 and can be credited with bringing these verses to
the attention of theologians in a way which no one else had ever done. Brutsch

---

is quite correct in calling Saravia "the first theoretician of Protestant missionary thought", but he overstated the case when he said that Saravia had developed his doctrine of Missions to a remarkable state of precision. What Saravia achieved in this area of his thought was certainly remarkable, especially in light of where he stood in comparison with his contemporaries. But it could not be called "precise", nor even well developed, for in several places, as we shall see in the next chapter, what Saravia said about missions is not always clear and he sometimes stopped in his thought precisely where he could have made some really great contributions to the theology of missions in later centuries. This in no way should detract from the very creditable manner in which he did break through and go centuries ahead of his time in showing the relation of ecclesiastical to missions, but even at this point there is much that we could now wish him to have said and at which he seems only to have hinted. This desire is all the more acute and poignant since in some ways the Church has still not caught up with him. Kawerau expressed the feelings of this writer when he spoke of the excitement he felt when he read the few pages of Chapter XVII of "De diversis...etc.," and saw how Saravia had outlined his doctrine of Missions. Then Kawerau said when he discovered "Defensio...etc.," and realised that there were twelve whole pages devoted to this same doctrine in that treatise he had high hopes that Saravia would develop his ideas further. However, he was very disappointed that this author devoted much of this space to an explanation of "Apostolic fullness of power".\footnote{1. Brutsch, ibid., 149-50.} \footnote{2. Kawerau, ibid., 341: "Mit grosser Begierde griift ich nach dieser zweiten Ausserung Saravias zur Sache, in der Hoffnung, dass hier seine Missionsgedanken zu noch deutlicherem Ausdruck kommen wiirden. Leider wird diese Hoffnung stark enttauscht, denn der grösste teil der neuen Auseinandersetzungen bezieht sich darauf, zu verdeutlichen und gegen Missverstandnisse zu schützen was er unter 'apostolischer Vollmacht' verstanden wissen will." (He used the 1601 edition produced in Frankfurt and complained that it was so full of typographical errors that he sometimes could not make sense of what Saravia was saying).}
This preoccupation with certain facets of his argument with Beza to the exclusion of other sides which did not receive sufficient attention may very well be another major reason why Saravia's doctrine has received so little attention in recent centuries. By the time he was rediscovered at the close of the nineteenth century, the study of missions had already begun to develop into a science, which the Germans called Missionswissenschaft. The very advanced state of his thought about ecclesiology and missions simply has not outweighed with most of these authorities the tentativeness and incompleteness of his overall approach to a doctrine of Missions; e.g., he said very little about a practical methodology of missions and this has always been an important part of missionary thought.¹

It is to some extent understandable that those who did not agree with Saravia's doctrine of the Ministry should have difficulty in accepting his doctrine of Missions, although if they had carefully examined what he said they would have seen that the one did not necessarily preclude the other.² The real difficulty in assessing the lack of influence which Saravia had on others comes in the context of his Anglican contemporaries. We have seen that Saravia was in very close agreement with them in his theology, and particularly in his doctrine of the Ministry. Yet, there is not any trace in the works of the Anglicans of his time that they accepted or rejected what he had to say about missions to the heathen.³ An example of the way this part of his thought was almost completely ignored can be found in Bilson's Perpetual Government of
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¹ In Chapter II we shall consider the practical suggestions which he made for implementing his missions thought. V. "Apostolicity and the Ministry in the World-wide Expansion of the Church".

² Both Kawerau (ibid., 339) and Brutsch (ibid., 149-51) said they thought it regrettable that he tied the two doctrines together, but neither thought this made his doctrine of Missions invalid or unacceptable.

³ Kawerau, ibid., 343.
Christ's Church. In that book he commented on the way Beza had said that Matthew 28: 16, 19, applied only to the Twelve, but Bilson, who rejected Beza's views, said nothing himself about the continuing validity of the missionary message of those verses for the Church. Since he was referring to the work which Beza had written against Saravia, there is certainly no question but that Bilson was familiar with what Saravia had said in support of missions to the heathen. It has been notable throughout this study of Saravia that he was held in very high regard by other leading theologians such as Whitgift, Bancroft, Hooker, Andrews, and many others, so it is something of a mystery as to why they chose to ignore this subject. Several hypotheses could be offered, ranging from pre-occupation with the Puritan controversy to the radicalness of this new doctrine. A better explanation may have been suggested by Bishop Lesslie Newbigin when he described the attitude of those times towards the world in these words:

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, when the evangelization of the greater part of the human race had not been begun or even thought of, Bishop Lancelot Andrews could give thanks for 'the more than marvellous conversion of all the world to the obedience of faith.' Christendom had become a largely isolated and self-contained conclave of humanity.

Could that kind of view of the world have been the fundamental reason why Saravia's words fell on deaf ears about the need to carry the Gospel to the heathen? If so, then he also needs to be credited with the recognition of the spiritual need of the whole world in an age when most theologians did not recognize it. Whatever the reason was it amounts to a tragic omission on their part. England had more contact with the rest of the world at that time than
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1. Bilson, *Perpetual Gov't...etc.*, 130, cited Beza's "Responsio ad Saraviam de Ministrorum Evangelii Gradibus," 26, 27, in Chap. V.
2. Anderson (ed.), *ibid.*, Foreword, xi.
any other Christian nation not dominated by the Roman Catholic Church. Saravia offered the basis for a sound, workable theology of missions which could have afforded the Church of England a strong rationale for carrying the Gospel "to all nations". It staggers the imagination to think of how much more Anglicans could have contributed to the spread of Christianity if they had acted at the beginning of the seventeenth century instead of waiting two centuries to launch a really effective program of missions to the heathen.¹

¹ The S.P.C.K. was founded in 1698, the S.P.G. in 1701, and the C.M.S. in 1799. Cross (ed.), Diet...Christian Church, makes the following observation about these three organizations: "Though later in date than the S.P.C.K. or the S.P.G., it [C.M.S.] became the first effective organ of the Church of England for missions to the heathen."
CHAPTER II
SARAVIA'S WORK AS A PIONEER IN THE RELATION
OF MISSIONS AND ECCLESIOLOGY

Introduction

A study of the manner in which Saravia laid bare the union of ecclesiology and missions is a logical continuation and conclusion of all that we have previously considered in this thesis. A proper appreciation of those doctrines in the first section dealing with the nature of the Church is essential for a correct evaluation of his doctrine of Missions to the Heathen. These doctrines are all closely related to one another because Saravia's thinking was so thoroughly ecclesiological. This in turn can be explained because he had the very practical purpose in every treatise which he wrote of attempting to meet what he considered to be the most pressing theological needs of his time. His evaluation of such needs in Elizabethan England was consonant with the judgment of his Anglican contemporaries for the doctrine of the Church received more attention from them than any other subject.

The Church of England in the Elizabethan period was primarily interested in the doctrine of the Church for three reasons: (1) the freshness and vitality of theological thought which resulted from the "rediscovery" of the living Word of God in the Scriptures during the Reformation; (2) Anglicanism was being very strongly influenced by those who wanted a reformation which would incorporate both Protestant and Catholic elements; (3) the Puritan controversy forced Anglicans of all theological persuasions to focus their attention on ec-
eclesiastical polity. Saravia was a man made for this kind of theological environment. His experiences in the Netherlands had already convinced him that most of the post-Reformation problems were arising out of faulty ecclesiology. He never attempted to define his doctrine of the Church, but he spent his remaining twenty-five years on English soil writing about the answers to these problems which he found in the Scriptures and patristic literature.

We have seen in Part I that Saravia's main ecclesiological interest was centered in the doctrine of the Ministry. However, he often dealt with related doctrines, such as the Eucharist, Civil Authority, and Missions. All of these were approached because of his prior interest in the doctrine of the Imparit of Ministers, but this should not be interpreted as meaning that he thought they were any less important than the doctrine of the Ministry itself. He chose to write to the needs of his times and he considered this doctrine the one about which he should speak as forcefully as possible. Also, he found in his investigation of this doctrine that its Apostolic foundations made it necessary for him to deal with other doctrines related to the Apostolate. This was the reason missions came to be a vital part of his concern. He found that he could not trace the roots of the ministry of the Church to their Apostolic sources, but ignore the doctrine of Missions which also had its roots in that same ground and which was growing by their side and was even intertwined with them; i.e., he could not explain the doctrine of the Ministry which was thoroughly Apostolic without explaining the mission of the Church which was also Apostolic. There is a rather ironical feature to this, for the doctrine which was the etiology of his successful breakthrough in missionary thought also proved to be the circumscription of its development to doctrinal maturity.

1. V., supra, Chapter I.
Some of Saravia's conclusions about the nature of Apostolicity are questionable, but it is not debatable that he took the Apostolic foundations of the Church seriously. Theologians have not always been this wise and leaders of the Church have usually erred when they failed to do so. This has been particularly true in the study of missions for the missionary nature of the Church must always be seen in its Apostolic perspective. If for no other reason the concept of missions which Saravia had is worthy of consideration because he saw very clearly that the Church could not carry out its mission to the world when it denied its Apostolic nature, nor could it be truly serious about the Apostolate and ignore its continuing responsibility to be missionary. It is quite apparent from this why Saravia saw ecclesiology and missions as complementary to one another.

The Lordship of Christ of His Church and Its Mission

The objective presupposition of all that Saravia understood by and said about the mission of the Church to the heathen was the sovereignty of its Lord. This was inherent in and a direct consequence of the reconciliation and redemption which He wrought for all mankind in His incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection. This meant also that all Apostolic or ecclesiastical authority was and is subject to and determined by the heavenly and earthly power of the Lord: "...All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." This is the sine qua non for the Church's proper understanding of itself and its universal mission. As we shall see later, Saravia strongly accentuated the authority which the Church had received to carry out its mission and it was this which caused Beza to misunderstand and to accuse him of saying that the Lord had han-

1. Cf., "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," 2:6: "Dominus noster Christus Deus et homo, Rex Regum, et Dominus dominantium est, atque totius mundi rector et iudex, sicut et redemptor."
ded over His divine authority to the Apostles. This represented more a fail-
ure on Beza's part to carefully read his opponent's material than an error by
Saravia; in "De diversis...etc.," he had clearly spoken of the Apostles as
being men, who, although they had the gift of the Holy Spirit, were only men
of "mortal powers" for they did not "possess" the Spirit, except as they re-
1
mained true and loyal servants of their Lord. He left even less room for such
a misapprehension in his later work for he strongly contended in it that this
divine authority and power must always be in the hands of the Lord Christ.3

Saravia firmly believed that the Lord was the builder of the Church and
in the true sense of these words He had not even turned over to the Apostles
the power to lay the foundations of the Church, for this was a work which He
entrusted comprehensively to no one.4 This was not meant to minimize the
uniqueness of the Apostoliate or the special gifts which the Twelve had re-
ceived, for the very fact that the Lord retained this power in His own hands
gave true dignity and worth to Apostolic authority.5 By this Saravia meant
that the Apostles knew that they had not been sent, "...by a human being, or
by a human agency ...". It also meant that even those who were under the
Apostles in order and authority, viz., the Evangelists, Prophets, Presbyters,
etc. did not go out on missions only because the Apostles sent them, but pri-
marily they went "... in the name of Christ, as the servants of Christ, as
persons who were due to render an account of their actions to Christ,"6 not to
an apostle. This leads us to an idea which is central to this whole concept
of the sovereignty of Christ: Saravia maintained that passages in the New

1. "Defensio...etc.," 174
2. A Treatise...etc., 72-73 ["De diversis...etc.," 4-57]
3. "Defensio...etc.," 174-5
4. Ibid., 154: "...Christi hoc opus est. Ipse est, qui Ecclesiam suam
supra petram aedificat."
5. Ibid., 175.
6. Ibid., 180-81.
Testament Epistles proved that such power as the Lord wished to bestow on the Church could be given but not delegated. This was a crucial point in his ecclesiology for it naturally had particular relevance to his understanding of the nature of the succession of that Apostolic authority. He often commented on the "giveness" of this divine "power" which was neither possessed by nor handed on by and through ecclesiastical ranks.

A second vital theme in Saravia's doctrine of Missions likewise has a special relevance to the content of this whole section generally and to the foregoing paragraph in particular; i.e., the Church must have requisite authority before undertaking any part of its mission. Here, too, a misunderstanding by Beza resulted in Saravia's underlining in "Defensio...etc.," what he had already made sufficiently clear in his first work. Beza had accused him of teaching missions as an historical contingency. He did not give his reason for this ill-founded assumption, but it seems quite likely that he thought Saravia was advocating missions to the heathen simply to reinforce the Protestant position vis-a-vis the Roman Catholic claims that this was a true mark of the Church and to refute their boasting about missionary successes in the sixteenth century. Saravia replied that he would never endorse missions simply for the sake of missions and he added this very illuminating statement as to why he was advocating such activity: "... obeundae legationi authoritatem operatur. Hæc enim duo coniuncta sunt, ut causa et effectus. Qui legat, authoritatem dat. Et ex legatione authoritatem demonstrare volui." We have already seen that he established the source of all authority in the Church in the
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1. Ibid., "...ex quibus non legata, sed data potestas intelligitur."
2. Cf., A Treatise...etc., 157-181; "De diversis...etc.," 18-22; "Defensio...etc.," 170-71, 173-78, 180-83, 185-87.
3. "Defensio...etc.," 172-73.
4. Ibid., 173.
Christ, but now we see that he has gone a step further and established an internal necessity in that authority which compels the Church to be missionary. In the same way that "cause and effect...are joined", so are ecclesiastical authority and missions united. It is worth noting also that he has reiterated in this context the sovereignty of Christ in these words: "The One who sends, gives the authority".

In the last sentence of the above quotation Saravia amplified what he had said just prior to it, but he gave it a meaning in this context which deserves special attention. He not only seemed to be saying that the Church must be missionary, but he qualified his statement with the proviso that it be understood that the Church is missionary because Christ has been "sent" from God and because Christ "sent" the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. It is really missionary because both of these were prior events even to the "sending" of the Apostles. However, it is also missionary in a secondary, or external sense, because of the commission given to the Twelve. To put this another way, Saravia is saying that the mission of the Church was prior to its Apostolic foundations for it came out of the heart of Him who sent both the Apostles and the rest of the Church. What Apostolic authority the Church had could be proved by its legatio. Those who have sought to dismiss Saravia's doctrine of Missions as a proof-text for episcopacy simply do not have sufficient grounds for their claims, unless they are willing to say also that he "used missions as a proof-text" for the very foundation of the Apostolate itself!

The nature and presence of the power of Christ in the Church must be understood in reference to Saravia's doctrine of the Holy Spirit; this was to be unexpected in light of the way he interpreted Matt. 28:20. He made a particular point of expressing his conviction that all who have been sent out since the Ascension have been under the authority and command of the Spirit.  

1. Ibid., 20.
Even the Apostles were charged not to leave Jerusalem until He came upon them, so we tempt the Lord in any age if we try to go before or without Him: A man need first be furnished with the gifts of the Holy Ghost necessary to so great an undertaking, before he attempt it.¹ When the faithful have been "inspired and filled" by the Spirit then they may undertake those works which are pleasing to God.² It should be quickly added that Saravia had very serious reservations about accepting any idea of the Spirit moving outside of those churches with proper Apostolic authority. He said that in his times even though no one is sent from the churches of Christ to the nations which are ignorant of the Gospel, nevertheless he was not advocating rash and hasty action by the churches to meet this need.³ Saravia would have no part in people arbitrarily deciding they had been inspired by the Spirit to go as missionaries to the heathen without the consent and authority of the Church.⁴ On the other hand, he also denied that the Spirit was obliged to work only through the Apostles in the Apostolic Age for He could and did use others to found churches and to assist them in growth.⁵ The Evangelists, Prophets and other early Christians who went out on missions were not obliged to depend only upon the command of the Apostles, for this was secondary to the command of the Lord's Spirit and it was therefore actually under His auspices that they had received and were to carry out their mission.⁶

We see in this doctrine a living relationship established between Christ, who is the Head, and the Church, which is His Body. This union of the divine and the human in Saravia's thought prevented his doctrine of the Church from becoming a sterile form of institutionalism. There are points in his writings

¹. A Treatise...etc., 165 /"De diversis...etc.," 12/.
². "Defensio...etc.," 20.
³. "De diversis...etc.," 19 /A Treatise...etc., 164-667.
⁴. Ibid.: "Nam Apostolica potestate hic opus est."
⁵. "Defensio...etc.," 49.
⁶. Ibid., 48; cf., Chapters IV, V.
where it appeared that he was somewhat in danger of allowing that to happen to his doctrine of the Ministry, but he redressed that kind of imbalance in other places, such as this one dealing with missions and ecclesiology. In these places we can see beyond all doubt that he would not allow any idea of ecclesiology, or polity, which could stand between the Lord and His people, the elected ones who were members of His Body. Not only did Saravia maintain that this close relationship must exist between Christ and the clergy of the Church, but the relationship must be just as close with all those in the true Church.

Quite naturally the question arises out of the preceding material as to what Saravia meant by "the Church" and those whom he considered to be members of the true Church. Did he mean a visible or an invisible Church, or a combination of both? How did he see the Church and the Kingdom related to one another in his ecclesiology? These are not questions to which we can find specific answers in his writings, for he neither raised such questions himself nor gave definitions which would serve as answers to our hypothetical queries. However, he certainly showed an awareness of the importance of most of these matters in what he wrote. For example, in "De honore Praesulis...etc.," he indicated that he believed the visible Church to consist of all who believed in Christ and had received the sacrament of Baptism. This convinced him, as we have seen earlier, that where a whole nation had been so received into the Church then "...the Church is the commonwealth and the commonwealth is a certain visible form of the Church." This explains in what manner he saw the visible Church but he seldom used the qualifying adjectives "visibilis" or "invisi-
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1. "De honore...etc.," 71: "Sed ubi totus aliquis populus nomen dedit Christo, et nemo illie est qui Christi baptismo non sit tinctus, Ecclesia est Respublica, et Respublica est externa, et visibilis quaedam Ecclesia: cui inserto, aut altero tantum, aut utroque nomine, (modo constitutus a Deo ordine structur, distinctaque mansent quae natura separata sunt) nullum Evangelium prohibit." /Of the honor...etc.c, 189-90/.
bills". Occasionally he spoke of the "catholic and universal Church" which seemed to indicate that he had in mind both the visible and the invisible church. ¹ However, he also could use these terms "universal" and "catholic" to denote what could have only been the sum total of all the visible churches; for example, he certainly seems to have had this universal, visible Church in mind when he spoke of it as the true recipient of the missionary mandate in Matthew 28.² Generally we can draw the conclusions that the visible and the invisible were for him both aspects of the one true Church, but they were neither coterminous nor identical. In all probability Saravia was in agreement with Hooker who said that men could not distinguish those who belonged to the visible Church but not to the invisible, mystical Church.³ In such matters related to those doctrines which contained what he sometimes called "the mysteries of God" he preferred to be vague rather than to seek a precise definition. A very appropriate statement of this attitude which formed a veritable theme in his discussion of the Real Presence in the Eucharist was this: "Divine Mysteries may not be tried by natural laws".⁴

In connection with Saravia's use of the Church as both a heavenly and an earthly manifestation there seems to be almost a sacramental idea present. He thought more in terms of the earthly, visible Church, to be sure, but he never used that concept when he did not also have the invisible, perfect Church in

¹. "Defensio...etc.," 177: "Quod plantare et fundare Ecclesias tribuitur Apostolis, id respectu catholicae et universalis Ecclesiae fit, non singularum et particularum Ecclesiarum."

². Ibid.; cf., 173: "Quicquid potestatis Ecclesiasticae Dominus Apostolis dedisse legitur, non personis sed Ecclesiae datum ab Orthodoxis intelligitur."

³. Woodhouse, Doctrine of the Church...etc., 45, cited Hooker, Ecc. Pol., VIII, iv, 7. Cf., Thirty-Nine Articles, Art. XIX, in Certain Sermons...etc., no page given, (1757), for statement on the visible Church.

⁴. Saravia...Eucharist, 29. Cf., "De diversis...etc.,” 1: "Mysterium autem voco tam doctrinam admirandi consilli Dei in redemptione generis humani, quam omnia quae omn a doctrina Deus coniunxit."
mind; the same could be said of the times when the major accentuation seemed to be on the Church as the mystical Body of Christ. He accepted Irenaeus' definition of a sacrament as that which consisted of earthly and heavenly parts which were held in the same relationship as the union of the two natures of Christ. In the administration of the sacrament Saravia surely must have had in mind an analogous relationship with these two aspects of the one true Church which dispensed grace to all believing members and condemnation to those who were non-believers. Here again he must have thought of the Body of Christ offered in the Lord's Supper as analogous to the Body of Christ offered as a means of grace to the world in its mission. These may be only suppositions, for he did not directly connect the two in his writings, but in studying his ecclesiology and his doctrine of the Eucharist it does seem reasonable to draw these inferences from both doctrines.

A very important characteristic of this doctrine of Missions is the way Saravia repeatedly expressed the conviction that the mission and the authority for a mission were given not to individuals but collectively to the whole Church in all ages. This was a very significant interpretation, as we saw in the previous chapter, for most sixteenth century divines generally held that Christ's commission and His promise to be present with them to the end of the age and His gift of the Holy Spirit were all made to the Apostles alone and not to the Evangelists or to the rest of the Church. Watts has shown that most Anglican divines believed all of these things referred to the ordinary apostolic office as such and that they were inherited by the successors of the Apostles. Therefore, Saravia's interpretation has particular significance since he believed
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1. Ibid. 21.
2. "Defensio...etc.," 173: "Hoc mandatum non datum fuisse singulis, sed universis, qui coetum illum constituebant, et usque ad finem seculi permaneretur, Ecclesiamque superarum." Cf., 177, and "De diversis...etc.," 18-19.
3. Watts, Doctrine of the Church...etc., 448-49.
they were all passed from age to age by the Church as a whole, and not by the bishops, or presbyters. He further contended that as far as the world mission was concerned no one Apostle was able in his lifetime to range over the whole earth, nor was it ever in the mind of the Saviour that one, or all, of the Twelve would do so.¹ During the Apostolic age many went out on missions to various places. These were often called "apostles" in the New Testament epistles because they too were being "sent out."² As we shall see in the next section Saravia was convinced that it was the gift of this mandate and authority to the Church which led the Apostles to choose "helpers and co-workers" in this task which they all had in common.³ This is why he said he was attempting to prove their "authority" by their "embassy."

Eschatology was usually a weaker part of Saravia's theology, but his awareness of the importance of this doctrine for other doctrines is more noticeable in those places where he thought missions and ecclesiology into one another. Even then, though, much of his eschatology was like the submerged nine-tenths of an iceberg, hidden behind his ecclesiological thought. If he had given more attention to the ontological nature of the Church then he would have had occasion to display more of his eschatology; as we have seen in many places, however, he devoted himself almost exclusively to those problems related to the empirical Church. These prior concerns tended to mask the eschatological nature of the Church, as might be expected, since the institutional continuity of order and ministry received the bulk of his attention. It was the eschatological discontinuity which he often times failed to bring out in his doctrines and which clearly is a vital force in the New Testament doctrine of the Church and

¹. Defensio...œct., 173, 280.
². Ibid., 64-66. Examples he gave were Andronicus and Junia in Rom. 16, Titus and the brethren in II Cor. 8, and Epaphroditus in Philippians 2. The Twelve were called "chief Apostles" to distinguish their Apostolic rank and office.
³. Ibid., 173.
all correlates of that doctrine. However, when he traced the Apostolic doctrine from its source through the Church and its mission Saravia showed the greatest awareness of the Lordship of Christ over, and the presence of the Holy Spirit in, the Church: this assertion by him of a continuing vertical penetration of the divine into the human and earthly scene brought out the discontinuity which must always be a part of the new humanity gathered into the Body of Christ.\(^1\) This saved his doctrine from becoming that bare and sterile institutionalism which is the inevitable result whenever a theologian stresses too strongly the solidarity of the Church with the passing forms of history and contemporary milieu. The Lordship of Christ as Head of the Body, His Church, is the ultimate proof that the Church is "in the world but not of the world."

The strongest and most emphatic eschatological note which Saravia sounded anywhere in His works is found in those places where he spoke of the Church as carrying out its Apostolic mission\(^2\) "...ad consummationem saeculi" and of the new nature of the Apostolate after the Resurrection and the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost.\(^3\) The Cross and Resurrection gave the Church her eschatological nature in the same way that these events gave the Church a new Apostolate and mission. Prior to these occurrences the disciples had been limited to a mission to Israel, but after these occurred they were themselves a part of the New Israel with an unlimited mission to all the world. Eschatologically Christ charged all the Church "to the end of the age" with this commission and mandate, for Saravia thought of all the Church, in all ages, as bound up in the Apostolate:\(^4\) "...quandoquidem donec veniat Dominus iudicatam vivos et mortus..."\(^5\) there is an interim of Grace in which the Church must faithfully
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1. A Treatise...etc., 161-66 /"De diversis...etc.," 18-12/.
2. Ibid., 73, 161-63 L, 18-19; "Defensio...etc.," 49, 173; "De imperandi authoritate...etc.," Prologus.
3. "Defensio...etc.," 50.
4. Ibid., 171-73.
5. Ibid., 49.
preach the word, found new Churches, and restore those old ones which need reforming. One can sense a deep realization in these passages on missions and ecclesiology of the Church moving towards the end of times: the Church having been crucified to itself resurrected and filled with the Spirit of God prochronically anticipates the perfect and complete manifestation of the Kingdom in the Parousia. In the midst of this movement towards this glorious end the Church has a task to do in the world to which it must be faithful, but it can complete its mission only by being true to its Apostolic foundations. In this way Saravia did not conceive of a static ecclesiology which was bound by earthly, temporal, and immobile forms. Even in regard to his prior interest of episcopal government and the ministry of the presbyter in the Church, he conceded to Beza that he would agree to a reformation of the office of the pastor.¹ Since this was a key term which he used most often for the role and functions of bishops it shows that he did not think of this itself as being unchangeable.² He did not mean by this that he would agree to an abrogation of episcopacy, but any modification which could be shown necessary by the Scriptures.

Saravia was interested in and devoted to the expansion of the empirical Church in lands where it had never existed, or where it had fallen into desuetude, but he could not be accused of advocating such work for the glory of an earthly institution. This was the mistake which the seventeenth century Dutch Reformed theologian, Voetius, made in his theology of missions. He, like Saravia, was influenced to some extent by Roman Catholic missions and he borrowed from them the concept of the plantatio ecclesiae. This idea, which gained much prominence in the Second Reformation, put so much emphasis on ecclesiology

¹ V. supra, p. 129, for a discussion of the way he used the term "pastor".
² A Treatise...etc., 181 "De diversis...etc." 22: "Si quis in illo ordine reformationen desiderat, si ego non adversor."
that it came to be thought of mainly in terms of augmenting the size and glory of the Church.¹ It is true that there were many who, like Voetius himself, stressed with this the conversio gentium, but even this was thought of as being for the purpose of strengthening the Church for its own sake. There are some who think of the plantatio ecclesiae whenever missions and ecclesiology are tied together, but this kind of suspicion is unfounded in regard to Haürian Saravia's doctrine. His desire to see the Church spread to the ends of the earth was justifiable, for he thought of it not as an end within itself, but a means to carry the Kingdom of God to the ends of the earth. The Word of God was actually normative for his theology and not the Church. It was the Lordship of the Christ expressed in and through His living Word which made Saravia see the dynamic relation between Christ and His Body, the Church, when it remained obedient to the Apostolic doctrine and mission.

**Apostolicity and the Ministry in the World-wide Expansion of the Church**

We have seen in several places that Saravia's understanding of the Apostolate is the key to his doctrines of the Ministry and of Missions. He found that he could not separate these from one another nor could he separate them from their Apostolic roots. The interrelation of these three doctrines led him to give them all a strong ecclesiological emphasis, so it was not accidental that he joined the doctrine of the Church and the doctrine of Missions to one another.

The way Saravia desired to prove "Apostolic authority" from the "embassy" or "mission" of the Church is very significant.² Most authorities have sought to prove the "mission" from the Apostolic doctrine of the Church and have sel-
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¹ Van den Berg, *Constrained...etc.*, 19-20, 184.
² V. supra, 277-78.
dom thought of approaching it this way. If he had meant by this that the Church was ontologically independent of the Lord then he would have clearly been wrong in using this approach, but upon close examination we see that this was not what he was teaching at all. Rather we find that he believed the Church, which was in existence before the Incarnation was changed by Christ's incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection, and the coming of the Holy Spirit even as the Apostolate itself was changed by these events. He based this on the New Testament records of the Twelve being sent out, or commissioned, to be "Apostles" on two different occasions. In both instances Saravia maintained that Apostleship was involved because the Lord defined the meaning and scope of their ministry in terms of being sent out by His power to proclaim His truth. In the first case the mission was limited to Israel, but in the second case it was an unlimited mission to all the world. Saravia had an interesting interpretation of the first commissioning in that the Twelve never returned this commission to Christ when they reported to their Master after they had made their journey.

When the Apostles received their second commission they were promised the power of the Holy Spirit by the Christ. At Pentecost when the Lord came upon them in the form of His Spirit, the "character" of the Apostolate was changed, and at that time they were given the Keys of the Kingdom and the powers of binding and loosing, which the Lord had not given at the time of their first commission. Saravia maintained that this power hitherto had been united with the priesthood of Aaron and that this power had not been destined to be ended until the sacrifice of the Son of God. On the Cross Christ abolished Levitical,  

2. Cf., Karl H. Rengstorff, Apostleship: Kittel Bible Key Words, trans. J.R. Coates (1952) 44-45, said they did return their commission and Apostleship to Him, and received it again after the Resurrection.  
3. V. supra, Part I, Chap. II, for more on the Keys of Kingdom. He adhered to a literalist interpretation to support episcopal authority to govern, or oversee, churches.
sacrificial rites and transferred the priesthood and all therewith to Himself. Therefore, as long as the Old Church stood, they had not had the power to found a new Church. In this manner Saravia showed an Apostolate which overlapped the Old and the New Covenants. In a sense we could say that he believed the Apostolate was being evolved even while the Church itself was being transformed. His point in this was to demonstrate that the "call" of the Apostles came at an earlier time than their "mission" to all the world. The decisive and radical change in character of their Apostolate came with the second commission and it was this which made them the doctrinal founders of the Church and the first missionaries to be sent into all the world. It is this latter point which has made it worthwhile to trace this rather lengthy interpretation by Saravia. It was his way of showing that missions to other nations was a decisive part of the radically different nature of the Apostolate and consequently of the Church; therefore, he concluded that the Old Israel had had no mission beyond its own people. The New Israel had an unlimited mission to the whole world because of God's decisive act in Christ as His full and complete revelation and because of His commission to them to go into all the world with this Gospel.

This leads us to another idea which has an Old Testament connection. In the context of an argument with Beza about "Apostolic authority" Saravia said, "The power of a delegated person and the power of the delegator is one and the same power." There is no question but that he had the Jewish concept of the

1. Johannes Blau, The Missionary Nature of the Church, 3rd impression (1963), 42: "When one turns to the Old Testament to find a justification and basis for missions in the current meaning, that is, as 'foreign missions', one is bound to be disappointed. It does not seem advisable to build a theology of missions on a few statements, esp. on those which are still exegetically in dispute." V. Ibid., Chapter 3 for a discussion of "universalism" as a proper foundation for the understanding of what kind of missionary theology there is in the Old Testament.

2. Defensio...etc.," 180: "Nam delegati et delegantis eadem est potestas."
Shaliach in mind, but there is a real question as to the way he understood it. This argument arose about the nature of the authority which Timothy and Titus had received from Paul to carry out the missionary tasks they had been given. Saravia's point in using this reference to the Shaliach was that Timothy and Titus had as much authority for the work to which they had been sent as Paul himself had had. He went on to say that he was not so much concerned with the delegation (of a person) as with the transference of Apostolic power and with the succession of that power. This is an important passage for it helps to explain the reason why Saravia put so much emphasis on "Apostolic authority" and the way he saw that authority being transferred from one generation to another generation in the Church. The former, *i.e.*, the proper Apostolic authority in the Church in every age, was really of greater concern to him than the latter, *i.e.*, showing the nature of the "succession of that power." We have already had opportunity to consider the nature of the authority and for the purposes of this chapter we need only briefly mention that Saravia adopted what might be called a kind of dual "Apostolic succession." In one way he regarded this to be a personal succession from Apostle to successor, and in another way he regarded this as a doctrinal succession in which the Church remained faithful to its Apostolic foundations by adherence to a correct preaching of the Word of God, the proper administration of the sacraments and the continuance of the Apostolic form of government in the Church. He felt that there was no real contradiction between the two so he made no attempt to reconcile differences between them; however, we do find that in some places he stressed one manner of
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1. Ibid. : "...ita hoc loco non tam de delegations ago; quam de transmissione potestatis Apostolicae, et successiones."
3. Ibid., 182 : "Dico igitur Apostolos, migraturos ex hac vita, suas vices mandasse Episcopis."
4. *Cf.*, A Treatise...etc., 51-53 /"De diversis...etc.," 17.
"succession" and in other places he stressed the other.

Rengstorf has thoroughly examined the relation of the New Testament term \( \Pi\varepsilon\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\nu\) to the Hebrew word Shaliach. He revealed that the New Testament title "Apostle" got only its form from the Greek word and that the background of the real content of that word came to light through the meaning of Sheluchim.\(^1\) This did not mean that the two words meant the same thing for the former was a religious term and the latter was a legal term. Likewise, he revealed that there was an additional difference in the missionary element of "Apostle" which cannot be found in the Shaliach. Basically, Rengstorf showed that the relation of the Shaliach and the man who sent him out to do a task was that of a "proxy in function, not of personal identity".\(^2\) To come back to Saravia's understanding of this term we can see from his dual concept of "Apostolic succession" that he thought of the Apostle (or bishop) as being a fulfilment of the Shaliach in both ways. He could think of this as being a "proxy in function" for he clearly stated that the successors to the Apostles went out because they had been sent by Christ and that they did all that they did in His Name and not in the name of the Apostle Paul.\(^3\) This same point was made in a slightly different context when he described the way the Apostles were sent out without any imperium, or command, over nations or the rulers of nations.\(^4\) By this he meant that the Apostles had the same relation to the Lord Christ which an ambassador had to his king when he was given an embassy or mission. As the vassal or client of the king the ambassador was not appointed equal to or superior to the one who sent him out, but as the representative who carried the king's commands.

\(^1\) Rengstorf, ibid., Chapters II - III, et passim.
\(^2\) T.F. Torrance, Conflict and Agreement in the Church, (1959), I, 38.
\(^3\) Reid, Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry, 39-41.
\(^4\) "Defensio...etc.," 180; "Et quae Titus et Timotheus, alter in Greta, alter in Asia fecerunt, non nomine Pauli sed Christi, tanquam ipsius servorum administratur, tanquam ei, non Paulo rationem actionum suarum redditur;"
This was the meaning of Paul's statement in II Corinthians 5:20, said Saravia, for the clear meaning there was that the Apostles were ambassadors who carried out their mission in the Name of Christ. This establishes Saravia's idea of the Shaliach as being one who served in the sense of having a proxy in function. However, there is missing in these passages the idea of the Holy Spirit as the one true Shaliach, for in the New Testament understanding of the word He, and He alone, is able completely to identify Himself with the Christ, but even "...He does not draw attention to Himself or speak of His own Person, but speaks only of Christ."\(^1\)

Since the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was not brought out in the discussion of this term by Saravia, then we should conclude that he also saw another side in this matter, which might best be understood as a positing of a personal representation between the Apostles and their successors. The way we have seen him show that all of the servants of Christ carry out their missions in His authority and in His Name precludes this being called a "personal identity," but it explains the two-fold manner with which he dealt with Apostolic succession. This is the only logical conclusion which we can draw in the light of the "series" type of succession which he advocated in these words: "Perpetua Episcoporum sibi succedentium series, nobis ipsorum posteris immota lex esse deberet."\(^2\) To conclude this matter, we can say that Saravia thought of succession in two ways, i.e., as a doctrinal and as a personal succession; and, in the same manner, he thought of the Shaliach in a dual sense, i.e., as one with an identity or proxy in function, and as one who served as a personal representative. This duality was not seen as being self-contradictory but as mutually complementary.

In Part I we saw the importance which Saravia and Beza attached to their

---

1. Torrance, ibid., 40.
2. "Examen...etc.," 16.
interpretations of the ordinary and the extraordinary calls both in Biblical times and in their own age. This discussion is germane to Saravia's doctrine of Missions because he said the extraordinary call was no longer necessary for obedience to and participation in the missionary mandate, but Besa contended that it was essential for a person to have such a call in order to carry the Gospel to the heathen. At this point it should be remembered that Saravia admitted the Apostles had this kind of call to their office, but this did not mean that all about the Apostolate was extraordinary, and therefore temporary. Only those personal gifts, such as the ability to work miracles, etc., were temporary and as such they were not capable of being passed on to others. All other things about the Apostolic office they received in common with the Church. This meant that what he considered the "essence" of the Apostolate was not really theirs for it belonged to the Church. This "essence" consisted of the proclamation of the Gospel to all nations, the administration of the sacraments, and the authority of governing the Church. These were occasionally described as the marks of the true Church, or the mysteries of the Gospel to show that there was an essential relation between the Church and the Gospel. They were also called "mysteries" because they were "...both the doctrine of the wonderful counsel of God in the redemption of mankind, and whatever things God has connected with that doctrine." This means that Saravia thought of the proclamation of the Gospel as an essential part of the Gospel itself; ergo, that it was of the very essence of the Gospel that it be proclaimed in all ages even as Christ had commanded the Apostles to publish this Good News abroad. This is almost certainly related in his thinking to the doctrine of

1. V. supra, pp. 110-112.
2. A Treatise...etc., Chapter XVI.
3. Ibid., 165-66 "De diversis...etc.," 127.
4. Ibid., 51-52 [17].
the Providence of God which was mentioned in the discussion of the manner in which he developed his doctrine of Election. It was the will of God that all His creation share in His goodness, so there must be those who will proclaim His message of reconciliation to all people. He reminded Beza that it was this providence of God which furnished the gifts necessary for this mission to the unbelieving peoples of the world. Therefore, the goodness and righteousness which God has shown forth in the reconciliation and redemption offered in His Son also leads Him to continue sending out missionaries to share this Good News with those who have not yet heard it.

Having considered the origin, nature, and succession of Apostolic power, and its relation to the Church in all ages, we turn now to examine the way Saravia saw this "power", or "authority", as applicable to the mission of the Church. Since he did not believe that it was a temporary gift to the Apostles, but a permanent possession of the Church as long as the Church remained true to the "marks" or to the "essence" of the Apostolate, then it should be apparent that the mission of the Church was the same as that of the Apostles themselves. Therefore, as long as the Church was true to its Apostolic nature it would have a proper "...zeal for the propagation of the Kingdom of God." There were two things requisite for this task. Firstly, even as the Apostles had been charged to return to Jerusalem to receive the Holy Spirit before they were sent out as missionaries, so should any servant of the Lord "...be furnished with the gifts of the Holy Spirit necessary to so great an undertaking, before he attempt it."
Lest this be taken by anyone as an invitation to rash action based on personal judgment and feelings, he quickly added the second condition in these words: "...it is (also) requisite that the Church interpose its authority." Here, too, the importance of the Church in missions to the Heathen is brought out for this was a work which needed the internal inspiration of the Spirit and the external authorization of the Church. These two he felt would come together, for the Spirit would convict no one of something without giving the Church that same conviction and guidance.

Many authorities on missions agree today that a large part of the difficulty which Protestants and Anglicans in the sixteenth century had in conceiving of and carrying out a program of missions to the heathen was the practical problem of how to go about it. Saravia did not ignore this problem, but he dealt with it only in connection with comments on other parts of this doctrine. He believed it was to be effected in basically the same way the Apostles had begun their mission to all the world. However, there was to be one main difference between the way Christians in the sixteenth century would go about fulfilling this task and the way the Apostles had gone about it. The latter, he said, had had freedom to go wherever they desired in their mission, but no other Christians had received the right to go throughout the whole world as they desired. Yet, even the Apostles had seen fit to divide the world into regions and to assume responsibility for certain areas in which they would make their witness. After doing their best to carry the Gospel to all people, nevertheless they had died leaving the task unfinished. Saravia maintained that they had known that they would not be able to evangelize the whole world in their lifetimes so they had chosen co-workers or assistants to help them and to take
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1. Ibid.; cf. Galm, Das Erwachen des Missionsgedankens...etc., 33-38, 76-77.
2. "Defensio...etc.," 280.
up where they left off when they died. In this he was saying that a major part of the work of bishops as the successors of the Apostles was to continue this work of ministering to the heathen nations. Although they did not have the freedom to go out into the world to any place they desired to bear witness and would be assigned to a specific diocese, he maintained that there was nothing in the Scriptures or in the patristic writings which would prevent the transfer of a bishop from one diocese in a Christian nation to another diocese in a heathen land. This could be done even if the bishop was only one of two presbyters in that new diocese. Congruent with this, he said bishops could be missionaries because "...there is no inconsistency between acting as a bishop, and at the same time doing the work of an Apostle and Evangelist." 

Saravia certainly was not of the opinion that only bishops should go to witness to the heathen and establish churches, for presbyters could also engage in this work. This idea of men chosen to go out as evangelists, or missionaries, prompted Beza to charge that these people would be meddling in the business of other churches or parishes. He quoted an ancient ecclesiastical canon as proof of this, which said: "...each man should remain content with his own Sparta and should not encroach upon another man's domain...". Saravia naturally denied this and said that there was no more danger of that happening in his day than in the early Church when Timothy and Titus went out to do this same work. The most important thing about those chosen by the Church to be sent was that they should be "fit persons" commissioned "...to preach the Gospel

1. Ibid., 49.
2. "V., A Treatise...etc., Chapter XXIV.
3. "Examen...etc.," 16.
4. A Treatise...etc., 192 "De diversis...etc.," 247.
5. "Defensio...etc.," 178. Beza said these missionaries would be "busy-bodies" who would be concerned with all sorts of things which were not their business.
with Apostolical authority.\textsuperscript{1}

Although he did not say so, Saravia must have had in mind that these decisions to initiate missions to the heathen should be made in the convocations of the clergy. Those areas which needed this kind of mission were those where the Gospel had never been preached,\textsuperscript{2} and in those nations where it had formerly been proclaimed but had since died out. The Church had no need of a special revelation, or authorization, for such undertakings, for the special mission to a particular place was included in the general mission which the Church already had.\textsuperscript{3} Thus, the Apostle Paul had no need of special instructions from the Lord to make each of his missionary journeys for they were a part of his first calling to be Christ's witness.\textsuperscript{4} The rule which the Church should follow was this: "When anyone has a general command, the particular things in it are of his own judgment."\textsuperscript{5}

\section*{Conclusion}

Saravia was undoubtedly a pioneer in missionary thought. His ideas were not only advanced and far-sighted but they presented a doctrine of Missions which should have been acceptable in part, if not in the whole, to most of the Protestants and Anglicans of his times. At a time when the Church was in great need of such leadership he made a very commendable attempt to bring it back to the missionary message of the New Testament. It is regrettable that his effort resulted in no ostensible success, but this to some extent may have been his own fault. For one thing, he developed his doctrine in such a way that

---

\textsuperscript{1} A Treatise...etc., 166/1\textsuperscript{3}. Cf., "Defensio...etc.," 42, where Saravia said the Church should never try to extend its witness or influence by means of war, or the use of force.
\textsuperscript{2} Probably more than two-thirds of the world in the 16th. century.
\textsuperscript{3} "Defensio...etc.," 173: "Mandatum missionem et legationem continens."
\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., 19.
\textsuperscript{5} Ibid., trans, J.F. Russell.
those strongly opposed to episcopal government would be tempted to think that this was only a "proof" of his own particular doctrine of the Ministry. A second reason that this might be said is that he left his doctrine only partially developed in its bearing on such doctrines as Eschatology, the Holy Spirit, Revelation and Soteriology. If he had shown how his concept of missions was grounded in these doctrines he might have won followers, particularly in the Church of England. A third way that Saravia failed to put forward a doctrine which would gain acceptance was his failure to ground it in the Scriptures as a whole.

The major blame, though, is certainly not Saravia's, but should be put at the feet of those like Beza whose minds were so closed that they never really gave serious consideration to the profound insights which Saravia did offer. Every single critic of his doctrine in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries based his opposition to what Saravia said about missions on his doctrine of the Imparity of Ministers. It was not necessary that they agree to the latter to accept the former, but all treated the two as if they were one. It is significant, however, that all of them were opposed to any idea of missions to the heathen quite apart from what Saravia had said in its support.

It has been suggested previously that Saravia was ahead of his times in his missionary ideas. The manner in which he showed the importance of ecclesiology and missions for one another, is very relevant to the advance which the Church has made in this century in missions and oecumenism. The oecumenical movement would have never really been possible if ecclesiology and missions had not been thought into one another in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This has been matched by a new appreciation of the contribution which the indigenous, younger churches can make to the older churches. This, too, is a latent idea in Saravia's writings, for he steered clear of any re-
commendation of colonial missions so that he might lay the emphasis on an autochthonous church. Saravia made a contribution also in drawing the attention of all non-Roman churches to the importance of the closing verses of Matthew's Gospel as a missionary text. These are insights which were far ahead of his times. For the Church of the present and the future, possibly the most important insight which he had was the one to which he gave most attention - the Apostolic basis of the ministry and mission of the Church. These two must always be thought of and studied together. Until they are traced to their Apostolic roots and made to conform to the truth found there, the doctrine of the Ministry will probably remain the most divisive doctrine in oecumenical discussions and the mission of the Church will continue to receive inadequate implementation.
CONCLUSION

A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF SARAVIA'S DOCTRINES

The apprehension of the vital importance of Saravia's life-history for a proper evaluation of his theology came very early in this research, and as the end of this study draws near this judgment is even more firmly held because of the evidence which has been unearthed in the investigations for the intervening chapters. To some extent the conviction of the necessity of being conversant with the context of Saravia's life in relation to his writings has arisen out of a realization that he more than most was affected in mind and thought by what went on around him. Also, to a somewhat lesser degree, it has come from the growing awareness of how necessary this kind of understanding is in the doctrinal study of one who lived in an era which was as disturbed and as abnormal religiously, socially, and politically, as that one was during and immediately after the Reformation. Proof of the way the events of his times impinged upon his life and influenced his thinking can be seen in the following points: (1) the near chaotic conditions which he saw as a by-product of the Reformation were, by his own statement, the precipitant cause of the alteration of his concept of ecclesiastical polity; (2) although he had long been recognized as a very capable scholar, the greater part of his life was relatively unproductive and uncreative because he was at cross-purposes with his theological environment; (3) the traumatic events and theological cross-currents in which he was caught for so long and which distressed him so deeply, created a commensurate
desire for a lasting unity and peace in the Church; (4) the very nature of the controversial subjects to which he addressed himself prevented him from giving adequate attention to, or exposition of, such vital doctrines as those of the Holy Spirit, the Priesthood of Believers, Eschatology, the Visible and Invisible Church, and, ironically enough, the tenet which proved to be his most distinctive contribution to the Church — viz., the doctrine of Missions to the Heathen. This is the reason that both attention and credence has been given throughout this work to historical matters as well as to theological subjects.

Rather full conclusions about Saravia's doctrines have already been stated in and at the close of each chapter, so there will of necessity be some repetition of some of these here; however, this will be done in such a way that they may be analyzed in their relation to one another so that they may be seen in the larger context of his thought and theology. Another important purpose for this chapter is that of giving the opportunity for making a comparison between some of Saravia's doctrines and those of the writer. These doctrinal comparisons which will be made and the criticisms which will be offered are all given with the full realization that there are no easy solutions to the problems with which Saravia concerned himself — evidence of this is seen in the fact that nearly all of them are still with us in the Church today as obstacles to progress and unity. The writer comes to this section, therefore, deeply conscious that the ultimate knowledge required for the complete answers to all theological questions does not lie in human hands but in those of Christ our Lord. As one author has wisely said, this gives "... our critical judgment that quality of reserve without which all criticism unavoidably takes on the flavour of hybris and haughtiness." Therefore, whatever judgments are

1. Van den Berg, Constrained ... etc., 188.
made about one who has contributed as much to the Christian Church as has Saravia must be given as "criticisms-in-gratitude" and "criticisms-in-solidarity" because of a sincere appreciation of his work, as well as of a consciousness of our unity in Christ which must always be prior to our differences. Nevertheless, there are significant dissimilarities in our doctrines as will be seen at several points, and these must be expressed because of the necessity of remaining faithful to one's own beliefs and because an uncritical attitude would be neither creative nor realistic.

**Saravia's Accentuation of Christology and Apostolicity**

The strongest and most impressive feature of Saravia's thought was undeniably its Christological character and the way this permeated his ecclesiology. This is stamped like a hallmark on many of his doctrines - particularly those closely related to the Church - as evidence of his genuinely Christocentric way of thinking. This is not always immediately apparent in the study of his treatises, but it was nonetheless a most vital factor in the development of most of his doctrines, whether he made it explicit in his writings or not.

In this connection it is worth noting that the tenets into which his Christology was most soundly thought have proved to be those which are the most timeless and constructive; e.g., his ecumenical convictions which he revealed in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and, his concern for the world to hear and respond to the Gospel as revealed in his doctrine of Missions to the Heathen. On the other hand, the doctrines which do not have a sound Christological basis are those which have become most dated and outmoded; e.g., the doctrine of Erastianism.

---

or of the Divine Right of Kings, both of which have faded so far into obscurity that it would be difficult to find many theologians today who would either espouse or defend them.²

Saravia's Christo-centric way of thinking was a deliberate and not an accidental choice in his thought about the Church, for he consciously made this the determinative factor in his ecclesiology. All that he said of the Church revealed that he saw its origin, continuing mission, and eventual fulfillment in Christ Jesus its Head. Furthermore, that authority which the Church had in any age was seen by Saravia as having been received as a gift from the Lord and it should therefore be exercised as by an obedient servant - i.e., the Church could never "possess" Christ's authority or power in its own right, for this remained, even as did the whole Church itself, as a prior possession of the Lord through the Holy Spirit. To summarize and to underscore this, we can say that Saravia saw the tota ecclesia as controlled and empowered by Christ, and as inseparably connected to Him who is the Head of the Body, which is the Church. It was this concept which became normative for his doctrine of the Ministry - that is to say, he believed the foundational ministry of the Lord to be the prototype of the ministry of the Gospel so that Christ's ministry and His ministry alone would be the pattern for all service rendered in His Name.³

It is in the context of his Christological thought that Saravia's accent on Apostolicity must be seen and understood, and not simply in the relation of the Apostles to the orders of the ecclesiastical ministry which came after them; although, it is true that much of the attention which we have hitherto given the role of the Apostles has of necessity been more in regard to the latter than to the former.⁴ However, above all else, Saravia realized that the true signifi-

---

1. Ibid., "The Divine Right of Kings."
2. V. infra, 331-32, for more on this Christological error.
3. Later we shall discuss one way that he failed to be consistent in his adherence to this principle.
cance of the Twelve must be seen in their calling by and obedience to the Lord, for when He called them unto Himself to learn of Him and to be witnesses of His life, death and resurrection, and then empowered and sent them forth to proclaim this Gospel, He was de facto making them the foundations of the Church. This needs to be said emphatically because we have seen in previous discussions of the nature of the Apostolate that Saravia saw the Twelve in two different ways - i.e., in one way he saw them as the unique founders of the Church who could have no successors in their work, but, in another way, he saw them as the first and foremost ministers in the succession of a long line of bishops and presbyters who have all shared in the "essence" of the Apostolate through the preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the sacraments, and the government of the Church. The fact that Saravia felt it necessary to give the greater part of his attention to the role of the Apostolate in regard to the latter, should not mislead his readers into thinking that this was of greater importance to him, for it has been shown quite clearly that the former was preeminent to and determinative of his thought about the other.\footnote{Ibid., 113-16, for the reasons which led to this conclusion. Later, we shall have an opportunity to examine this judgment again in its relation to his views on Apostolic succession and the Shaliach.} Indeed, we can say that even though Saravia somewhat blurred the distinction between the Apostles and all other ministers it was precisely because he did recognize the sui generis character of their role as founders of the Church that ultimately he put his ecclesiology above his doctrine of the Ministry. Likewise, it is relevant to this conclusion to say that Saravia did not once blur or confuse the complete sovereignty of Christ over the Apostles and all who came after them. He contended that the Apostles in handing on their coelestis doctrine had never drawn attention to themselves, to their own doctrine, authority, or mission, but had consistently communicated it in such a way that it wit-
nessed to the grace and truth of their divine Master.

We have seen this same idea carried over into Saravia's explanations of the continuance of Apostolic authority in the Church. This, he said, was not given to the Apostles as individuals, but to all true believers, because the Church as the Body of Christ was constituted by all who were "in Christ." ¹ There is a definite eschatological element in this part of his thought for he interpreted such passages as Matthew 16:19 and 28:16-20 in such a way that it is reasonable to believe that he had in mind that these divine commands and promises were received not only by the first century Church, but by the Church in all ages - as if all Christians until the end of time were in some sense present with or represented by those who actually heard the Lord first give them. Saravia did not spell out these ideas in so many words, but there is good reason for drawing these inferences, because there is the strong implication in his discussions of Apostolic authority that it exists in the Church eschatologically - i.e., the Lord Himself has transmitted to the Church whatever authority it has in any age and in so doing He has united the Church at any one given moment of time with the Church in all ages from the Resurrection to the Parousia. This naturally means that the Church not only has the same authority for its work at any point in its history, but that it also has the same mission in each and every age by virtue of its Apostolicity.²

It is in light of this eschatological understanding of the way Apostolic authority has been and is given to the Church that we can best understand Saravia's views about Apostolic succession.³ For one thing, this explains

---

¹. Ibid., 112-13, 119, 148-49, 234-35, 262-63, et passim. Later we shall see one way that he failed to connect this authority given to the Church with the exercise of it by the ministry.

². Vi infra, 335.

why one who had so much to say in his works about the importance of the apostolica potestas remaining in the Church, had amazingly little to say about the way this was meant to be handed on from one age to another within the Church. This eschatological explanation also clarifies what he meant when he said that the succession could be proved by the authority abiding in the Church and not vice-versa.\footnote{1} This meant, as with most Reformed ministers, that Saravia believed the continuous Church produced the continuous ministry and that his primary interest in and discussion of succession was in regard to Apostolic doctrine, for he felt the Church must ever be faithful in its witness to the \textit{coelestis doctrine} of the Apostles.\footnote{2} But closely akin to this was his idea of this as being a functional succession whereby the performance of such Apostolic functions as governing the Church, administering discipline, and proclaiming the Gospel, were to be continued down through the ages.\footnote{3} The particular function about which he had the most to say was the maintenance of the Apostolic form of government through the episcopate, or by some kind of hierarchical ordering of the ministry so that there would be some ministers over other ministers in the ecclesiastical regimen. It really would be more correct to say, though, as far as Saravia was concerned, that this was not so much a two-fold succession as it was the two sides of the one true Apostolic succession. This is why he saw the whole ministry of bishops and presbyters as successors of and dependent upon the Apostolate generally, but with the episcopate as being their particular successors in regard to ecclesiastical government.

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{1}{Cf. \textit{"De Fecundo... etc."}, 175.}
\item \footnote{2}{V. supra, 120.}
\item \footnote{3}{Ibid., 121. We have also seen that he mentioned a series type of succession in one place (v. \textit{"Examen... etc."}, 18), but this one sentence comment is neither self-explanatory, nor can its meaning be understood from its context.}
\end{itemize}
The word "pioneer" has been used previously in regard to Saravia's work in the area of the theology of missions, but this term can also be used justifiably of his ecumenical efforts, and, as far as the Anglican Church is concerned, of his writings about the ministry. We shall consider the first two of these three subjects later, but now we are to turn our attention to his thoughts about the ministry. Saravia's interest in this field was truly that of a pioneer in the Anglican Church because he was the first theologian to write a treatise on this subject in the Elizabethan period, and, even more important, he was one of the first to search for a Scriptural and dogmatic basis for this doctrine. Eventually the Church of England would have been compelled to move in this direction anyway, but Saravia rendered yeoman's service to Anglicanism by leading the way in breaking some new ground in this area of theology. The manner in which he did this may be seen in the following points which are partially a recapitulation of some stated in the preceding section and of some from previous chapters which can now be added to them: (1) the ministry of Christ was made the foundation and prototype of the ministry of the Gospel; (2) all of the ministerial offices and gifts were seen as a gift of the Holy Spirit; (3) all ministers were shown to be dependent upon and successors of the Apostles; (4) the Gospel and the proclamation of the Gospel were seen to be inseparably joined; (5) the edification and nurture of the Church was taught to be the continuing task of the ministry in general; (6) the ministry to be rendered was that of the whole Church and as such was therefore committed to the universal Church; (7) the necessity was shown for ministers to

1. V. infra, "The Unity of the Church and Its Mission to the Heathen."
2. V. supra, 103.
continue to carry the Gospel to the heathen and to attempt to restore Christianity in lands where it had fallen in desuetude; (8) an authoritarian structuring of ecclesiastical government was given great emphasis in and was closely linked with the nature and function of the ministry.

This seems to be the best place to begin the examination of the differences which this writer has recognized between his own doctrine of the Ministry and that of Saravia's. Primarily, these have to do with the last point in the above list, although, as we shall see, they are also closely related to significant divergences in several other doctrines. This dissidence does not stem from his high regard for the doctrines of the Ministry or of the Church, but it arises out of the way in which he saw them in their relation to one another. Saravia was certainly right in his emphasis on the ministry of Christ as being the foundation of the ministry of the Gospel, but he failed to show that it can be thought of in this way only because it is a special ministry within the Church which is the Body of Christ. We have seen in several ways that Saravia's ecclesiology was prior to his doctrine of the Ministry and that this is the only way that the latter doctrine can be properly understood. However, the point which is being made here is that Saravia never sufficiently clarified the way that the former could be shown to be related to the latter in its priority. In other words, in his desire to emphasize the special role and function of the ministers of the Gospel it appears that he almost completely ignored the corporate ministry of the whole Church. In its deepest sense the "ministry" in the New Testament is a *diakonia* which must be ultimately that of the entire body of believers and not that of an individual or of a special order within the Church.1 It is the Church which has originated in the Gospel —

i.e., in the mighty acts of God, the incarnation, ministry, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and in the descent and presence of the Holy Spirit. It is not the special ministry within the Church which has originated in these acts, but the Church itself, which, as the Body of Christ, is made up of all true believers. This should lead us to recognize that "the ministry of the Church is first and foremost a corporate ministry, grounded upon baptismal incorporation into Christ," and that this concept of the priesthood of the whole Body of Christ is not only prior to but determinative of the ministry of the Gospel.

Saravia's error in this regard was compounded by his very weak doctrine of the Laity for he had almost nothing to say of the role of laymen in the Church, except in regard to his occasional comments about the functions of ecclesiastical government in which magistrates and civil authorities might sometimes have a part. This reveals a serious weakness in his ecclesiology for he not only failed to say much about the very legitimate role of laymen in the Church, but, as far as is known, he did not comment at all on the priesthood of believers. If he had done so it would have surely strengthened both his ecclesiology and his conception of the Ministry for this doctrine quite naturally has relevance to both of these. Also, above and beyond these

---

2. A. Gilmore (ed.), The Pattern of the Church (1963), 99. V., infra for comments on the nature of the special ministry within the Church.
3. It should be remembered that Saravia's Erastian period came after his treatises on the ministry were written and even then he considered the exercise of civil authority in and over the Church as a priestly function and not a lay activity.
reasons, it would appear that it was incumbent upon him to bring out the role of the laity in his thought because he had maintained that the *apostolica potestas* had been given to the whole body of believers and not to the ministers of the Church. If, like Bilson, he had understood this authority as having been given only to the ministers, and the ministry *per se* to have constituted the Church then it would be apparent why he did not concern himself with the corporate priesthood of the Church.

It should be said at this point that Saravia probably did not see the need to express the importance of the corporate ministry of the Church because of his prior interest in the ministry of the Gospel as an order clearly and distinctly set apart from the laity. His conception of ordination as conferring a special, though not priestly, character on the minister can be seen in the fact that he often contended that the preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the sacraments, and the government of the Church were essential notes of the ministry. This reveals a very decided difference of view about the nature of the ministry and the performance of these ecclesiastical functions from my own, for these are seen by this writer as activities in which the laity can and should share.¹ This does not detract from the role of the special ministry within the Church for these notes are committed to them, but not exclusively. It is actually in this perspective that the proper relation of the ministry to the laity and the corporate priesthood of the Church can be seen —

---

¹. "Report of the Council of the Baptist Union on 'Church Relations in England' (adopted in 1953) in Payne, *ibid.*, 297: "We find no difficulty in allowing any church member — man or woman — to preach and administer the sacraments on occasion, provided such person is duly authorized by the local church in which these acts take place."
This ministry of Christ continues through His body, and pastoral care and concern should be characteristic of the Church as a whole. It would not be true to the New Testament pattern to begin by dividing the Church into shepherds and sheep, pastors and flock, and then to assume that the former only are called and endowed to continue the pastoral work of Christ. Certainly the apostles, the presbyters, the bishops, were appointed to exercise episcopate in a special way. But as the whole Church is diakonia, so all mature Christians have the Shepherd's heart.1

Before we proceed to a discussion of other features of the special ministry within the Church it would be well at this point to draw attention to an even more basic difference which exists between the thought of Saravia and my own—viz., in regard to the nature of the Church itself. As we have just seen in the preceding discussion, and, indeed, as has been apparent throughout this study of Saravia's doctrines, the doctrine of the Church which one holds has much to say about the concept of the ministry as an order within the Church, so this must be properly understood before attempting to consider the ministry of the Gospel at any length. Saravia's belief about the Church when he was writing his doctrinal treatises on the ministry was that of an established Church which with the State would form a Christian Commonwealth. There were situations which he realized could prevent this, such as times of persecution, etc., but when the nation was ruled by a Christian monarch he believed this to be the best arrangement of the civil and ecclesiastical life of the country, and this naturally meant that national citizenship corresponded to Church membership. This is, me judice, a wrong conception of the Church, and, at best, a very naive and unrealistic view of the difficulties which such an alignment must cause.2 The witness of the Church is bound to suffer in such

1. Gilmore, ibid., 58.
2. Cf., Karl Barth, The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism, trans. by E.L. Payne (1959), 52-54, for his comments on the difficulties related to the idea of a national Church, particularly in regard to infant baptism.
a relationship for as T.W. Manson has observed, "it is not the business of the Church to be one of the Kingdoms of this world." However, we need not turn to the writings of more recent authorities to see the dangers which are involved in such a conception, for Saravia's later Erastianism in which he subordinated the Church and the ministry to civil power, and his doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings which even led him to subordinate the mediatorial work of Christ to His kingly role are both eloquent proofs of how the Church can come dangerously close to becoming "... one of the Kingdoms of this World."2

The doctrine of Baptism is so closely related to the doctrine of the Church that it might even be considered an integral part of it, so the preceding discussion can be carried a step further by an examination of baptismal thought. We have seen that Saravia thought of infant baptism as a means of regeneration and as a means by which the recipient was grafted into the Body of Christ,3 and although this was thought to be the normal way for entrance into the Church, he did not tie the moment of regeneration to the act itself, for he saw this as coming either before, during, or after the administration of the sacrament. This basically is a conception of the Church as a family of God, or, as we have already seen, a "Commonwealth" whereby all in the nation are seen to be members of the Church in the same way that they are citizens of the nation - the latter by birth in England and the former by baptism as infants according to the rites of the Church of England. This very brief resume of Saravia's views on this subject does not bring out aspects of this doctrine which others might feel to be important, but it does convey the essentials of his doctrinal position. It also clearly reveals the significant differences between

1. Manson, ibid., 25.
2. V. supra, 179-184. Of., "The Baptist Doctrine of the Church," ibid., 290: "Any form of control by the State in these matters appears to us to challenge the 'Crown Rights of the Redeemer.'"
3. Ibid., 73-74.
his standpoint and that of this writer. Turning to the thought of the latter - it is maintained that the Church should be seen as a regenerate society - i.e., "... a holy society ... truly to be found wherever companies of believers unite as Churches on the ground of a confession of personal faith." The Church is seen here as a regenerate society composed of converted people who acknowledge the supremacy and sovereignty of the Lordship of Christ, which doctrine might be called that of a Gathered Church, related and subsequent to believers' baptism. Although Saravia himself would have said that he also believed in a regenerated Church, the real question here is how and when the regeneration of the believer should take place in regard to his baptism and entry into the Church. This same question has been stated in a slightly different way in these words:

There are two distinct ways of representing the operation of the Spirit of God in regard to baptism. We may think of the external act, and the material means, as the prescribed channel of the work of the Spirit, and then the result is what is commonly known as sacramentarianism. Or we may think of the internal conditions, the personal faith and conversion emphasized in Believers' Baptism, and see in them the true realm of the Spirit's activity, 'the Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God.' In fact, when we speak of Believers' Baptism, we mean that baptism in the Spirit of God, of which water baptism is the expression.

1. "Reply of the Churches in Membership with the Baptist Union to the 'Appeal to all Christian People' issued by the Lambeth Conference of 1920," in Payne, ibid., 260.
3. Ibid., 24-25. Although this author uses the term "sacrament" it can be seen from his usage of "sacramentarianism" that he had a different concept of the nature of a sacrament than Saravia had. Therefore, when Robinson and other Baptists use this term they usually mean that it is "something sacred" and that it is in some sense "a means of grace" (v. "Baptist Doctrine of the Church," ibid., 268). However, I prefer to speak of Baptism and the Lord's Supper as "teaching ordinances" for they "... symbolize the two truths which constitute the eternal gospel of grace; namely our Lord's death and His resurrection." (v. report by R.C. Johnson in Pehr Edwall et al. /eds./, Ways of Worship /1951/, 142-43). In this way they may still be "means of grace" but only in the same sense as may any other act of worship in the name and presence of Christ.
Baptism is an ordinance of the Lord, grounded in that grace which was manifested in His atoning work, and, as such, it should be administered to an individual only after he has expressed repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. This response of human repentance and intelligent confession of faith should never be thought of as being in any way as determinative of, or adding to, Christ's redemptive deed "... as though in our believing we are partners with Christ in the joint production of our salvation." This is not, therefore, a subjective experience, as it may appear vis-a-vis the objective nature of Saravia's sacramentarianism, for even though faith in the Lord must be personal it can never be private - i.e., it is always dependent upon and derivative from the saving initiative of God working through His Spirit. This means that in a very real way this faith points beyond itself to those objective events in Christ through which alone this new relationship with Him is made possible.

The Lord's Supper, like Baptism, is also an important doctrine in the explication of one's ecclesiology, and as the two ordinances of the Church they should be considered each in the context of the other. Both of them might be thought of as "acted parables" in that they proclaim the death and resurrection of the Lord, and the elements in both should be thought of as complementary to one another in their "spiritual symbolism." The symbolism in the case

2. Beasley-Murray, Baptism ... New Testament, 269. This author gives a very good discussion of the nature of faith in relation to baptism and soteriology.
3. Champion, ibid., 75; cf., Joseph Nordenhaug "Baptists and a Regenerate Church Membership," Review and Expositor, IX, No. 2 (Spring, 1963), 141.
4. Ibid., 51.
of Baptism is that of the moral and spiritual cleansing of the believer in a rite which cannot be repeated, while the elements of the Supper represent the spiritual food on which the recipient must repeatedly feed for the strengthening and growth of his faith. These two rites also have the characteristic of being administered and received in the fellowship of believers with one another and with their Lord.\footnote{1} The Lord's Supper itself is a memorial feast which is held in remembrance of Christ's death, but it is more than just a commemoration or remembrance of that great event. For the believer it is an actual spiritual participation in the shed blood and the broken body of the crucified Saviour;\footnote{2} but we do not receive Him as a dead Christ, save only in so far as He died on the Cross and rose again to live evermore.\footnote{3}

Saravia thought of the Lord's Supper as a sacrament which consisted of physical and spiritual elements which could not be separated.\footnote{4} These were given the same relation analogically as the human and divine natures of Christ had been defined in their relation to one another by the Council of Chalcedon. He saw this sacrament as being received by believer and unbeliever alike, except that the former by virtue of their faith received what he called the \textit{res sacramenti}, or "the virtue of the sacrament" and the latter received a just condemnation because of an unworthy participation. This was, he said, the doctrine of the Real Presence because Christ was in the elements "... after a manner Divine and Spiritual, Heavenly and Supernatural, without any multiplication or extension of His Body..."\footnote{5} This doctrine of Saravia's stands over against my own views about the Supper which have been briefly presented above.

\footnote{1}{The Lord's Supper as an act of fellowship with other Christians will be discussed in a later section.}
\footnote{3}{Arnold Dakin, \textit{The Baptist View of the Church and Ministry} (1944), 32.}
\footnote{4}{\textit{V. supra}, 74-76, 213-21.}
\footnote{5}{Saravia ... \textit{Bucharest}, 29.}
However, there is this to be said for Saravia's doctrine, that although it cannot be accepted by this writer, it makes a deep impression on one in the balance, symmetry and spirit in which he presented it. His Christological analogy was carefully thought through and commendably communicated. The scholarliness and thoughtfulness which characterize "De sacra Eucharistia" make one wish that he had given the same care and thought to all that he wrote. Even with this kind of admiration for his work there is nevertheless a difference in our notions about the nature of the presence in the Supper. Saravia saw this as a sacramental presence guaranteed by the bread and wine having become sacraments, but I see the presence of Christ not in the elements, but around the table of the Lord in the hearts and midst of all who love and believe in Him. This is a presence which is real and meaningful for it is "Spirit touching spirit" but not dependent in any way upon being mediated by the elements. In some ways this could be shown to be similar to Richard Hooker's thought about the "presence" when he said, "the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not, therefore, to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament."1 This is indeed a "real presence," but it should be understood that the Supper does not:

occasion the Real Presence in any manner different from the way in which that Real Presence is ever about us. The Lord's Supper is rather an occasion when a change might occur in the recipient's attitude and through such a changed attitude he may be brought into greater obedience to and intimacy with the ever-present Lord. Many Baptists would perhaps agree that in a moment like that the Communion in a very real sense does become a means of the grace of God to the communicant.2

We can see in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as in the doctrine of Baptism that the necessity of faith in the participant is emphasized, however this need not make the former a human act - i.e., this is no mere will to be-

---

2. Report by V.E. Devadutt in Donald Baillie and John Marsh (eds.) Intercommunion (1952), 179.
lieve arising out of the subjectivity of the communicant for here too faith has 
itself subjectivity in the great gift of God in Christ Jesus and in His redemptive 
purposes revealed in His life and death.\(^1\) We can be certain of this objec-
tive and real presence because of the presence of the Holy Spirit whose work 
is essential for the creation of true faith and the sanctification of the 
obedience of the recipient of the Supper. These must always be thought of as 
"His peculiar work" for without Him there can be no communion with Christ. 

Both of these ordinances, as we have already seen, witness to the fact 
that there can be no valid relationship with Christ which is private and iso-
lated, for both must be administered and received in the fellowship of other 
believers.\(^2\) Also, as we have seen in the discussion of baptism, this rite 
should be seen as a means of admission into the membership of a local church as 
well as to that of the universal Church. This was an error in Saravias 
ecclesiology which makes it worthwhile for us to give at least brief considera-
tion to the very significant importance of the local community of believers. 

As we shall see later there is ample Scriptural evidence for the valid place 
which the local Church should have in a study of the doctrine of the Church, 
and even Saravias admitted that some of the churches in the New Testament period 
were self-governing,\(^3\) but he ignored this as having been caused by the un-
finished state of the Church at that time.\(^4\) However, this is another point about

---

\(^1\) There must of necessity be some subjectivity in any idea of this 
doctrine, as can be seen in Saravias emphasis upon the subjective conditions 
which he declared to be involved before the objectivity of the sacrament 
could become realized as a means of grace, e.g., the need for personal examina-
tion and repentance in the communicant before coming to the table of the Lord 

\(^2\) \textit{cf.}, Beasley-Murray, \textit{ibid.}, 282.

\(^3\) \textit{v. supra}, 130-31.

\(^4\) \textit{A Treatise ... etc.}, 204: "... they \textit{do} now err, who would place the 
Church on the footing on which it was in its commencement, and incomplete 
form."
which Saravia and I must disagree, for, me judicium, it is precisely to the New Testament period, or at least to that part of it which has been included in the Scriptures, to which we should look for guidance in our understanding of how the Church is or should be constructed both internally and externally.

This is not to say that a precise form for either the polity or the ministry of the Church can be found in the New Testament,¹ but neither is there any evidence that the Apostles or the writers of this Scripture thought or taught that a more complete state of either would evolve at some later period. We shall return to this matter in the discussion of whether there should be an imparity among ministers, but for now it should be noted that there is sufficient evidence in the New Testament era to show that the local community of believers has been and is far more important than Saravia's writings would indicate.

Giving the local church or congregation its due emphasis in ecclesiology is not an advocacy of an atomistic or isolationist doctrine of the Church, but it is an acknowledgment that here in one place there is the expression of the great universal ecclesia which is in heaven and on earth.² Barth, who said that it was best not to apply the idea of invisibility to the Church, revealed the importance of the community of believers in this comment on the phrase from the Creed: "Credo ecclesiam means that I believe that the congregation to which I belong, in which I have been called to faith and am responsible for my faith, in which I have my service, is the one, holy, universal Church."³

¹. Cf., Torrance, Conflict and Agreement ... etc., I, 33; Hugh Martin, "Baptists and the Great Church," The Baptist Quarterly, XIV, No. 7 (July, 1952), 312-13; Doctrine ... Church of England, 117-18; Champion, ibid., 77-78.
². Martin, ibid., 310.
³. Karl Barth, Dogmatics in Outline, 7th. reprint (1960), 144; idem, Church Dogmatics, Vol. IV, Pt. I, pp. 701-25. Cf., Aulen, Reformation ... Catholicity, 53-54, who said that Barth, at least as far as his view of the church is concerned, belongs in the context of the post-Reformation churches, primarily because of his rejection of infant baptism and his assertion that Congregational order surpasses all others.
This, of course, must be seen in the context of the catholicity and universality of the Church and not as a federation of local, isolated, congregations. As we have seen earlier, it is the tota ecclesia which is prior to these communities of faith and therefore they must be understood in that context. The author of "I Clement" expressed this in the opening words of his epistle: "The Church of God which sojourns in Rome greets the Church of God which sojourns in Corinth."1

The full meaning of this kind of catholic thought is seen when it is realized that Christ Himself is the only seat of authority within His Church, for it has been created by God and sustained by Him in all ages. In this sense every community of believers is derived from divine initiative and lives by Christ's sovereign grace and not by human decision; ergo, this koinonia is not a democracy but a Christocracy.2 However, this authority under Christ must take some external form in the Church, and here, quite differently from Saravia's concept of this as being exercised by a hierarchy of the ministry,3 it should be regarded as belonging to the whole congregation. This apparently was the way Paul's Gentile churches were organized, for, "these communities were self-governing," they exercised discipline, chose their leaders, and gave judgments with "... no hint of any one ecclesiastical office endowed with independent authority," and in each of these places the "recognition of those who ministered to the congregations depended on the free choice of their members."4 This indicates that the normal pattern of authority was congrega-

1. Martin, ibid., 311, no ref. given.
2. Gilmore (ed.), Pattern ... Church, 143; cf., "Baptist Doctrine of the Church" in Payne, ibid., 283-86.
tional and that a parity existed in the ministry itself. Such an ecclesiastical polity allows for individual dissent should the community of believers violate, either in word or in deed, the clear teachings of the Scriptures, but the usual channel of authority must of necessity be through the group as a whole. In any event, the ultimate authority in the interpretation of the Word of God is neither individually nor collectively a human agency, but it is the work of the Holy Spirit who guides one and all in their understanding of and obedience to that Word.

This discussion of the nature of authority in the Church will be taken a step further in the next section, but, first, it will be necessary for us to consider Saravia's arguments for an equality of ministers. This must be done at some length because these constituted a very large part of his writings. The evidence which he offered for this doctrine can be divided into the following three parts: (1) the appeal to the sub-Apostolic period; (2) arguments from the Scriptures; (3) the de facto contention of inequality.

The sub-Apostolic era had special significance for Saravia because of his conviction that the form of the ministry which evolved gradually under the Apostles was only partially complete at the time of their deaths (ut supra); therefore, he contended that the Church should not look to the Apostolic age for a well-developed ordering of the ministry, but to the period which followed. This elicits several comments: (1) this was a tacit admission by Saravia that even though he had made Scriptural arguments for his doctrine of the Ministry, his ultimate "proof" must really be found in the sub-Apostolic period - for it was to the latter to which he said the Church must look for a completed and perfected ecclesiastical polity; (2) this was an implicit acknowledgment that no exclusive ordering of the ministry was in fact instituted or intended by the
Apostles — otherwise it would have been necessary to have explained how the Twelve as founders of the Church and as those who gave "... the canon and rule whereby the teaching of all others should be tested ..." should have failed to have completed or perfected their work in ordering the ministry while on earth; (3) this assignment of special significance and authority to the sub-Apostolic age was an error in Saravia's judgment for the temptation to look to that particular period "... as a model of what Church organization ought to be ...," because of its proximity to the historic ministry of Christ, "... betrays an unconscious doubt in the real presence of Christ in His Church ...."2

Saravia's Scriptural arguments for an imparity of ministers were drawn from both of the Testaments. He was quite right in showing that an imparity existed in the priesthood under the Old Dispensation, but he failed to prove that this should be brought over into the New Dispensation. There were many passages which he adduced from both Testaments to argue this point, but these can be resolved into two basic lines of reasoning. One of these was the imparity which he said the Lord had instituted when He called the Twelve and the Seventy and had given the former authority or superiority over the latter;3 this ἔνεργος, he said, was therefore intended by the Lord to be a permanent characteristic of the ministry of the Gospel.4 The other line of reasoning and the basic New Testament text which he used in this way was Paul's list of ministerial offices in Ephesians 4:11,5 and in regard to this he made the following very significant comment:

1. A Treatise ... etc., 73.
4. V. supra, 96.
5. A Treatise ... etc., 57-58.
... Pastors and Presbyters were distinguished by the Apostles into two Orders, so that as the authority of an Apostle was greater than that of an Evangelist or Prophet, and that of an Evangelist greater than that of a Bishop or Presbyter, so Titus and Timotheus, who were at once Presbyters and Bishops, possessed greater powers than the Presbyters ordained in every city by Apostolical authority, and who were merely Presbyters.¹

This is in point of fact the heart of what Saravia was seeking to prove from the Scriptures about an imparity of ministers, but we can see the following discrepancies in his usage of this, and the other texts which were virtually supplementary to this one: (1) the fact that there was a difference in the authority of the Apostles and that of the Evangelists would not prove that the Lord intended this to be a characteristic of the ministry in general unless it could be shown that bishops succeeded the former and presbyters the latter. We have seen, though, that Saravia denied that the presbyters succeeded the Evangelists and that he thought of bishops as successors of the Apostles only in the government of the Church.² (2) Saravia's notion of a four-fold ordering of the ministry in New Testament times - i.e., Apostles, Evangelists, superior presbyters, and inferior presbyters - indicates inso fuso that the episcopate was not derived from the Apostolate but was elevated from the presbyterate.³ (3) Ephesians 4:11-12 is a very doubtful passage from which to draw definite conclusions about a permanently ordered ministry in the Church; for these five ministries do not indicate ranks or degrees of ecclesiastical authority, but they have to do with charismata, or "... special divine

¹. Ibid., 58.
². V. supra, 128, 135; cf., "Defensio ... etc.," 107, 123, 178, where he denied that Benza was correct in designating Timothy and Titus as Evangelists, but said that they were under the Evangelists (whom he also called "Apostles of the second rank").
³. V. supra, 132, for a similar deduction by F.J. Shirley about Saravia. It is also relevant to note here that Lightfoot came to this same conclusion about the relation of the episcopate to the presbyterate (v., J.B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, 8th. ed. (1888), 196.

endowment [g] ...." Significantly, Vincent said of all of these ministries that "whatever authority they possessed depended upon the church's conviction that their charisma was of divine origin." Saravia, who interpreted these five ministries as ranks or orders within the one ministry, had difficulty in fitting this passage into his overall thesis because he sought to show only a two-fold gradation of ministerial ranking to have continued permanently in the Church from this five-fold ordering. Since he could not offer Scriptural evidence that some of these were meant to be permanent offices while others were meant only to be temporary, and, since he could not indicate in what manner he thought the Evangelists and the Prophets to be contemporaneous in the sixteenth century Church, then he simply disregarded them except in regard to his premise that they were a part of the New Testament ecclesiastical hierarchy. Likewise, he had difficulty fitting teachers into this assessment because he said they were ministers of the Church - and not of the Gospel - omitting thereby to say why Paul would have included them in this list even though deacons, who were also thought to be ministers of the Church, were left out. Not only are ἐπίσκοποι not mentioned here, but neither are ἐπίσκοποι nor ἀρχιτριφύλακτοι, and, what is more important, these three are not found together anywhere in the acknowledged Pauline epistles; the only place in them where even two of the three are mentioned together is Phil. 1:1 ("bishops and deacons").

(l) Since Saravia believed the continuation of Apostolic authority in the Church to be related to, though not dependent upon, the continuation of the Apostolic form of government (i.e., an imparity of ministers), then it is strange, to say the least, that the Apostles allowed the title ἐπίσκοπος to be used

---

2. Ibid. 40.
3. Cf., A Treatise ... etc., 57-58.
4. Vincent, ibid., 40.
homonymously, knowing, as they undoubtedly would have, that this would lead to confusion in the correct form of ecclesiastical polity after their deaths.\(^1\)

(5) The Pauline custom of adding the names of Timothy, Titus, and others to his own name in the prefaces of some of his epistles (e.g., Phil. 1:1; Col. 1:1; II Cor. 1:1) did not mean a coauthorship of them, and, thereby, an inference that these men were to be thought of as being bishops by virtue of their having been chosen as successors to Paul.\(^2\) It is obvious that Paul did not have such an intention in mind because in each epistle after the greeting he dropped the plural pronoun and began to speak of himself in the first person singular and of these colleagues in the third person singular. Barth has explained the coupling of Timothy's name with Paul's in Phil. 1:1 as having been occasioned in all probability by the likelihood — according to Acts 16:1 and 17:4 — that Timothy was with Paul during the stormy events which took place at the time of the founding of that congregation, and, presumably, according to Acts 19:22, the former had visited them again later.\(^3\) Similar explanations could be given about the other epistles in which this custom was employed.

(6) The titles which Paul sometimes used in speaking of one or more of his co-workers — e.g., "fellow-workers" (Col. 4:11 - διακονούς), "a fellow-soldier" (Phil. 2:25 - σύμμαχός), "a partner" (II Cor. 8:23 - δωροφόρος), "stewards" (I Cor. 4:2 - διακονούς) — neither prove these so designated to

\(^1\) V. spurr, 129.

\(^2\) Ibid., 129-30. Cf., Barth, ibid., IV, Pt. I, 673: "As far as the apostolate of Paul is concerned, it is plain from his Epistles that his relationship to the communities was definitely not that of a universal bishop. If he had adopted towards them an attitude veering in this direction, this would have appeared, e.g., in I Cor. 1 and 3 in his reaction to the parties at Corinth."

have succeeded the Apostles, nor to have been superior to other presbyters.  

In most instances these New Testament titles seem to have been used indiscriminately of the presbyterate and in ways which obviously did not always carry connotations of superiority or authority.  

(7) Saravia assumed what he actually had to prove when he used ordo and gradus interchangeably, without a clear distinction made between them it is not possible to be certain what the nature of the hierarchical ordering was which he desired; consequently, it is just as difficult to be certain where he thought the line should be drawn between the authority for governing the Church and the external form of government - that he himself saw a difference between the two is obvious, but this was a distinction which he blurred in the same manner as that which he did between the Apostles and all other ministers.

The third feature of Saravia's rationale for an imparity of ministers was what has been called his de facto argument. From observation and experience (i.e., a posteriori) he had developed a strong conviction that an inequality existed among ministers because of age, experience, piety, wisdom, education, gifts, etc. These distinguishing characteristics, he contended, caused the opinions of some men to count far more than those of others; examples which he gave of this were Calvin and Bema because of their influence over great numbers of ministers.

He saw these distinctions as inevitable since "... God scatters His gifts unequally" - giving five talents to some and two talents to others.

---

1. V. supra, 130. Cf., ibid. 120, no. 1, for other words such as προκαταληκτως, ἀναπληρωμα, κυριαληκτως, διακονος, which should all be understood as designating functions of the presbyterate and not official titles (V., Vincent, ibid., 36-41).

2. V., iii John 6; Phil. 4:13; Philom. 2; I Cor. 10:18, 20; II Cor. 11:7; Gal. 4:2; Matt. 20:26; I Tim. 3:14-12; Acts. 27:11.

3. V. supra, 82-83.

4. Ibid., 79-80.

5. "Defensio ... etc.," 52.
Saravia’s conclusion about such \textit{de facto} inequality among men was that some were meant to be in positions of authority and others in positions of obedience and that without an hierarchical ordering of the ministry these differences could lead to oligarchical government—\textit{e.g.,} such inequalities should be regularized in the Church \textit{de jure}.\footnote{1}

Few, if any, would disagree with Saravia’s basic premise that differences in divine gifts and natural abilities are conducive to certain inequalities among men, but there is good reason to disagree with his conclusions about these. The very fact that some men stand out above others by virtue of their age, wisdom, piety, and talents should be sufficient reason within itself to persuade ministers to listen to and learn from them. Those who are as distinguished and gifted spiritually and mentally as men like Calvin and Beza will always deserve and receive the attention of the less gifted, but the real question is whether the former will be given a greater or a lesser opportunity to provide leadership in a hierarchical ordering of the ministry.\footnote{2} However, the answer to this question probably would depend more upon one’s predisposed notions about the best kind of ecclesiastical polity than upon anything else, so we should turn now to a more important matter in this consideration. Saravia’s position on the \textit{de facto} inequality of ministers is strongly reminiscent of his confusion of charismatic and functional gifts, as listed in Ephesians 4, with a hierarchy of ministerial offices—\textit{i.e.,} he maintained that the one who received a five talent gift from

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] “Emmen ...etc., 44. Cf. A Treatise ...etc.,” 147-48, where he said of Luke 22:25, 26 “\ldots he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger ...” was Jesus’ way of calling attention to this inequality among men.
\item[2.] “Defensio ...etc.,” 195: “In ordinis aequalitate, personarum inaequalitas non potest non perturbare aequalitates.”
\item[3.] Although, as we have seen, Beza did not show himself to good advantage in his dialogue with Saravia, either because he entrusted the work to someone else or failed himself to give serious consideration to his opponent’s case, he was nevertheless one of the foremost Biblical scholars of his time.
\end{itemize}
God was entitled thereby to a certain superiority over one with only two talents, etc. His basic mistake here was that he considered ecclesiastical authority to be a corollary of all gifts, whereas, in point of fact, some of these gifts which ministers may naturally possess or which may have been given by God do not necessarily equip them to assume responsibility as leaders of men or as officers in ecclesiastical government. Here again it must be admitted that a part of one's conclusions about this matter may depend more upon a predetermined bias than upon the merits of the issue involved, but, it must also be said that there is no evidence that the charismatic gifts of the New Testament carried a corresponding rank or position of authority in the government of the Church. Instead, the evidence of the New Testament indicates that apart from the Apostles, whose authority was related to their function as founders of the Church, there existed a parity among ministers in their episcopate, although many were blessed with different kinds of charismata.

**Saravia's Accentuation of Authority**

We have seen in several chapters how important order and authority were in the development of Saravia's thinking, but the import of this could not be seen as clearly in any one of the preceding chapters as it can now when we examine his authoritarianism in the total perspective of his thought and the way it increasingly affected his theology. This discussion will also draw to a conclusion the material in the preceding section on his doctrine of the Imparity of

---

1. Note Rom. 12:6ff where "ruling" is mentioned as only one of a number of other gifts; *cf.*, I Cor. 12:1ff.
3. The use of "authoritarianism" in this section may be defined as that capacity and right to govern, direct, or exercise a control of affairs over other men. This subject is a veritable theme in all of Saravia's work - *i.e.*, that in every institution, or organization there must be some in authority and some in subjection to that authority (*v. supra*, 168).
Ministers, for Saravia was never committed to a particular ordering of the ministry per se, as much as he was to an expression of authority which would produce order and harmony in the Church. This is to say that the former was really a means to the latter, which became more and more for him an end within itself. It is conceivable, therefore, that if he had become convinced that ecclesiastical peace and order could have been better served through some other ordering of the ministry, then he probably would have been willing to have altered his stand on ecclesiastical polity again,¹ and to some extent it might even be said that Saravia's later Erastianism was a partial change in this respect. This distinction between the means and the end in his thought is important because it shows why the conclusion was reached earlier that the authority for ecclesiastical government was made a part of the internal structure of the Church while the form of that government was placed in the external structure, and, consequently why the assertion has been made all along that he did not make any claims for an exclusive ordering of the ministry.²

Saravia never changed his desire to promote unity and order in the Church through the proper exercise of authority, but there was some change in his views as to who should hold that authority. The full impact of this can be seen only if we go back and draw together the central ideas which he expressed very late in his life about the relation of the Church and State. The reader will remember that Saravia felt the ideal arrangement of civil power was for the sumnum imperium to flow downwards from the ruler to the people and by virtue of this sovereignty the ruler, or king, constituted the nation and not vice-versa.³ However, in the case of the Church, the apostolica potestas meant virtually the

---

¹. His first change from the Dutch Reformed to Anglican polity should be understood as having been brought about by his devotion to the end mentioned above.
². V. supra, 84.
³. Ibid., 170-71.
same thing for him that the *sumnum imperium* had meant in his thought about the State, but with the significant difference that the former was given to all the Church, and, therefore, the Church constituted the ministry and not vice-versa. Apparently, late in his life, he felt the Church could not reach that state of order and harmony which he desired without a greater centralization of authority, and because he had already firmly set his ecclesiology above his doctrine of the Ministry (*ut supra*), he saw the State in general and the ruler of the State in particular as the powers best suited to achieve this aim. We can only regret that he did not live long enough to finish the seventh book of *De imperandi authoritate ... etc.*, which was to have dealt with the government of the Church, for had he done so we would have surely seen a full exposition of this amazing transition of emphasis from one institution to the other, and we would have certainly been able to show much more clearly that authoritarianism was the dominant reason for this change. Therefore, these assessments must perforce be of a somewhat conjectural nature, but they should also be seen as having foundations much stronger than those built on mere supposition. We shall attempt to show what these foundations were in the remainder of this section.

Saravia’s later adoption of a more Erastian theological position and of the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings are important not only because they indicate a change in his position about the relation of the Church and State, but even more so, because of how clearly these alterations reveal this basic authoritarian bias. To place the civil authority above that of the ecclesiastical, or to maintain that kings rule *de jure divino*, would not in themselves necessitate a subordination of the ministry of the Gospel, nor would the adoption of these theological positions necessitate a change in one’s Christological thought to the effect that Christ’s work as Mediator was subordinated to that of
his work as the Ruler of the Universe. Why then did Saravia feel that it was necessary to do these things when he had devoted most of his life to the purpose of getting men to give the ministry the honor and the respect which it deserves and when his thought had apparently been soundly Christological prior to this change? Of the several mysteries with which his life is marked today (such as the matter of his ordination, or why he said nothing of the unfinished books of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, etc.) these two enigmas are the most baffling of all.

Some light may be shed upon the matters discussed above if we look into his earlier doctrines to see if these subjects existed in some incipient state even before they came to the surface later on. All the way through Saravia's writings on the ministry he gave the greater part of his attention to the need for proper authority in ecclesiastical government. This need not have indicated anything more than that he felt this was that part of his doctrine which spoke most directly to the needs of his times and therefore required the greater explication. However, whenever any theologian devotes excessive attention to only one doctrine, or to a part of one doctrine, without carefully and painstakingly thinking it into all of its correlative doctrines and without continuously looking at each in the perspective of the others he stands in danger of allowing that tenet unduly to influence and even to corrupt other areas of his thought. This may well be the explanation of what happened in Saravia's case. He defined the ministry in all of its aspects, but it is only when we look at the total perspective of what he had to say about the work of ministers that we begin to see how much his attention to ecclesiastical government blinded him to the basic characteristic of the minister as a *σάκοντεs*. This is not to say that he did not mention certain aspects of the ministry as a service rendered to Christ
and to the flock of Christ,¹ but it is to say that his continuing controversy with Beza and his strong commitment to some form of authoritarianism² led him to look all the more upon the ministry as a governing and not a serving body in the Church—this was true of presbyters as well as of bishops, even though the former did not have as such authority as the latter. A significant illustration of this in his earliest treatise can be seen in his interpretation of Jesus' admonition to his disciples, "... he that is greatest among you let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve."³ Saravia said that this passage (Luke 22:24-30) was as certain a proof of a preeminence of some ministers over others as any in the Gospels. Of course, this within itself was a contradiction of what he had said elsewhere about the Apostles all being equal to one another⁴ (these words of the Lord were probably spoken only to those in the upper room with Him at the institution of the Supper), but what is of even greater importance is that he missed the main point of this passage. The disciples had been arguing amongst themselves about who was the greatest and Jesus chided them with the warning that they were not to concern themselves with such things, but they were to serve one another even as He had served them. The keynote of this passage could very well be understood as a summary of his ministry "... I am among you as he that serveth." Surely this is a note which is sounded all too weakly in Saravia's works and was therefore a very significant way that he failed to show the ministry of the Gospel as having been founded upon the ministry of the Lord.⁵

¹. V. supra, 70-77, 129, 137, 140-43.
². Which received much more attention from him than it did from his contemporaries (v. supra, 65-69).
⁴. "Examen...etc.," 45.
⁵. V. supra, 302.
Saravia's failure to interpret this passage correctly may even have some connection with his conclusions about the subordination of the nature of Christ's work as Mediator to that of his Regal power. In those chapters in which he described his views on this subject there is the strong implication that Christ's work as Mediator, by virtue of the fact that it was done when He was in the form of a servant, was thereby inferior to His Regality which He exercises as a King ruling over the heavens and the earth. When Saravia became an Erastian, the natural consequence of this was to say that the ministry representing Christ as Mediator was subordinate to the monarchy representing Christ as King. Therefore, in justice, it seems logical to say that the seminal ideas for his Erastianism can be found in his excessive stress upon ruling or governing as a function of the ministry.

The New Testament does not substantiate in any way the subordination of one part of Christ's work to any other part, but it does say of the Lord who was supremely Prophet, Priest, and King, that He "... made Himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant." This kind of must characterize the ministry of all who are called to proclaim His Word and whatever authority the minister has is only that of Christ's doctrine which he proclaims and not of his office or his status in the Church. The Lord defined the true Apostolic ministry in terms of a pastoral and universal witness (Matthew 28:19-20), but He made no mention there of ruling or governing the Church, even as He showed Peter (John 21:15-17) that his work was to be that of tending and feeding His sheep, but again without any reference to ruling over them. Since characterized the ministry of Christ and can be said to be the basic definition of the true Apostolic ministry then those who stand in the succession of the

1. v. supra, 188-90, 196. Cf., "De imperandi authoritate ...etc.,"
2. Phil. 2:7 (K.J.V.)
3. Rengstorff, Apostleship, 49.
Apostles are those who are above all else servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God (I Cor. 4:1) whose only authority is grounded in and obedient to the prior authority of the sovereign Christ. As Karl Barth has said:

In this matter there is only one true succession, and even on the part of the Church it is the succession of service. If the community is really to find itself and to act in line with Jesus Christ and His apostles, there is only one attitude, and that is the attitude of submission and obedience.

This is precisely the note which Saravia sounded far too weakly in his works, but it is one which could have provided an important corrective in his thought if he had seen this as first and foremost the highest calling of every minister of the Gospel.

The Unity of the Church and Its Mission to the Heathen

Saravia's preoccupation with order and authority was largely due to pragmatic considerations which were rooted very deeply in his past history. His experiences in the Dutch Reformed Church, whether justifiably or not, left him with the overriding conviction that ecclesiastical government must have an authoritarian structure in order to withstand external pressures and corruptions. Without this he felt it was inevitable that schisms and heresies would tear the Church apart. Therefore, these experiences which influenced him so much in his thoughts about ecclesiastical polity, also created a commensurate desire to see the Church united in doctrine and in Spirit. The older he grew the more this desire for unity characterized his spirit and his thought. This can be seen in his treatise "De sacra Eucharistia" and in his appeal for a general council to be called so that concrete action could be taken in bringing together the fragmented Church of the sixteenth century. This spirit apparently made a deep impression on Isaac Casaubon, for in his memorandum about a con-

---

1. Aulen, Reformation ... Catholicity, 174.
2. Barth, Church Dogmatics, IV, Pt. 1, 720.
versation with Saravia he began by saying of him, "he is a man ... most anxious and earnest in seeking for general peace and concord in the Church of God."

Saravia's desire for unity in the Church, like his doctrine of Missions, has not become dated or outmoded with the passage of time, for it has some features relevant to contemporary thought. His belief that unity in the Church could be found in an agreement about the Lord's Supper would be shared by many theologians today, although there would undoubtedly be differences about certain parts of his interpretation or of his manner of expressing himself. This writer would certainly be in agreement with him that oecumenicity could be furthered by such unanimity on the Supper and that this should probably be the starting point for discussions among Christian brethren. Just as we can say that the "... coming together of the members of a Church for the Communion service has always been regarded as one of the marks of true Churchmanship," so can we say that such a coming together of various members of the Church would be a meaningful witness to the oneness which is of the essence of the Church as the Body of Christ. However, the point at which Saravia and this writer would differ would be in the nature of the way that unity should be understood to be expressed in the Supper. He saw it as bound up in its sacramental nature and as stemming from a mutual understanding of and participation in the elements which have become sacramentally the body and blood of Christ. However, me judice, the Supper should be seen as an act of fellowship of the participants who reveal their prior unity as being inherent in the presence of the Christ who is only represented by the elements because He already lives in their hearts and in their midst - even as He promised that, "... where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."
Just as missions and the Oecumenical Movement are closely related in our times\(^1\) it is possible to say that these two subjects had a close relation to each other in Saravia's thought. There are no known statements by him in which he consciously tied these two together, but the conclusion seems justifiable that Saravia's concept of missions opened the way for his deeper interest in oecumenicity. In a manner similar to the experience of many in this century, he may have become convinced that the Church's mission into all the world was being hindered by the division which existed in the Church in those lands where it had long been established. This conclusion goes far in explaining why Saravia said no more about missions to the heathen after he wrote "Defensio Tractatus de diversis Ministeriorum gradibus," and why he devoted his attention instead to a search for means to unite those who had already been won to Christ. If this is a valid judgment, and there is more internal evidence for it than against it, then Saravia was not only the first Anglican or Protestant to develop a doctrine of Missions to the Heathen, but he was also the first to see that missions and oecumenicity are closely related to each other.

Saravia's outstanding contribution to the Church through his unfolding of a doctrine of Missions cannot be found in the fullness or completeness of his thought in this particular area, but in the fact that he saw the need and offered a theological rationale for meeting it in a way that no other sixteenth century Anglican or Protestant had done.\(^2\) Several like Bucer and Calvin had had some idea of the need for missions to the heathen, but they did not pursue or develop this thought the way he was to do later. His view was not limited only

\(^1\) E.g., the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910 proved to be the forerunner of the Oecumenical Movement which has subsequently developed in this century.

\(^2\) V. supra, Pt. II, Chap. I, "The Doctrine of Missions to the Heathen During and After the Reformation and its Relevancy for Saravia."
to areas where the Gospel had never been preached, but he also revealed a deep concern about those parts of the world where Christianity had once flourished, but had since fallen into desuetude. There really is no certain indication in his theology of why he came to these convictions when others had failed to do so, for there were many in his times who were in essential agreement with him on his doctrines of the Church, the Ministry, Election, Soteriology, etc., but who did not express any consciousness of the need of missions in their time. Even though all of these doctrines undoubtedly influenced some of his thought in this direction, the most logical conclusion is that it was his intense interest in and devotion to the Apostolic nature of the Church which caused him to see and proclaim the continuing responsibility of the Church to share the Gospel with all the world. 1 We have seen in a number of ways why this can be thought of as a justifiable judgment, but it was his interpretation of the Great Commission which gives this assessment its strongest credibility. Actually, it was his belief that the Apostles had gone out to evangelize many areas of the world after receiving this command by Jesus which made Saravia so deeply concerned about reevangelizing those countries which had once been Christian; for it was primarily those sections of the world in which the Apostles had once worked and witnessed which had since fallen to the forces of Islam. However, he was not only concerned about missions to those places where Christianity had died out, but he was equally concerned about the rest of the world as well. He saw missions to the heathen as an internal necessity of the Church by virtue of the fact that it must always be grounded in and faithful to its Apostolic foundations. The same authority which had sent out the Apostles was present in the Church in all ages and therefore the command to go to all nations which issued from that

1. Ibid., 234-37, 286-96.
authority would always be relevant to the mission of the Church.

In a very real sense, though, Saravia's thoughts about missions were even more deeply rooted in his Christology than in his Apostolicity, for he contended that even Apostolic authority itself could be proved by the mission given by the Lord to the Apostles.¹ He meant by this that ultimately the Church had been sent into all the world because Christ Himself had been sent from God to the world and because Christ sent the Holy Spirit at Pentecost to empower the Church for its task.² We can say, therefore, that Saravia believed the mission of the Church to be prior to its Apostolic foundations, for this ultimately came from the heart of Him who first sent out the Apostles, and we can also say that this reveals again that Saravia's Apostolicity itself was rooted very deeply in his Christology. Likewise, it should be noted that this conception both of Apostolic authority and of the mission of the Church as being directly related to Christ reveals that hidden but nonetheless real eschatological character of this part of his theology. Just as he had interpreted a Shaliach to be one who serves both as a proxy in function and as a personal representative of the one who sent him, he also saw that Christ's power could be held and given only by the Lord Himself — i.e., it could not be delegated or transmitted horizontally through the Church.³ It is, he said, "the One who sends, who gives the authority,"⁴ so in every age the Church can know that it has Apostolic authority because it remains true to the doctrine Christ gave to those who first went out, and because the Church's missionary command comes directly from Christ through the Holy Spirit. Just as the Shaliach could not take the place of the one who sent him out except to represent his master personally, so ecclesiastical authority could not be delegated from one person to another, or handed down from

¹. Ibid., 273.
². Ibid.
³. Ibid., 277, 289-92.
⁴. "Defensio ... etc.," 173.
ecclesiastical problems and needs of his time. He seems never to have shirked that responsibility by choosing easy or safe subjects about which to write but he willingly and generously gave himself to a study and exposition of whatever he felt needed his attention even though it be highly controversial. Although we may not agree with some of his answers, we can nevertheless recognize the lasting theological contribution which he has made to the Church in his writings and in his ministry.
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